

STATE PLAN PEER REVIEW CRITERIA Peer Review Panel Notes Template

STATE: Michigan
DATE: August 2017



U.S. Department of Education
April 5, 2017

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

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.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>	<i>MI indicates that they are applying for the first option (applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i). However, the analysis indicates they are combining both exceptions (i) and (ii). In their report, they recognize what they have described is not permitted under current law so they will be seeking a waiver.</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<i>MI provides an outline of how they plan to address recently arrived English learners in year one, two, three and four.</i>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>Selection of option does not correspond to description. The plan, as outlined by MI, does not align with current statute.</i>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (3 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<i>MI states which exception they will select but does not outline how they made this determination. It also notes that they plan they intend to implement is not an option under statute, therefore they intend to seek a waiver to implement MI' s preferred plan. Absent a waiver, MI will need to select one of the three exception options provided in the statute.</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>	<i>MI includes the n-size of 10 for public reporting and will use an n-size of 30 for index calculations. The minimum n-size is the same for all student subgroups in each indicator.</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>Further explanation of MI's selection of 30 occurs in next response.</i>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

- Is the selected minimum number of students statistically sound?¹

¹ 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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<i>MI provides information about how the n size is statistically sound and compares to what many other states have chosen. MI indicates their selection of 30 is based upon investigation of research and scholarly papers that indicate 30 is large enough to yield statistically reliable results.</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Minimum n-size of 30 is widely accepted as statistically sound</i>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.ii.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>	<i>MI has added an appendix to the state plan that comprehensively describes how it collaborated with stakeholders. MI shared the collaboration process it utilized to involved different stakeholders including the disagreements different entities had regarding the n-size. At least 40 comments were in favor of decreasing the n-size while others recommended increasing above 30 and others supported an n-size of 10. The plan does not discuss how a compromise was reached but n-size of 30 was determined for the index based accountability system while n-size of</i>

[“Best Practices for Determining Subgroup Size in Accountability Systems While Protecting Personally Identifiable Student Information”](#) to identify appropriate statistical disclosure limitation strategies for protecting student privacy.

	<i>10 was used to report for transparency purposes.</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<i>MI provided comments from stakeholder groups; while it was clear there was disagreement among the stakeholders, MI used research and evidence from scholarly papers along with their stakeholder feedback to reach a compromise of 30 for accountability metrics and 10 for reporting purposes.</i>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.iii: 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>	<i>Long-term goals are included for each sub group and reflect the same goal for each subgroup. MI describes their long-term goal is to raise the statewide averages to meet the 2016-17 proficiency rates at the 75th percentile in ELA and mathematics by the end of the 2024-2025 school year. While MI meets many of the criteria in this requirement, the long-term goals do not provide clear evidence of ambitiousness for all subgroups. MI might want to consider individualizing long term goals for each subgroup based on the current baseline of each sub group to ensure each sub group is increasing their proficiency at sufficient rates based on their baseline and reaching an appropriately ambitious long-term goal.</i>

<i>Strengths</i>	<i>MI identifies numeric measures for all students and all subgroups.</i>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>Mi has an opportunity to differentiate based on baseline data. For example, applying the same long-term goal to all subgroups where one of those subgroups (Asian) is already surpassing the 2024-25 long-term goal in both RLA and Math may not be perceived as sufficiently ambitious.</i>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (3 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	MI will need to provide greater evidence that the long-term goals that they have set for each of their sub-groups is sufficiently ambitious. MI should consider individualizing long-term goals so that all goals are perceived as being sufficiently ambitious for all subgroups. MI should provide more detail on how subgroups with different baselines will all achieve their identified 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?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<i>Measures of interim progress are included for each subgroup and includes timelines. Note: if the prior section regarding long-term goals is revised, this section will need to be revised accordingly.</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<i>MI provides interim targets for each subgroup that consider the progress each sub group needs to make. MI should consider adding a description of what steps they will take to ensure each subgroup can meet the goal taking into account the current baseline and proficiency gaps of each sub group.</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<i>MI outlines that they have the same high expectations for all students. The interim targets outline that every subgroup will meet the same long-term goal.</i>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>MI does not provide a description or explanation of how they will address proficiency gaps to ensure all students will meet the long-term goals. The MI plan would benefit from such a description to provide greater transparency.</i>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<i>MI describes their long-term goal is to raise the statewide average to the 2015-16 4-year graduation rate at the</i>

	<i>75th percentile baseline target. This includes student who earn regular diplomas. MI indicates their graduation rates are ambitious leading to a rate of nearly 95% within ten year. MI includes baseline data and long-term goals for all sub groups of students.</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>MI's calculation for establishing the long-term goal is somewhat complex and might benefit from articulated examples.</i>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.iii.b.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>	<i>MI includes baseline line data and long-term goals for all students and all subgroups for 5th and 6th year graduates. Each subgroup has the same length of time to reach the goal within each extended rate. MI's 5- and 6-year rates are 96.49% and 97% respectively, more rigorous than the long-term goal for the 4-year adjusted rate.</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewer(s))

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

A.4.iii.b.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>	<i>MI includes measurements of interim progress but there is inconsistent data listed in the plan. The six-year adjusted rate measurements of interim progress as displayed in Appendix A do not reflect the long-term goal of 97%. The 6-year rate baselines and measures do not seem consistent with a long-term goal of 97%. Appendix A displays a 6-year rate that is less rigorous than the 5-year rate.</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (3 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	MI will need to adjust or clarify appendix A. On page 29 the six-year adjusted rate is listed as 97% and on page 138 it is listed as 96.43% with corresponding interim progress measures.

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>	<i>MI provides interim targets for each subgroup that consider the progress each sub group needs to make. MI should consider adding a description of what steps they will take to ensure each subgroup can meet the goal; taking into account the current baseline and proficiency gaps of each sub group.</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<i>MI outlines that they have the same high expectations for all students. The interim targets outline that every subgroup will meet the same long-term goal.</i>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>MI does not provide a description or explanation of how they will address proficiency gaps to ensure all students will meet the long-term goals.</i>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

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

<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<i>MI describes the process for how they will assess English learners and describes an expectation of the timeline in which students are expected to achieve language proficiency. However, MI does not clearly identify a long-term goal or data for progress towards proficiency. It appears what MI has provided is a long-term goal for proficiency not a goal for increases in the percentage of Els making progress in achieving proficiency.</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (3 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	MI must provide and/or clarify the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of Els making progress in achieving English learner proficiency and include base line data and timeline for meeting the long-term goal.

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>	<i>MI includes interim progress goals based on the proficiency levels of students when they enter the system but does not provide interim goals for the percentage of students making progress towards proficiency.</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>MI does include information about measures of interim progress. However, the way the information is presented makes it unclear to the reader as to if this is a measure of interim progress of progress towards proficiency.</i>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (3 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	MI must connect their interim progress goals to the long-term goal for the percentage of students making progress towards English language proficiency. The interim progress goals would need to be adjusted based on the adjustment to the long-term goal in requirement A. 4. iii. a. 1.

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>	<i>MI provides a detailed description of the calculation of their academic indicator. The indicator uses grade level proficiency on their annual assessments for grades 3-8 and 11. A measure of growth is used for high schools and is articulated in their description. MI uses the SAT as their assessment for 11th grade students – as the measure of proficiency and growth. While MI indicates that a Student Growth Percentile is calculated, it is unclear how that growth measure is calculated if the SAT is given at a singular point in time to students when they are 11th graders. The academic indicator is based on the state’s long-term goals. Both ELA and math are used to calculate their indicator, but the description of weighting for ELA and math is sparse. Essentially, the state asserts that because all students are required to be assessed in both content areas, that “roughly equates to a 50/50 weighting.”</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<i>MI is using a 100-point index which would appear to be easily understood to the public.</i>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>The complicated calculations regarding high school growth, while sound, may not be entirely transparent to the public. The articulation description for growth does not explain how MI intends to calculate growth on a single point in time measure. In addition, MI should provide an explanation of FAY (full academic year) when the plan originally introduces the concept.</i>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (3 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the</i>	<i>MI will need to specify their weighting of ELA and math in their academic indicator.</i>

<i>specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Additionally, MI will need to clarify how growth is calculated with a SAT given that students are generally taking the SAT once in their 11 th grade year.
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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>	<i>MI uses a student growth percentile as the basis for its other academic indicator for all other schools that are not high schools. The indicator is based on MI's long term goals. MI uses a method in which a student's SGP is compared to that same student's adequate growth target which accounts for the growth needed for that student to reach or consistently progress to the long-term goal. MI uses a timeframe of 3 years for students to attain proficiency</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Using this combined approach (SGP and AGP) holds schools accountable for necessary improvement for students to reach the long-term goals.</i>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>The calculation is complicated and may not be transparent to the public. MI would benefit from providing some examples so the public could have a better understanding of the measure of growth.</i>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewer(s))

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

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>	<i>MI describes its graduation rate indicator using its 100-point index. MI uses its 4-year, combined with its 5- and 6-year cohort rate with a weighted average of 50-30-20 for each subgroup to derive the graduation index. The indicator is calculated for all students, and all sub-groups meeting the minimum n-size of 30. The index value represents the percent of the long-term goal achieved with the 4-year goal of 94.4; this rate includes only those students achieving a regular high school diploma in four years. MI’s long-term goal is to have 75% of its schools and sub-groups meet the statewide rate at the 75th percentile. It is unclear whether the weighting schema for combining the 4-, 5-, and 6-year rates is sufficiently rigorous given that the majority (nearly 80%) of MI’s students currently graduate within the 4-year period.</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<i>MI recognizes that not all students will graduate in 4 years and recognizes the need to continue to hold schools</i>

	<i>accountable for students during years 5 and 6.</i>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>The 50-30-20 weighting schema for each subgroup that derives the 100-point index may not reflect the state’s ambitious initiative to become a “top 10 Educational state in 10 Years.”. Given that MI currently has a nearly 80% graduation rate for all students and a 90% rate for its Asian sub-group, a weighting system that weights the 4-year rate more heavily might send a more consistent policy message. Giving equal weights to the 4-year and the 5- and 6-year combined may potentially mask issues of access to 4-year graduation.</i>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.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>	<i>MI describes its methodology for determining students progressing toward meeting English language proficiency (ELP). The description includes a definition of ELP (composite performance level of 4.5 or higher) on their statewide assessment, WIDA ACCESS for ELLs 2.0). MI also defines adequate progress as earning a scale score within the established timeframe depending on the student’s initial WIDA score. MI has set a timeline for all students to reach language proficiency within, and no more than, 6 years. This timeframe is based on research and stakeholder input. Students with a student growth percentile (SGP) equal to or greater than their adequate growth target (AGP) are considered to have met their growth targets (adequate progress).</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<i>MI considers a reasonable expectation of growth and progress for it EL students.</i>

<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>While the calculation is sound, it is not necessarily intuitive nor transparent to the public.</i>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.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>	<i>MI includes 5 additional indicators in the school quality realm: K-12 Chronic Absenteeism, 11-12 Advanced Coursework completion, Post-secondary education, and K-8 access to arts/PE and Librarian or media specialist. The weighting within the school quality indicator, as well as the overall weighting within the system is clearly articulated. While the indicators appear valid and reliable, it is less clear that all the indicators can be applied to all schools and compared across all schools, particularly the 11-12 Advanced Coursework Completion indicator. While MI describes several ways that students can access courses, it does not appear to be the case that all courses are made available to every student in each building. The indicator is described as a percentage of students who successfully complete an advanced course, but there is no definition for “successfully completing.” In addition, the</i>

	<i>post-secondary indicator does not seem to account for 100% of MI students. MI indicates that calculations will occur for each of these indicators, but does not describe how this index will be calculated nor does it describe what an attainment target might be. Given that attainment targets are included in MI's current schema, targets should be included for these quality school indicators.</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<i>MI puts forth a well-rounded set of indicators that could provide appropriate measures of school quality.</i>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>The 11/12 coursework indicator and the post-secondary indicator do not appear to meet the statewide comparability threshold. While measuring FTE for 2 of their indicators is a reasonable measure, the degree to which students are engaged in such activities may not be captured. MI does not articulate expectations around these measures so that schools may understand how to improve or meet an attainment target.</i>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (3 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	MI will need to clarify the access and availability of courses in each building for all students for the 11/12 coursework measure to be comparable. In addition, MI will need to clarify how the collection of post-secondary education indicators will be comparable state-wide - how will they account for missing data? MI will need to articulate how these indicators are calculated and what the expectations are to allow for meaningful differentiation.

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>	<i>MI describes its system of meaningful differentiation and includes all 5 indicators of performance. MI includes participation (both general and EL) as two separate indicators. Including the participation rates of the general and ELP assessments as indicators in determining meaningful differentiation may add unnecessary variability and noise to this task of determining meaningful differentiation across schools. MI's participation rate is already accounted for in Section A. IV. vii. of the state plan. Additionally, participation in the annual ELP assessment must be 100% for eligible students, so establishing a participation rate in this requirement seems inappropriate. Responding to MI averages indicators using a weighting system to attain an overall summative index value. However, MI will report each category separately in its "transparency dashboard." MI will calculate each index for all students and any</i>

	<i>valid sub-group meeting the minimum n-size.</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<i>MI has included some initial modeling in their plan – very transparent.</i>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>The MI plan refers to a “peer group” or average of “comparison schools”, but does not provide a description of what constitutes a peer or comparison for the dashboard. The plan would benefit from a clearer distinction between accountability differentiation vs MI’s transparency dashboard; unclear how the transparency dashboard figures into the accountability system – appears to be strictly a reporting mechanism that is separate and distinct. MI may want to consider removing the participation rates into this section. If they remain, then it seems appropriate that they be considered additional school quality indicators and would be subject to the necessary elements for including it into the system of indicators.</i>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.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>	<i>MI adequately describes the weighting of each of their selected indicators. Additionally, MI provides 3 examples of schools where an indicator may not be calculated due to the minimum number of students. These examples are helpful, but not entirely sufficient to clearly demonstrate MI’s rationale behind the weighting schema or the proportional redistribution. The academic achievement, other academic, graduation rate, and ELP progress receive much greater weight in the aggregate than the school quality indicator. While the academic achievement and the other academic indicator receive substantial weight, the graduation rate seems proportionately low and not necessarily substantial on its own. This perception may be altered by additional examples of redistribution. MI is</i>

	<i>including assessment participation rates as part of the weighting. As noted above, this may add unnecessary variability and may not provide much meaningful differentiation.</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<i>MI has determined a methodology to ensure the preservation of the policy decision regarding weights when schools do not have sufficient data to include one of the indicators.</i>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>Graduation and EL progress weights are individually each less than the school quality indicator weight; one could argue that these are not given adequate weight in the system in general. MI would benefit from a deeper description and articulation of the rationale behind the weights.</i>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.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>	<i>MI recognizes that traditional accountability systems may not be sensitive to alternative settings. MI has committed to developing a new parallel alternative system which it intends to make available to schools on an opt-in basis. MI has met with stakeholder groups to discuss possible indicators, but no description of such indicators is provided. MI intends to make this a voluntary system based on certain eligibility criteria, but such criteria is not articulated in the plan. It is unclear how or if MI will hold these schools accountable prior to an actual alternative accountability system being put into place</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<i>MI intends to have students attending such schools contribute to the alternative accountability system.</i>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>MI does not describe the schools for which it will consider an alternative path nor the criteria which might make a school eligible. Very little detail is provided in response to this requirement.</i>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewer(s))

	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (3 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	MI will need to describe its methodology it will use for the voluntary, parallel systems of accountability. While MI speaks about “alternative education-focused entities,” it provides no detail as to the criteria that will be used to establish eligibility. It suggests that a one-year pilot will be undertaken once the path is developed, but no timeline is provided. MI will need to indicate that they are holding all schools accountable absent an alternative accountability system.

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>	<i>MI explains the methodology and process to identify the lowest performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds. MI’s plan outlines the 100-point index using each of the 6 accountability indicators (proficiency, growth, graduation rate, English language progress, school quality/student success, and assessment participation) based on the specific indicators that exist at each school. MI also explains how it will calculate the index for each campus missing one or more of the indicators. MI’s timeline to identify Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools begins with the use of data generated from the 2017-2018 which sounds like a planning year, for identification in the following year. MI uses the summative index for Title I schools, but does not indicate the calculation.</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<i>MI’s plan is comprehensive and outlines the procedure to be followed if any school is missing one or more of the data components and bases all results on a calculation of the proportionally defined weighted average of the actual indicators present.</i>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>Hard to determine if this will result in accurate identification – could benefit from some detailed examples and scenarios.</i>

<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<i>MI complies with the identification process to determine all public high schools failing to graduate one-third of more of students by utilizing a composite weighting system to combine the 4-, 5- and 6-year cohorts. The timeline for implementation uses data from the 2017 – 2018 school year to identify the schools required to receive comprehensive support and improvement. MI may want to revisit the weighting system once they have actual data to determine if it accurately portrays the graduation rate.</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>MI uses the same weighting schema described previously of 50-30-20 for the 4-, 5-, and 6-year rates respectively; it is unclear from the description whether this weighting will result in the lowest third.</i>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to</i>	

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

A.4.vi.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>	<i>MI describes the methodology to analyze performance of subgroups of students to lead to identification of individual schools falling in the lowest –performing five percent further identifying a Comprehensive and Support and Improvement School. Using the summative index calculated on all subgroups – any subgroup less than or equal to the highest overall index of the lowest performing five percent will identify that school containing the subgroup as a Comprehensive Support and Improvement School. MI states it will identify such schools if after first being identified for additional targeted support, continue to have subgroups meeting the described criteria after four years.</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>MI’s explanation of the identification process and the timeline in which they will be able to identify such schools meeting the criteria is not fully described or clear and would benefit from additional clarification that helped articulate the process.</i>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<i>MI states identification of consistently underperforming subgroups will occur annually and is based on its definition that at least one subgroup is performing as poorly as all students in any of the lowest statewide schools determined to be a Title I Comprehensive Support and Improvement school. MI’s statewide accountability system of annual differentiation will be utilized to determine the performance of subgroups. MI indicates they will annually identify any school with one or more consistently underperforming subgroups.</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<i>MI clarifies that identification of schools is in addition to previously identified schools.</i>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	.

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<i>MI will first identify Additional Targeted Support schools based on 2017-18 data and identify every three years using the 100-point index calculated for all valid subgroups with a value less than or equal to the highest value in the lowest 5-percent of schools. MI identifies 2017 – 2018 data will be used to identify Targeted Support schools and identify subsequent schools every three years but does not clarify ongoing identification processes based on new annual data for every school not already targeted.</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<i>While MI meets elements (number of years no more than 4), the description of the exit criteria, improvement in</i>

	<i>ELA and Math, does not necessarily ensure alignment with the State’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress, closing statewide proficiency, the graduation rate gap and continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success. MI may want to revisit the specific criteria to be used for exit once evidence of improved performance is available. MI does include a possible intent to submit an amendment for modified exit criteria in the future, but does not specify details for the original exit procedures.</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<i>MI indicates they may submit an amendment.</i>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>MI does not explain how the exit criteria will ensure continued progress and academic achievement.</i>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.viii.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>	<i>While MI essentially meets the required elements including the number of years schools are expected to meet the criteria (4), the description of the exit criteria, improvement in ELA and Math, does not necessarily ensure alignment with the State’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress, closing statewide proficiency, the graduation rate gap and continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success. MI may want to revisit the specific criteria to be used for exit once evidence of improved performance is available. MI does include a possible intent to submit an amendment for modified exit criteria in the future but does not specify details for the original exit procedures. MI states the school will be no longer receiving Additional Targeted Support when the system no longer identifies the school as an Additional Targeted Support</i>

	<i>School. The school must demonstrate improvements in math and ELA but there is no discussion how the exit criteria will improve student outcomes for the subgroup(s) that led to the school's designation as a Targeted Support School.</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<i>MI indicates they may submit an amendment.</i>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>MI does not provide any details to specify exit criteria as well as any discussion to the alignment to the State's long term goals or measurements of interim progress. The plan would benefit from a deeper description of how the exit criteria will ensure improved student academic achievement and school success.</i>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	