

STATE PLAN PEER REVIEW CRITERIA Peer Review Notes Template

STATE: Nebraska



U.S. Department of Education

Background

Peer reviewers apply their professional judgment and experiences when responding to the questions in response to the criteria below. Consistent with section 1111(a)(4)(C) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), peer reviewers will conduct an objective review of State plans in their totality and out of respect for State and local judgments, with the goal of supporting State- and local-led innovation and providing objective feedback on the technical, educational, and overall quality of a State plan, including the validity and reliability of each element of the State plan. Peer reviewer notes inform the written determination of the Secretary regarding the consolidated State plan.

Role of the Peer Reviewers

- Each peer reviewer will independently review a consolidated State plan with respect to the criteria for Title I, Part A and Title III, Part A and record his or her responses to the questions. Each peer reviewer will note where changes may be necessary for a State educational agency (SEA) to fully address statutory and regulatory requirements and may also present suggestions to improve the State plan or to highlight best practices. Each peer reviewer will create his or her individual recommendations to guide the in-person review. These individual recommendations are submitted to the Department but will not be shared with the State.
- A panel of peer reviewers will meet in person to discuss each SEA's plan. The panel of peer reviewers will generate one set of peer review notes that reflects its collective review and evaluation of NE's consolidated State plan, but the panel is not required to reach consensus. The notes should reflect all peer reviewer perspectives on each requirement.

After the peer review is completed, each SEA will receive the final peer review notes that include the peer reviewers' responses to the questions and any recommendations to improve NE's consolidated State plan. The peer review notes: 1) constitute the official record of the peer review panel's responses to questions regarding how an SEA's State plan addresses the statutory and regulatory requirements; 2) provide technical assistance to NE on how to improve its State plan; and 3) recommend to the Secretary what, if any, additional information to request from NE. Taking into consideration the peer reviewers' recommendations, the Department will provide feedback to each SEA that outlines any areas NE must address prior to the Secretary's approval of its consolidated State plan. If a State plan cannot be approved, the Department will offer NE an opportunity to revise and resubmit its State plan and have a hearing, consistent with ESEA section 8451.

Consistent with ESEA section 1111(a)(5), the Department will make publicly available all peer review guidance, training, and final panel notes. The names of peer reviewers will be made publicly available at the completion of the review of all consolidated State plans. The peer reviewers for any individual State will not be made publicly available.

How to Use This Document

The peer review criteria are intended to: 1) support States as they develop their consolidated State plans, and 2) inform peer reviewer panels as they evaluate each consolidated State plan. This document outlines the required elements that an SEA must address in its State plan in order to fully meet the applicable statutory and regulatory requirements. If an SEA has provided insufficient information for peer reviewers to determine whether any requirement is fully addressed, peer reviewers should indicate that NE has not fully addressed that requirement and identify what additional information or clarification may be needed. Note that responses to some elements are required only if the specific circumstances addressed in the question are applicable to NE submitting the consolidated State plan (*e.g.*, if NE establishes an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate in addition to a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate in item

A.4.iii.b.2 below). For these particular questions, if the circumstances addressed in the question do not apply to NE, NE is not required to answer the question in order to fully address the statutory and regulatory requirements.

Instructions

Each peer reviewer should include individual review notes in the space provided below each consolidated State plan requirement. For each consolidated State plan requirement, a peer reviewer will provide:

- Peer Analysis: Describe the peer reviewer's justification for why an SEA did or did not meet the requirement;
- Strengths: Summarize the strengths of an SEA's response to the State plan requirement;
- Weaknesses: Summarize the weaknesses of an SEA's response to the State plan requirement, including issues, lack of clarity, and possible suggestions for technical assistance; and
- Assessment: Determine if NE met the State plan requirement (indicated by Yes/No)
 - If the peer reviewer indicates 'No' above, the peer reviewer must describe the specific information or clarification that a State must provide in order to meet the requirement.

The peer reviewer notes should address all of the required elements of each State plan requirement in this document, but need not address each element individually (*i.e.*, the peer reviewer notes should holistically review A.3.i about the SEA's definition for native languages, incorporating each of the four bulleted items in this element but need not individually respond to each bullet).

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

A.1: Challenging State Academic Standards and Assessments

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

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Not applicable
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

A.3.i: Definition

- Does the SEA provide its definition of “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population”?
- Does the SEA identify the specific languages that meet that definition?

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	NE provides the following definition “language that represents 15 percent or more of the native languages spoken by identified English Learners statewide is considered a language present to a significant extent in the participating student population.” (page 62) NE identifies Spanish as the only language meeting this definition. NE does not provide specific information regarding its consideration of ELs who are migratory, ELs not born in the U.S., and ELs who are Native Americans.
<i>Strengths</i>	NE sets a definite threshold at which languages fall into the definition of present to a significant extent and conducted a review of individual district data in determining its definition.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	NE did not describe how it considered languages other than English that are spoken by English learners who are migratory, who were not born in the United States, or who are Native Americans. NE did not describe how it considered languages other than English that are spoken by a significant portion of the participating student population in one or more of the State’s LEAs, or languages spoken by a significant portion of the participating student population across grade levels.
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	NE must describe how it considered languages other than English that are spoken by English learners who are migratory, who were not born in the United States, or who are Native Americans. NE must 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, or languages spoken by a significant portion of the participating student population across grade levels.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>NE provides math (NeSA-Math) and science (NeSA-Science) content assessments in Spanish for students in grades 3-8. General directions are provided in Spanish for the English language arts (NeSA-ELA) assessment. LEAs are currently allowed a local option to translate the math (NeSA-Math) and science (NeSA-Science) content assessments as well as the language arts (NeSA-ELA) directions into languages other than Spanish for ELs who are literate in their native language.</p> <p>NE also allows linguistically supportive accommodations for ELs taking content tests.</p> <p>As NE uses the ACT for high school, no translations are provided, but EL accommodations are expected in 2017-18.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Clear and concise explanation.</p> <p>NE allows for local translation options for math and science content, as well as ELA directions, in order to support English learners.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	District capacity to offer translations and the consistency of translations could have an impact on validity and reliability.
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.3.iii: Assessments not Available and Needed

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	NE indicates that there is not a need for any academic assessments beyond what the state is currently offering.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>NE states that the required assessments in the content areas of math and science are currently translated into Spanish – the only native language that is present to a significant extent in LEAs. LEAs have the option to translate the math (NeSA-Math) and science (NeSA-Science) content assessments as well as the language arts (NeSA-ELA) directions into languages other than Spanish based on local needs.</p> <p>NE describes how it consults with stakeholders: on an annual basis, NE gathers data regarding languages spoken in districts through the assessment advisory committee of stakeholders. This group annually reviews data related to languages spoken that meet the definition of languages present to a significant extent and makes a recommendation at that time on assessments to be offered in languages other than English.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Clear and sufficient explanation.</p> <p>NE has provided assessments in Spanish since 2010</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	NE includes all of the state’s major racial and ethnic groups in its accountability system.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.i.b: Additional Subgroups at SEA Discretion

- If applicable, does the SEA describe any additional subgroups of students other than the statutorily required subgroups (i.e., economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners) included in its statewide accountability system?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Not applicable
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

Note: This peer review criterion applies only if a State selects the third option in item A.4.i.d in the consolidated State plan template for recently arrived English learners under which the State applies the

exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i) or the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii) to a recently arrived English learner.

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Not applicable - state chooses the second option.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.ii: 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 NE provide the minimum number of students that the State determines is necessary to meet the requirements of any provisions under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that require disaggregation of information by each subgroup of students for accountability purposes, including annual meaningful differentiation and identification of schools?
- Is the minimum number of students the same State-determined number for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State (i.e., economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners) for accountability purposes?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>NE provides the minimum N-size for accountability as being 25 assessment scores, which is different than using 25 students as N-size.</p> <p>ESSA does not allow the number of “assessment scores” to be used for the min. N-size. Further, the IES report, “Best Practices for Determining Subgroup Size in Accountability Systems While Protecting Personally Identifiable Student Information,” which states were encouraged to consult, makes no mention of the use of the number of assessment scores rather than the number of students. Grad rate. Table 21 indicates that an n-size of “a cohort size of 25 from either the 4- or 7-year cohorts” will be used for the graduation indicator.</p> <p>The plan states “For the graduation indicator, a school must have minimum number of 25 students. If a cohort lacks the minimum number of students, up to two previous years may be combined to reach the 25-student minimum.”</p>

	The plan should make clear that the n-size for the graduation indicator is the number of students in the graduating class (cohort), not in the entire school.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	As stated above, NE is not complying with ESSA requirements with regard to determining minimum n-size. The state uses assessment counts rather than student counts, which sets no true min. N size for student count. Data on the rate of inclusion of subgroups is not provided.
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	NE must provide an n size of students to be used for accountability, rather than the number of assessment scores.

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

- Is the selected minimum number of students statistically sound?²

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	NE does not propose a minimum number (N) of students. Rather, NE proposes that its decision to use the number of assessment scores (as opposed to students) is in large part because this approach provides better stability of data. The state provides no data in defense of this position.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Since NE is not complying w/ ESSA requirement regarding N-size, it is determined to not comply with this requirement.
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	NE must provide an N-size of students to be used for accountability along with supporting information describing statistical soundness.

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The NE plan states that the N-size was determined by “The AQuESTT Task Force (2014-15) (Appendix B) (which) was composed of national experts, school board members, ESU professional development staff, administrators, and teachers from across the state.” Thus, it is not clear that parents and other stakeholders were adequately included in this work. Although NE provided n size, it is based on assessment counts rather than students.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The state does not explicitly state that it engaged with parents on this issue. NE appears to be judging the n size on how it captures the “all students” subgroup. This is evidenced by statements like “The AQuESTT Accountability system’s unique approach to the minimum number makes it so schools are held accountable under Nebraska’s annual meaningful differentiation of schools.” In fact, the purpose of n size is to hold as many schools as possible accountable for the performance of each subgroup.
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	NE must provide a minimum n size of students for accountability purposes as well as how the state collaborated with parents.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	NE provides its procedures for ensuring protection of PII. The information presented appears to apply to NE’s reporting of student information, not to the accountability system.

³ See footnote 5 above for further guidance.

	NE also describes masking rules related to the reporting of student data for small groups (less than 10).
<i>Strengths</i>	Value is large enough to ensure student privacy. NE limits access to individual student data and has masking rules to protect privacy.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	NE rules allow for reporting of unmasked membership even if fewer than 10 students which could result in identification of individual student performance. The rule of 100% does not fully address suppression related to performance approaching 0% or 100%.
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	NE uses an N-size of 10 students for reporting which differs from the approach it is using for the N-size for assessment counts in the accountability system. This appears to satisfy requirements with respect to privacy and statistical reliability. NE has adopted several primary masking rules, including: the Rule of 10 – used to protect personally identifiable information when the number of students in a group is small (masking all numbers when there are fewer than 10 in a group, but NOT at the State, district, school and grade level, even if fewer than 10 students); Performance Level Reporting; and the Rule of 100% (used to protect privacy in student performance when all students in a group fall into the same achievement level, regardless of the total student count).
<i>Strengths</i>	The plan describes the use of FERPA-aligned best practices. By establishing a minimum of 10, more transparent information is available for reporting purposes.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Membership information is reported for groups smaller than 10 students as noted above.
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)

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

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>	NE’s methodology for establishing long-term academic achievement goals is to cut proficiency gap in half in 10 years – 2026. NE describes its long-term goals for ELA and Math for all students and each subgroup, provides baseline data and the timeline. The timeline is the same for all subgroups, and goals are ambitious.
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The state’s goals are ambitious as they require faster growth for those furthest behind and lead to improvement over the next ten years.</p> <p>NE also proposes “challenge goals” and states that “If the Department notes student progress exceeding the 50 percent reduction model, then the NDE may consider using these Challenge Goals as the state’s long-term goals. These long-term goals propose a 70 percent reduction in non-proficiency in five years. These highly ambitious goals get all student groups to at least 80 percent proficiency by 2021 and above 95 percent proficiency by 2026.</p> <p>The model selected leads to all groups’ and schools’ improvement in percentages of students who are proficient, regardless of starting point. The State argues that this prevents higher achieving groups from being stagnant, requiring improvement from all students.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>NE makes no commitment to uphold the goals over time regardless of actual performance. Thus, goals may be adjusted downward based on actual achievement.</p> <p>NE does not clearly explain how the ACT addresses grade-level proficiency.</p>
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers)

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	NE provides 2-year measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for all students and for each subgroup of students. To determine interim benchmarks for each group, the 10-year goal ending point is divided by the number of years between the baseline year and ending year to arrive at interim percentages. NE provides a table on pages 20-21, showing interim measures of progress to meet the state goals. Some student subgroups are required to grow at higher rates than others.
<i>Strengths</i>	NE includes historical data for the previous five years. By explaining a 50% and a 70% gap reduction methodology, NE provides clear detail on the state’s goals and interim measures over the 10 year timeline.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	By requiring greater improvement in proficiency rates for the lowest performing subgroups, NE’s 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.

<i>Strengths</i>	NE's expected annual improvement in proficiency by subgroup is clearly outlined, such that the lowest-performing subgroups must increase proficiency rates by 4-6% every two years.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	NE's methodology for 4-year ACGR goals is to reduce grad gap by 50% over 10 years. NE provides baseline data and long-term goals for 4-year ACGR for all students and each subgroup, including the timeline, which is the same for all students and all student subgroups. The goals are ambitious and result in gap closing.
<i>Strengths</i>	The table on page 24 and the explanations were very helpful.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	It is unclear why the EL goal is 77% in the table on page 24, which contradicts the state's strategic vision goal of no subgroup less than 85% on page 23.
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

- If applicable (*i.e.*, if the SEA chooses, at its discretion, to establish long-term goals for one or more extended-year rates), does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students?

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	NE uses the same methodology for both four-year rates and seven-year rates. Data is included for all students and subgroups of students. The timeline is also 2026. These goals are ambitious as they require almost all students (96%) to graduate within seven years. The goals are higher for the seven-year rate, but the annual progress required is not more rigorous.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Seven years is quite extended, given that NE does not plan to use less extended-year ACGRs (such as 5-, 6-years). NE lists its American Indian / Alaska Native goal as 89%, which does not align with Goal 3.3 of the NE strategic vision.
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.iii.b.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>	NE establishes 2-year measurements of interim progress for both four-year ACGR and seven-year ACGR, for all students and for individual subgroups of students.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	By requiring greater rates of improvement among the state’s lower performing subgroups, the 4- and 7-year ACGR goals and 2-year MIPs provide improvement necessary to close graduation rate gaps.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>NE provides an ambitious long-term goal for increases in percentage of ELs making progress (50% reduction), provides baseline data and timeline and describes the activities NE is currently involved in to refine its approach to EL proficiency and progress.</p> <p>NE proposes to differentiate EL progress goals based on a student’s initial data point on the first administration of the state’s annual required English language proficiency assessment, which will determine the timeline to</p>

	<p>proficiency. This approach recognizes that the language growth of students at lower grade levels or proficiency levels is faster than the language growth of students at higher grade levels or proficiency levels. NE indicates that it has engaged technical assistance to refine this approach.</p> <p>NE has set an ambitious long-term goal of 74.8% of EL students meeting growth targets toward proficiency, as measured by ELPA21, by 2026-27, up from 49.5% in the 2015-16 school year.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	NE follows recommendations of the research for English language acquisition in acknowledging that applying a uniform growth standard is not necessarily best practice in terms of ensuring that all students are on track to exit EL services in six years. The State’s plan is to develop differentiated growth standards that are dependent on a student’s level of English proficiency in the prior year to better define support for students. English language growth is not linear.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	NE has not yet determined differentiated growth standards for individual student each year based upon initial score on ELPA21, but NE does clarify that the metric will be established consistently across all EL students.
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

- Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	NE provides two-year measurements of interim progress, which require an improvement of 5.06% of students making growth during each two-year cycle.
<i>Strengths</i>	NE used baseline data and growth from two years to establish long-term goals and interim measurements.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this</i>	

A.4.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 NE 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	<p>According to Table 16, NE uses the “Status” indicator in its accountability system to correspond to the “Academic Achievement” indicator required under ESSA. While not included in Table 16, according to the AQuESTT business rules, this indicator includes Reading, Math, <u>Science</u>, and Writing Assessments.</p> <p>NE states that “status” is calculated by averaging state assessment scores across all available grade levels for the current year. This average will earn an initial score of 1, 2, 3, or 4, with 1 being the lowest, and 4 the highest. Some schools with a small number of eligible assessment scores will have their district’s Status score substitute as their school Status score.</p> <p>The plan does not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the weighting of ELA and Math, • Describe how the indicator will be disaggregated for each subgroup of students, • Provide information on how achievement is based on the long-term goals, • Provide information regarding measuring the performance of at least 95% of all students and each subgroup. There is no acknowledgement of the ESSA requirement regarding calculation of non-participants as not proficient when participation falls below 95% of all students and each subgroup.
Strengths	NE’s explanation of the history and progression of the AQuESTT

	Accountability Framework is very detailed.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>While NE uses ACT for its high school assessment, it is not clear how this test measures grade-level proficiency on the state’s standards.</p> <p>Although the indicator chart on pages 76-77 is user-friendly, it contradicts AQuESTT business rules calculations for status.</p> <p>The plan does not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the weighting of ELA and Math, • Describe how the indicator will be disaggregated for each subgroup of students, • Provide information on how achievement is based on the long-term goals, • Provide information regarding measuring the performance of at least 95% of all students and each subgroup. There is no acknowledgement of the ESSA requirement regarding calculation of non-participants as not proficient when participation falls below 95% of all students and each subgroup. <p>The indicator is potentially not the same in each school, as all assessment scores (proposed as the N-size) for Reading, Math, Science, and Writing are compiled into a single calculation for status. This could result in content areas being weighted differently from school to school.</p>
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>NE must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify that this indicator is based only on ELA and Math achievement, • Describe the weighting of ELA and Math, • Describe how the indicator can be disaggregated for each subgroup of students, • Provide information on how achievement is based on the long-term goals, • Provide information regarding measuring the performance of at least 95% of all students and each subgroup. There is currently no acknowledgement of the ESSA requirement regarding calculation of non-participants as not proficient when participation falls below 95% of all students and each subgroup, • Describe how the calculation will be consistent across all schools.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>This metric looks separately at improvement (in all areas per Appendix F), growth in ELA and Math, and reduction in non-proficient in ELA and Math. NE awards credit to schools that have a three-year trend of improvement in student growth, achievement, or reduction in the percent of students not scoring proficient. Each metric may be disaggregated by subgroup. At the high school level the state looks at ACT and ELPA 21 performance improvement.</p> <p>The plan does not provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how the elements that make up the indicator (improvement, growth, non-proficiency) will be weighted in the indicator.
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>NE provides districts and schools multiple ways to demonstrate success based upon student growth.</p> <p>NE considers multiple data points across a three-year period at the school and district level to determine whether a school or district has made academic progress, potentially resulting in less volatility in this indicator.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>NE does not provide information about how the components of indicators are weighted nor how the indicators will be disaggregated for each subgroup of students for accountability.</p> <p>NE relies on districts and schools to disaggregate the non-proficient subgroup to determine which students are included, rather than handling this at the state level.</p>
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (2 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (2 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>Two reviewers noted that the plan needs to include improvement and non-proficiency on the ACT as part the Academic Achievement Indicator, rather than in this indicator (see bullet 2, A.4.iv.a above).</p> <p>Two reviewers noted that the plan must include progress on English language proficiency in the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency Indicator, rather than within this indicator.</p>

Two reviewers noted that the plan should provide information about how the components of this indicator are weighted and how the indicator will be disaggregated for each subgroup of students for accountability.
--

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 NE 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>	While NE has provided long-term goals for both four-year and seven-year graduation rates, NE does not use the four-year graduation rate consistently in the accountability model, but rather the higher of the four-year or seven-year cohort graduation rate for schools or districts; NE does use up to two years of prior data should that be necessary based on a very small number of graduates. NE needs to verify if the state plans to develop and award an alternate diploma.
<i>Strengths</i>	NE recognizes the need to capture data for small schools and has included rules for calculation based upon inclusion of prior years’ data.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The indicator is NOT based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. NE’s description does NOT specify how the State includes in its four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates. NE does not base this indicator on the four-year rate for all schools and districts, but rather the higher of a school or district’s four-year or seven-year rate
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information</i>	NE must:

<i>or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use the four-year graduation rate consistently in the accountability model; and must include how the seven-year cohort graduation rate (if used), is combined with the 4-year ACGR; • indicate if the state will develop and award an alternate diploma.
---	---

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>NE uses ELPA21 as a consistent measure of progress of EL students in each grade. NE plans to use ELPA21 in the accountability system, but the timeline for inclusion of this measure in the growth percentage calculation for each school or district is not clear. In order to reach English proficiency, students must earn a score of 4 or higher in the areas of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.</p> <p>NE indicates that EL proficiency is included in the Other Academic indicator (table 16, page 76) then on page 79 indicates that the state will determine EL proficiency growth as measured by the ELPA21 as the basis for this indicator.</p> <p>NE further describes that, after a determination of growth is made for each student, the percent of students making growth is calculated. If that percentage is at or above an established criterion (cut score), the school is awarding a one point rating increase for growth.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	NE has a consistent measure of EL growth through the use of ELPA21 in growth calculations for each school or district.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The proposed measure is invalid, as NE plans to combine progress toward EL proficiency with growth in other content areas. This does not yield a measure of progress toward EL proficiency.</p> <p>It is not clear if the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator is aligned with the State-determined timeline for ELPA goals.</p> <p>The state determined timeline for inclusion of ELPA21 results in the accountability system is not clear.</p>
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)

<p><i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i></p>	<p>NE must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide the timeline for inclusion of this measure in the progress percentage calculation for each school or district; • Describe how the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator is aligned with the State-determined timeline for ELPA goals. • Describe how this indicator is valid and reliable.
---	---

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, NE’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 NE uses a different indicator for each grade span, does it describe each indicator, including the grade span to which it applies?
- Does the indicator allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance?
- Is the indicator valid, reliable, comparable, used statewide in all schools (for the grade span to which it applies), and calculated in a consistent way?
- Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>NE proposes to use several measures within the SQSS indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chronic absenteeism: The state supplies extensive research linked to the importance of this indicator. It is used for all grade spans. The data supplied in the long term goal section suggest differentiation of schools. • Evidence-Based Analysis: a standardized, school-level questionnaire designed to measure the six tenets of AQuESTT: Positive Partnerships, Relationships, and Student Success; Transitions; Educational Opportunities and Access; College and Career Ready; Assessment; and Educator Effectiveness. It is used for all grade spans. There is not extensive data supplied on this metric and cannot be disaggregated by student subgroups. <p>NE needs to clarify if Science is an element of this indicator as listed on page 98.</p> <p>There is no information regarding the weighting of these elements within the SQSS indicator.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The EBA supplies information not only for use in accountability, but also provides additional context for the state to supply supports.</p> <p>At the beginning of the 2017-18 school year, NE provided strategies to schools</p>

	<p>with high chronic absenteeism rates in an effort to make improvement; NE notes the impact of chronic absenteeism on academic achievement through multiple research studies.</p> <p>NE claims that chronic absenteeism will be used annually for all schools, each grade span, and disaggregated by subgroup. NE states that a baseline for chronic absenteeism can be developed for all schools, growth targets established, and a method for analyzing data created.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>NE does not supply information on who at the school is replying to the EBA questions (principal, multiple school staff, or other stakeholders). If the role of the respondent differs from school to school there may be comparability issues.</p> <p>There is no evidence that these indicators allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance; that the indicators are used statewide in all schools (for the grade span to which it applies). There is no evidence or description of whether the indicator can be disaggregated for each subgroup of students.</p>
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>NE must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify whether Science is included in this indicator; • Describe how the indicator allows for meaningful differentiation and is used statewide in all schools; • Describe how the EBA metric can be disaggregated by student subgroup.

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The state uses a flowchart-like approach to differentiate schools. The system starts by looking at the achievement indicator and then adjusting the school’s label up or down based on subsequent indicators.</p> <p>NE states that its system of annual meaningful differentiation is based on AQuESTT school and district classifications described on pages 101-103, but also indicates on page 109 that classification occurs up to every three years.</p> <p>Every eligible public school and district is included and held accountable. The process is used to classify districts and schools within those districts into four</p>

	<p>rating levels: Excellent (4), Great (3), Good (2), or Needs Improvement (1).</p> <p>There is no information regarding how the performance of each subgroup of students on each indicator is included in the system.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>It is unclear what is meant by “eligible public school and district.” The text on page 75 and response to A.4.v.c. would appear to indicate that schools that are wholly SPED and wholly alternative programs are not included in the accountability system, in which case there would be an incentive to move students out of accountable schools and into schools not in the accountability system.</p> <p>NE’s system of annual meaningful differentiation is not based on all indicators in the State’s accountability system.</p> <p>NE’s system of annual meaningful differentiation does not include the performance of all students and each subgroup of students on each of the indicators in the State’s accountability system.</p>
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>NE must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe how it will meaningfully differentiate, <u>on an annual basis</u>, <u>all</u> public schools in the State; • Clarify what is meant by “eligible public school and district.” • Describe how the State’s system of annual meaningful differentiation is based on <u>all</u> indicators in the State’s accountability system; • Describe how the State’s system of annual meaningful differentiation includes the performance of all students and each subgroup of students on each of the indicators in the State’s accountability system.

A.4.v.b: Weighting of Indicators

- Does the SEA describe the weighting of each indicator in its system of annual meaningful differentiation, including how the weighting is adjusted for schools for which an indicator cannot be calculated due to the minimum number of students (e.g., for the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator)?
- Do the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicators each receive substantial weight individually?
- Do the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicators receive, in the aggregate, much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s), in the aggregate?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The state uses a flowchart model which prioritizes indicators, rather than weighting each indicator as required.</p> <p>NE classifies schools based initially on academic performance of students on the state assessments, including all students enrolled for FAY; once an initial performance score is assigned, adjustments to classification will be made</p>

	based upon business rules; adjustments may be made as a result of growth (which will include English Language Proficiency), graduation rate in high schools, participation rate, non-proficiency, chronic absenteeism, science performance, and evidence-based analysis.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	NE provides no weighting for each indicator. Thus, it is impossible to know if the academic indicators receive substantial weight individually or if the academic indicators in the aggregate are given much greater weight than the SQSS indicators.
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	NE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weighting for each indicator in its system of annual meaningful differentiation; • Evidence that each academic indicator is included and given substantial weight individually; • Evidence that the academic indicators in the aggregate are given much greater weight than the SQSS indicators; • Provide consistency between business rules and language within the state plan related to indicators.

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

- If NE 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>	NE provides neither a definition of “Special Purpose Schools” nor an explanation of how these schools will be included in the accountability system. The state will convene a task force to make recommendations to Nebraska Department of Education leadership and Nebraska State Board of Education about ESSA requirements and the ongoing maintenance of the accountability system. NE claims that schools in which no grade level is assessed under the State's academic assessment system (e.g., P-2 schools) receive the district’s classification. NE also states that its new schools will be classified in their first and second year of operation based on state assessments, graduation rate (if a high school), and participation. First and second year schools (Status) cannot become priority schools without three years of assessment data.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Results of students who attend “Special Purpose Schools” are not tied to sending schools for accountability purposes, but rather the district of the

	<p>sending school.</p> <p>The validity of the methodology used for schools in which no grade is assessed under NE’s academic accountability system is questionable because the grade is not tied to the receiving school but rather to the entire district.</p>
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	NE must describe how the state will include “Special Purpose Schools” in the 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>	<p>NE states that all Title I schools that receive a “Needs Improvement” designation in the AQuESTT classification process will be identified as Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools (page 109). The state does not indicate if this methodology would result in the identification of the lowest performing 5% of Title I schools, as required by ESSA.</p> <p>NE will include all Title I schools designated as “Needs Improvement” on the accountability system, as well as <u>LEAs in the lowest 5% of Title I schools</u>, schools with a graduation rate less than 75%, or schools with a chronically low-performing subgroup, beginning in the fall of 2018</p> <p>NE claims that initial Classification in AQuESTT occurred in the fall of 2015 and will occur up to every three years. The next classification will take place in the fall of 2018.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	It is unclear what is meant by “the <u>LEA is in the lowest 5 percent of overall performance of Title I schools</u> ” since CSI identification does not include LEAs. NE should provide clarification.
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)

<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	NE must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify that its methodology will result in identifying at least the lowest performing 5% of Title I schools; • Clarify what is meant by LEA identification.
--	--

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The state will identify any school with a grad rate (four year) less than 75% beginning in fall 2018.</p> <p>NE indicates that it will identify any school that has a four-year cohort graduation rate of less than 75% as a CSI school.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	NE proposes to use a higher 4-yr ACGR than is required by ESSA (67% or less) for CSI identification. It also proposes to use ONLY the 4-yr ACGR for this purpose.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

- Does the SEA include the year in which it will first identify these schools for comprehensive support and improvement (*i.e.*, does the timeline comply with the Department’s guidance)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	NE does not describe its methodology to identify schools receiving Title I, Part A funds that have received additional targeted support under ESEA 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 as CSI.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	NE must describe its methodology to identify schools receiving Title I, Part A funds that have received additional targeted support under ESEA that have not satisfied the statewide exit criteria for such schools within a State-determined number of years as CSI.

A.4.vi.d: Frequency of Identification

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The state will transition to this plan during the current school year and identify its next round of comprehensive support and identification schools in fall 2018. It states it will identify at least every three years.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify schools with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students, including its definition of “consistently underperforming”?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in the identification of any school with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students?

- Is the methodology based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation?
- Does the SEA identify these schools annually?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>NE does not describe its methodology to identify schools with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students.</p> <p>NE does not provide a definition of consistently underperforming subgroups or commit to identifying schools for this reason.</p> <p>NE does not look at subgroup achievement, but rather non-proficient students.</p> <p>NE indicates that its system “does not currently differentiate subgroups from the overall student population” and that the state will use its “non-proficient” designation to monitor non-proficient subgroups and provide reports to individual schools and districts. Identified non-proficient subgroups will be eligible for Targeted Support.” This approach would appear to substitute “non-proficient” students for the statutorily required student subgroups.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The state does not provide a methodology to identify schools with one or more “consistently underperforming subgroups,” does not provide a definition of the term “consistently underperforming” and does not provide information on how often the identification will occur.
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>NE must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a methodology to identify schools with one or more “consistently underperforming subgroups,” • Provide a definition of the term “consistently underperforming” and • Ensure the identification will occur annually.

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>	NE fails to differentiate between consistently underperforming and low-performing subgroups. It appears to plan to use the same criteria for both

	<p>categories. The state does not indicate whether it will identify these schools from all public schools or among those identified with consistently underperforming subgroups.</p> <p>NE also fails to provide the year for first identification and frequency (which must occur at least every 3 years).</p> <p>NE states that its accountability system, AQuESTT does not differentiate subgroups from the overall student population.</p> <p>NE proposes use of non-proficient student subgroup rates for the current year and two previous years to develop non-proficiency trend lines using linear regressions for the purpose of identification of subgroups; NE will require schools, regardless of their status score of overall classification, to create interventions for subgroups that are non-proficient.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	NE does not describe a methodology by which it will identify schools in which subgroup performance would lead to identification under 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I), nor the timeline or frequency of identification.
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>NE must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe a methodology by which it will identify schools in which subgroup performance would lead to identification under 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I); Provide the timeline or frequency of identification.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>NE's AQuESTT system is required to identify three schools for Priority School status which allows the State Board to select schools for interventions led by an intervention team selected by the Commissioner of Education. The first set of Priority schools was identified in December of 2015. The Priority Schools were identified from the 87 schools that were classified as Needs Improvement.</p> <p>The process for selecting schools, establishing improvement plans, and determining exit criteria for schools has been developed by the state's processes and procedures and established in its statute and rule.</p> <p>The initial Priority School process effectively serves as a prototype for the development of a process to designate and establish schools identified under ESSA for In Need of Comprehensive Support and Improvement.</p>

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>NE will lower the accountability score by one classification level for schools or districts failing to assess at least 95% of all students; NE will lower the accountability score by two classification levels for schools or districts failing to assess at least 90% of all students; schools with less than an 85% participation rate may not earn above the lowest classification.</p> <p>The information provided fails to address how the state will deal with schools that fail the requirement for 95% of all students and each subgroup to be included in assessments in ELA and math. The proposed “adjustment” appears to apply only to participation of “All students.”</p> <p>NE also fails to acknowledge the ESSA requirement regarding the calculation of proficiency rates when participation fails below 95%, i.e., non-tested students must be counted as non-proficient.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	NE does not describe how it factors the requirement for 95 percent participation of all students <u>in each subgroup of students</u> in statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments into the statewide accountability system.
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>NE must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe how it factors the requirement for 95 percent participation of all students and 95 percent of all students <u>in each subgroup of students</u> in statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments into the statewide accountability system;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that it will meet the ESSA requirement regarding the calculation of proficiency rates when participation fails below 95%, i.e., non-tested students must be counted as non-proficient.
--	---

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>	NE states that any approved school improvement plan contains SMART goals within a three-year timeframe. Schools meet exit criteria if they complete all goals identified in the AQuESTT classification process and no longer have low-performing subgroups.
<i>Strengths</i>	In order to exit, a school can no longer have low-performing subgroups.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>NE does not have statewide exit criteria, but rather school-level SMART goals, therefore this would not be a statewide criteria.</p> <p>NE does not provide enough details about how its State Board of Education determines what constitutes “sufficient progress”.</p> <p>The plan should describe how the criteria will ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success.</p> <p>There is no explanation on how the exit criteria are aligned with the State’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress.</p>
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	NE must provide exit criteria that are statewide and ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement.

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>	NE will require schools to develop SMART goals that must be completed within three years of identification for additional TSI, and school must eliminate low-performing subgroups.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	NE does not have statewide exit criteria, but rather school-level SMART goals. The exit criteria do not ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in the State. The exit criteria do not appear to consider meeting expectations for multiple years before exiting.
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	NE must establish statewide exit criteria, instead of school-level SMART goals that will ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in the State.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	NE explains that for schools identified as In Needs of Comprehensive Support and Improvement, it will annually review any progress plans and determine whether any modifications are needed. NE claims that if a school has not met

	<p>the exit criteria for needing comprehensive support and improvement by the fourth consecutive school year, the State will reevaluate the progress plan to determine if (a) a significant revision of the progress plan is necessary, (b) an entirely new progress plan is developed, or (c) an alternative administrative structure is warranted.</p> <p>For schools identified for Targeted Support and Improvement the State will annually review any progress plans and determine whether any modifications are needed. If a school has not met the exit criteria for needing targeted support and improvement by the fourth consecutive school year, the State will reevaluate the progress plan to determine if (a) a significant revision of the progress plan is necessary, (b) an entirely new progress plan is developed, or (c) the school should be identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	NE has established a three-year timeframe for schools to exit improvement status; options for more rigorous intervention include an alternative structure for administration of the school.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.viii.d: Resource Allocation Review (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(ii))

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	NE describes 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. An annual review will be conducted as part of the State Board of Education’s Strategic Plan to reevaluate all aspects of support offered to LEAs through NE’s Department of Education. Any identified inequities in resources will result in comprehensive analysis and suggestions for addressing the inequities. NE provides some examples of suggestions for addressing the inequities.
<i>Strengths</i>	NE will review issues each year and has offered a wide array of approaches to make necessary changes to ensure equity of resource allocation.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the</i>	

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

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

- Does the SEA describe the technical assistance that it will provide to each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement?
- Is the technical assistance likely to improve student outcomes by, for example, 1) identifying State-approved evidence-based interventions; 2) supporting LEAs and schools in the development and implementation of support and improvement plans; and 3) differentiating the technical assistance?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>NE describes that technical assistance for schools identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement (CSI or TSI) will begin with a robust needs assessment for each LEA.</p> <p>The State explains that the needs assessment examination will include information such as accountability determinations, student achievement data, trend data, demographic characteristics, and progress towards meeting long-term goals. The needs assessment will also examine data gathered with the EBA component of the accountability system. The needs assessment will be used to collaboratively develop a progress plan for each LEA identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement. The plan will detail evidence-based assessments and a timeline for implementation.</p> <p>In addition, NE explains that, to provide targeted technical assistance for items identified during the needs assessment process, cohort groups will be identified. Current cohort groups include: small community schools, urban/metro schools, demographically shifting schools, and Native American schools. Additional cohorts may be created around specific needs.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>NE focuses on differentiating interventions for each LEAs context. The state will provide evidence-based assistance and tailor the intensity of the support to the LEAs context.</p> <p>NE will rely on other organizations, including LEAs, to increase capacity needed to support CSI and TSI schools through differentiated approaches.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	NE describes its efforts to address educator equity. NE developed, submitted, and received approval of an Educator Equity Plan in June of 2015; the plan is intended to ensure that every student in every school is taught by an excellent educator. Historically, the state has had minimal gaps statewide among schools regarding the extent that economically disadvantaged

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

	<p>students are taught by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers. In the 2015 Equity Plan, NE summarized existing equity gaps, providing charts that reflect the data available. For each gap identified, NE outlined selected strategies being employed to address root causes. Nebraska has and will continue to monitor and provide support on the strategies identified. The goal is to ensure that economically disadvantaged and minority students are not taught by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers at higher rates than other children.</p> <p>NE explains that in this 2017 State ESSA Plan, the Education Workforce Index is being introduced as a means by which to message and advance Equity across the state. NE’s educator workforce index is built using the mean of four variables. The resulting Nebraska educator workforce mean index takes on real numbers ranging from 0 through 100, with 100 being the highest workforce index value or most ideal score.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The state includes data on leaders as well.</p> <p>While NE is addressing the reporting requirements related to educator access, NE is also using ESSA as an opportunity to strengthen teacher evaluations and supports for educator effectiveness, in light of concerns over the future of the teacher workforce pipeline in NE.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>NE describes how it will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A to improve school conditions for student learning.</p> <p>NE requires each LEA receiving Title I funds to include in its ESSA Consolidated Application an explanation of how the LEA is addressing bullying, harassment, and the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom.</p>

	<p>NE does not use either Title I-A or Title IV-A funds directly to support LEAs in the improvement of school conditions specific to these three categories, but technical support is available from state consultants.</p> <p>NE states that each LEA is required by state statute to adopt a board policy on bullying prevention, dating, and violence.</p> <p>The state statute also mandates that every school must have a security assessment completed by the state school security director by August 2019 and that every school submits its safety plan to the state school security director.</p> <p>NE's Rule 10 requires every school has an annual safety audit. The state's LEA and SEA representatives continue to collect and analyze data at the LEA and SEA level regarding discipline practices and outcomes, especially focused on students with disabilities, minority populations, and students from low-income families. Model intervention programs, model policies and evidence-based practices surrounding bully prevention and disciplinary practices continue to be researched by SEA staff and guidance is provided to LEAs to adopt such policies and practices through a variety of venues. On-going technical support from SEA specialists is available to each LEA throughout the year to assist and respond to questions regarding any of the requirements listed.</p> <p>NE states that it will continue to support each LEA in their efforts to address bullying and harassment; overuse of discipline; and aversive behavioral interventions, including those schools receiving Title I-A funds, through several programs and activities.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>NE has several long-term evidence-based interventions and collects data in areas related to bullying and harassment, overuse of discipline practices, and use of aversive behavioral interventions. The state has provided training to the majority of districts.</p> <p>NE includes reference to its attention to align efforts with its State Systemic Improvement Plan and notes its focus on students with disabilities, minority populations, and students from low-income families, which are the students most frequently subjected to bullying and harassment, overuse of discipline and aversive behavioral interventions. Also references relationship to Results-Driven Accountability and the IDEA requirement to identify significant disproportionality within special education.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	NE has state-adopted academic content standards that articulate learning expectations from kindergarten through high school, providing a continuum of educational expectations and opportunities; the AQuESTT system is designed to ensure students exit high school ready for postsecondary education or career pursuits.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	NE does not address specific supports for students transitioning from elementary to middle or middle to high school as a means of reducing dropout rates. The plan could be improved by providing information on specific strategies and initiatives to reduce dropout rates among student populations.
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	NE must address specific supports for students transitioning from elementary to middle or middle to high school as a means of reducing dropout rates.

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	NE has a current state rule that outlines uniform entrance criteria (based on the home language survey and ELPA 21 screener) and exit criteria (based on a score of proficient on the ELPA 21); NE plans to convene a stakeholder group to complete revisions to the state’s Rule 15; revisions to the rule will address the 30-day assessment timeline for EL students, as well as changes to

	eliminate the state language arts assessment as a primary means of exit, to increase monitoring of EL progress, and to update terminology. NE makes no mention of local input in its exit criteria.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	NE’s description does not include an assurance that all students who may be English learners are assessed for such status within 30 days of enrollment in a school in the state.
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	NE must 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.

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 SEA describe how it will assist eligible entities in helping to ensure that English learners meet challenging State academic standards?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	NE has adopted rigorous English Learner (EL) proficiency standards and provides resources on allowable EL accommodations, including the administration of native language assessments. NE is working closely with Title III LEAs to provide professional development and collaboration opportunities; furthermore, NE is identifying students who fail to meet ELPA21 growth targets rather than waiting for students to miss the six-year timeline to proficiency.
<i>Strengths</i>	NE is working with Title III LEAs to provide professional development and collaboration opportunities. NE is also timely identifying students who fail to meet ELPA21 growth targets, instead of waiting for students to end the six-year timeline to proficiency. NE notes among its efforts “Providing resources and technical assistance on allowable EL testing accommodations for content tests, including the administration of native language assessments” and “hosting professional learning collaboration workshops on challenging topics such as improving programming and increasing on-time graduations for high school newcomers and Students with Limited or Interrupted Formal Education (SLIFE)”
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information</i>	

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

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

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

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>NE describes how it will monitor the progress of each eligible entity receiving a Title III, Part A subgrant in helping English learners (EL) achieve English language proficiency through data review, program implementation, and the monitoring of former ELs.</p> <p>LEAs are required to conduct an annual review of their Language Instruction Educational Program’s effectiveness, and NE approves Title III grants as a part of the Consolidated Federal Programs Application process. The state reviews are conducted on a three-year cycle. For ineffective plans, NE will provide targeted workshops, on-site technical assistance or online/telephone support, or connect LEAs to a statewide EL professional development network.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	NE has identified multiple approaches to provide needed support to LEAs that are not effective in addressing EL proficiency.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did NE meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	