

STATE PLAN PEER REVIEW CRITERIA Peer Review Notes Template

STATE: New Hampshire



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 the SEA'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 the SEA'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 the SEA on how to improve its State plan; and 3) recommend to the Secretary what, if any, additional information to request from the SEA. Taking into consideration the peer reviewers' recommendations, the Department will provide feedback to each SEA that outlines any areas the SEA must address prior to the Secretary's approval of its consolidated State plan. If a State plan cannot be approved, the Department will offer the SEA 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 the SEA 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 the SEA submitting the consolidated State plan (*e.g.*, if the SEA 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 the SEA, the SEA 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 the SEA 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> | NA - NHDOE does not administer or require an end of course mathematics assessment. |
| <i>Strengths</i> | |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | |

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

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

A.3.i: Definition

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

| | <i>Peer Response</i> |
|--|---|
| <i>Peer Analysis</i> | <p>NHDOE defines a language other than English as present to a significant extent when that language exceeds 5% of the tested population. However, the state’s definition does not include the most populous language other than English spoken by the State’s participating student population. According to the NHDOE student database, less than 2% of NH students in tested grades receive limited English proficiency services. Within this two percent, 40 different languages are spoken; Spanish, Arabic, Nepali, Portuguese, and Vietnamese are the most populous languages other than English spoken by the tested student population. Of the total students assessed, less than 1% represent any one language with the highest percentage being Spanish at 0.81%.</p> <p>NHDOE, however, did not indicate how these languages are represented in LEAs or in specific tested grade levels, although they will continue to monitor and provide assistance and supports should a particular LEA meet the significant threshold (p. 17).</p> |
| <i>Strengths</i> | Translation accommodations for directions and glossaries are provided during state assessments. |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | NHDOE did not address languages other than English that are spoken by a significant portion of participating students in any of its LEAs or across grade levels. Data regarding LEA level populations is needed to support the claim that no LEAs currently have a significant population. |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | NHDOE must provide a definition that meets the Federal requirement such that it includes the most populous language other than English spoken by the State’s participating student population and information related to languages other than English that are spoken by a significant portion of participating students in any of its LEAs or 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>NHDOE does not offer any assessments in languages other than English. Of the total students assessed, less than 1% represent any one language with the highest percentage being Spanish at 0.81%. Thus, current student demographics do not call for assessments in other languages.</p> <p>Although the SEA does not offer any of its statewide assessments in complete translation, the Smarter Balanced Assessment embedded and designated supports included translated test directions and glossaries for construct irrelevant mathematics items and ELA. Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) test administrators may translate the assessments to students and the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) provides translated test directions.</p> <p>In spring 2018, new assessments will be implemented for mathematics, English language arts, and science.</p> |
| <i>Strengths</i> | <p>Though no one language meets the minimum necessary to be considered “significant,” NH makes extensive efforts to provide the necessary accommodations for students. All assessments provide either a human or electronic translation in multiple languages. Smarter Balanced mathematics assessments provide full Spanish translations for dual language supported classrooms or one-to-one glossary for all students in grades 3–8, and 11 in the areas of English language arts (ELA), mathematics, and science.</p> |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | N/A |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s)) |
| <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> | <p>NHDOE identified Spanish in A.3.i for which yearly academic assessments are not available. NHDOE indicated that human or electronic translation and/or 1:1 glossary for students in grades 3-8 and 11 in the areas of English language arts, mathematics, and science (pg. 18) are adequate. Of the total</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | students assessed, less than 1% represent any one language, with the highest percentage being Spanish at 0.81%. |
| <i>Strengths</i> | |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | |

A.3.iv: Efforts to Develop Assessments

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

| | <i>Peer Response</i> |
|--|--|
| <i>Peer Analysis</i> | The State deemed this criterion not applicable. |
| <i>Strengths</i> | |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | The State’s response does not address the definition as required in A.3.i. |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | NHDOE should revise the definition and address the criteria in A.3.iv. |

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

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

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

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

| | <i>Peer Response</i> |
|--|--|
| <i>Peer Analysis</i> | NHDOE lists each major racial and ethnic group and subgroup. NHDOE includes these major racial and ethnic groups as individual subgroups in its accountability system: American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, Hispanic, Black, White, and Multi-Race (p. 19). |
| <i>Strengths</i> | |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | |

A.4.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> | NA - NHDOE includes no additional subgroups beyond those required. |
| <i>Strengths</i> | |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | |

A.4.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> | NA - NHDOE selected exception option “ii” for recently arrived English learners. The State will <u>exclude</u> recently arrived English learners from proficiency and growth calculations in the accountability system in the first year of enrollment, <u>include</u> these students in the second year of enrollment, and <u>include</u> the third year and thereafter. |
| <i>Strengths</i> | |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | |

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

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

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

| | <i>Peer Response</i> |
|----------------------|---|
| <i>Peer Analysis</i> | NHDOE will continue to use an n-size of 11 for all indicators except test participation where the state will use a minimum n-size of 40. The rationale being that schools are not penalized for “having only a small number of students absent from testing” (p. 21). |

| | |
|--|--|
| | NHDOE’s assertion that this n-size of 11 represents a balance of reliability and inclusion is reasonable. However, their rationale for using n-size 40 for reporting of participation appears to contradict the rationale for use of n=11 applied to all other accountability purposes. |
| <i>Strengths</i> | An n-size of 11 ensures student privacy and includes most students in the accountability system. Using a small n-size helps to keep a stronger focus on more populations of students. |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | The rationale for n=40 for participation appears to be inconsistent with the rationale for n=11 for all other accountability purposes. One peer stated that such a small n-size (n=11) could lead to the state’s reduced ability to provide services if too many schools flagged. |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | NHDOE must address the inconsistencies in the n-size subgroup calculation and participation calculation. |

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> | NHDOE did not provide the statistical soundness for the decision. |
| <i>Strengths</i> | A smaller number allows for more schools to potentially receive resources if a population is struggling. |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | It is unclear how the state justifies the statistical soundness of either the 11 or 40 n-size. NHDOE does not present an argument that n=40 for participation is statistically sound. The state is arguing that the number is both statistically sound and not sound. |

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.

| | |
|--|---|
| | NHDOE should explain why they now believe it is statistically sound since such a small n-size still has a great impact when calculating performance and growth. |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | NHDOE should describe how the minimum number of students is statistically sound. |

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

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

| | <i>Peer Response</i> |
|--|---|
| <i>Peer Analysis</i> | <p>The NH AYP Advisory Committee selected a minimum n-size of 11 more than 10 years ago, although there is not an explanation as to how it selected this number. The current ESSA Accountability Task Force reviewed the current n-size and made a decision to continue its use. A description of how the State collaborated with teachers, principals, other school leaders, parents and other stakeholders to determine the minimum number is not provided.</p> <p>NHDOE does not state how and who determined the n-size of 40 for participation, although it is indicated that this n-size was selected so that schools are not penalized for having only a small number of students absent from testing. Data are not provided that support this n-size for participation.</p> |
| <i>Strengths</i> | An n-size of 11 ensures student privacy and includes most students in the accountability system. This value has been in use for more than 10 years, thus already part of NH accountability landscape. |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | <p>NH did not explain how the n-size of 11 determination was made with input from a wide variety of stakeholders.</p> <p>No documentation was provided related to the composition of the Advisory Committee.</p> <p>Little information provided as to whether or not stakeholders actually wanted to continue with the same value.</p> |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | NHDOE should provide (1) the membership of the ESSA Task Force and what input was provided by teachers, principals, and school leaders |

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> | NHDOE has strict privacy laws and states that the privacy of student data is a critical priority and the state continues to develop practices that improve privacy system. They also state that since they have had no issues for over 10 years using this minimum-n size, there is no reason to change (p 22). However, NHDOE does not describe <u>how</u> the State ensures the minimum n-size is sufficient to not reveal any personally identifiable information. |
| <i>Strengths</i> | NHDOE indicates NH has strict privacy laws that protect student data. |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | NHDOE does not describe (1) <u>how</u> the State ensures the minimum n-size is sufficient to not reveal any personally identifiable information, e.g., rules for when percentages are posted and not posting n-counts with data and (2) details about how the law is implemented. |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | NHDOE should describe how the data reporting process protects information and ensures the privacy of individual students, and how their privacy law is implemented. |

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

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

| | <i>Peer Response</i> |
|---|--|
| <i>Peer Analysis</i> | The state uses the same minimum n-size of 11 for both accountability and reporting, with the exception of participation, which is 40 instead. (p 22) |
| <i>Strengths</i> | |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | Please refer to previous section A.4.ii.a |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) |

³ See footnote 5 above for further guidance.

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

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

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

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

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

| | <i>Peer Response</i> |
|----------------------|---|
| <i>Peer Analysis</i> | <p>NHDOE identified the long-term goals for all students in all schools for improved academic achievement, as measured by grade-level proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments. NHDOE identifies 74% proficiency in English language arts and 54% proficiency in mathematics by SY 2024-2025 as its long-term academic achievement goals for the all students group. NH indicates that baseline is 2016-2017 SY data. However, no specific baseline data are provided and the numbers are “an estimate based on previous data” (footnote pg. 25). The date these goals must be reached coincides with the state’s Lumina Foundation Grant goal that 65% of 25 to 64-year old would have a high quality post-secondary credential by 2025.</p> <p>The long term goals are not ambitious. For example, the annual percentage point gain in mathematics each year is less than 1. By 2025, just 53.77 percent of New Hampshire’s students would meet mathematics standards. While the ELA goals are more rigorous, still the annual percentage point gain averages 1.5 percentage points per year. NHDOE explains that the goals far exceed past improvement in academic performance.</p> <p>In mathematics, the Asian/Pacific Islander group is calculated to remain stagnant and the white group (the highest percentage of students) is only expected to gain 2.82 percentage points in 8 years. The white subgroup meets the long-term ELA goal by 2023 and the mathematics long-term goal by 2022. The Asian/Pacific Islander subgroup meets the long-term mathematics goal in 2018.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>Each of these subgroups has been assigned different long-term goals; the timeline is the same for each subgroup. It is not stated how each subgroup’s long-term goals and interim targets were determined, other than citing historical data. Other subgroups interim targets decrease year-to-year over the seven years. Using the current trajectory, 85% of students would meet ELA standards by 2033 and 80% of students would meet math standards by 2057.</p> <p>The long term and interim targets for specific student subgroups appear to be inconsistent with NH’s statement on p. 22, “NH’s long-term goals are informed by a statewide effort to provide each student a personalized learning experience that allows them to reach their highest possible achievement and prepares them for 21st century careers and/or post-secondary education.”</p> |
| <i>Strengths</i> | <p>NHDOE set goals that exceeded historical trends. NHDOE applied larger relative gains for student subgroups farther from the all student subgroup. The gap between the highest performing subgroup and the lowest performing subgroup decreases over the seven-year period.</p> |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | <p>NHDOE did not provide the baseline student achievement data from 2016/17 for all students and all student subgroups.</p> <p>Seven of the nine student subgroups are not expected to attain the proficiency levels defined for the all student groups.</p> <p>The long-term goals for all the state’s subgroups are not ambitious. Although NHDOE states the numeric measures for each subgroup’s long-term goal, it does not provide a rationale for why two subgroups either have already met long-term goals or will meet them prior to 2025 instead of making the long-term goal more ambitious for these two subgroups. In fact, one subgroup, A/PI, attains the long-term goal in 2018.</p> <p>Also, while these are determined to be rigorous based on prior performance data, the goals are for only 74% of students to be proficient in ELA and 54% of students to be proficient in math. These are low expectations for students for the next 8 years.</p> |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s))</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))</p> |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | <p>NHDOE should set goals based on the 2017 assessment baseline data for all students and each student subgroup that are more incrementally ambitious so that all subgroups are making substantial and continuous progress toward the all students goals.</p> |

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

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

| | <i>Peer Response</i> |
|--|--|
| <i>Peer Analysis</i> | <p>NHDOE provided measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals (2025) for both English Language Arts and mathematics performance for the all student group and for seven subgroups of students (pp. 26-28). The Asian/Pacific Islander student subgroup will attain the long-term goals for mathematics in 2018 and thus has no measurements of interim progress and the white student subgroup will attain mathematics goals in 2022 and ELA goals in 2023 and thus do not have measurements of interim progress after attainment of the long-term goals.</p> <p>Although interim progress towards meeting the long-term goals for ELA and mathematics for subgroups is noted, the gaps among subgroups will not be substantively closing. The graphs provided convey that the achievement gap will be maintained throughout the entire 7-year span.</p> |
| <i>Strengths</i> | NHDOE provided the measurements of interim progress for the all student group and each student subgroup. |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | <p>No baseline data were provided. The numbers are estimates based on previous data.</p> <p>The state should set interim and long-term achievement goals that will close the gap between student subgroups. Interim goals simply show the same percentage improvement each year unless the group happens to meet the goal, then they flatline. This does not show how the subgroups will work to close gaps.</p> <p>One student subgroup does not have measurements of interim progress because it will have met the long-term goal in mathematics in 2018. Another subgroup does not have measurements of interim progress after it attains the long-term goal in mathematics in 2022 and in ELA in 2023.</p> |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (2 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (2 peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | The NHDOE must establish measurements of interim progress for mathematics for the Asian/Pacific Islander subgroup and measurements of interim progress for ELA for the white student subgroup for every year. |

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> | NHDOE documents that the long-term goals are 74% ELA proficiency and 54% mathematics proficiency for the all student subgroup; it is apparent that NHDOE does not expect all student subgroups to make <u>significant progress</u> in closing the statewide proficiency gaps. |

| | |
|--|--|
| | For example, in mathematics, the Asian/Pacific Islander group is calculated to remain stagnant and the White group (the highest percentage of students) is only expected to gain 2.82 percentage points in 8 years. Aside from these two highest performing groups, the plan calls for slight differences in student achievement gains between groups of students and does not call for significant progress overall. Using the current trajectory, only in 2033, 8 years after their goal of 2025, 85% of students would meet ELA standards; by 2057, 32 years after their goal of 2025, 80% of students would meet math standards. |
| <i>Strengths</i> | NHDOE set goals that exceeded historical trends. NHDOE applied larger relative gains for student subgroups farther from the all student subgroup. |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | In mathematics, with the exception of White and Asian Pacific Islander students, differences in goals are minimal. The state has set very low rates of improvement in mathematics – less than 1 percentage point per year. While the goals for some populations are still likely rigorous based on prior performance, in Math 7 of the 9 subgroups have a goal of less than 50%, 3 subgroups are less than 30%. In ELA, 3 subgroups are less than 50%, 7 subgroups are less than 70%. If the population of students happens to meet the long-term goal before 2025, the state shows them as not needing to improve further. |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | NHDOE should set long-term goals for all students and all subgroups to expect nearly all students to meet state long-term goals in both English/language arts and mathematics. The state should ensure that the goals both improve overall subgroup performance and result in closing the achievement gaps. |

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> | NHDOE provided long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rates to be reached by 2025 (8 years from the end of the 2016/17 school year). The SEA’s long-term goal for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students is 93% by 2025. The description asserts that a similar method was used to compute long-term goals and interim targets applied to all relevant subgroups, p. 32. While it was stated that the state has one of the highest |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>graduation rates in the country, no baseline data was provided. All goals will be updated using the baseline data in 2017.</p> <p>The long-term goals were established by reviewing graduation rates over the last 10 years (2006 to 2016). The state started using the four-year ACGR methodology in 2010. “. . . using the ACGR, changes (graduation rates) have been on average approximately 0.37 percent year over year” (p. 29). The state set long term goals to reflect annual increases of 0.56 percent, which is nearly double the historical increase.</p> |
| <i>Strengths</i> | |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | <p>Although NHDOE has an expectation for 93% of all students graduating by 2025, it is concerning that six subgroups will continue to graduate at similarly discrepant rates as the 2018 data and two subgroups meet this goal by either 2019 or 2022.</p> <p>The SEA did not include baseline data for each subgroup of students and did not include the long term goals for the multi-race subgroup of students.</p> |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | <p>The state must provide (1) the baseline graduation rate for all students and each student subgroup, (2) the long-term goals for the multi-race subgroup of students, and (3) develop ambitious long-term goals for all student subgroups such that the gap among subgroups closes.</p> |

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> | <p>NHDOE will include the five-year extended graduation rate in the accountability system. However, the state neglected to provide the long-term goals for the extended year cohort as well as the baseline data. It is noted that the “long term goals at the State level are set using both the four-and five-year adjusted cohort graduation rates” (p. 31), and reference is made to Table 4 and Figure 4. However, Tables 4 and 5 and Figures 4 and 5 reference only “4 year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate” goals.</p> |
| <i>Strengths</i> | <p>The state recognizes and includes the five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | in the accountability system. |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | Five-year extended graduation rate goals and baseline data are not provided. There is no description of the accountability formula using both the four- and five-year data sets. |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | NHDE must (1) state the long-term goals for the five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the all students group and for each student subgroup, (2) provide baseline data for all students and each subgroup, (3) provide the timeline for meeting the long term goals for all students and each subgroup, and (4) explain how the long term goals for the five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate are ambitious and more rigorous than the long-term goals set for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. |

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

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

| | <i>Peer Response</i> |
|--|---|
| <i>Peer Analysis</i> | NHDOE provides measurements of interim progress for all students and each subgroup of students for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. The state does not provide these for the extended year adjusted cohort graduation rate. |
| <i>Strengths</i> | Conceptually, the state recognizes and includes the five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate in the accountability system. |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | Five-year extended graduation rate measurements of interim progress are not provided for all students and for each subgroup of students. |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | Measurements of interim progress must be provided for NH's extended five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and each subgroup of students. |

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

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

| | <i>Peer Response</i> |
|--|---|
| <i>Peer Analysis</i> | <p>NHDOE has set long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for the four year adjusted cohort graduation rates and has taken into account the improvement necessary for subgroups to make progress. The state set long term goals to reflect annual increases of 0.56, which are nearly double the historical increase. With the exception of White (at 3) and Asian Pacific Island (at 1) groups, all other subgroups are expected to gain at least 4 percentage points in graduation rate over 7 years.</p> <p>However, no baseline data were provided. Long term goals and measurements of interim progress were not provided for the five-year adjusted cohort.</p> |
| <i>Strengths</i> | |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | <p>No baseline data provided; long term goals and measurements of interim progress were not provided for the five-year adjusted graduation cohort. One subgroup is projected to attain the long-term goal by 2019; another will attain this goal by 2022. It is concerning that NHDOE cited the “current state of education” as the rationale to determine probable end points for student subgroups.</p> |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | <p>NHDE needs to provide the measurements of interim progress toward the long term goals for the five-year extended graduation rate for each subgroup of students ensuring that the goals require greater rates of improvement for subgroups of students who are behind or below the all student group or other subgroups.</p> |

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>SGPs will be used for determining growth towards proficiency and will set Adequate Growth Proficiency targets to determine whether or not a student is remaining on track towards attaining proficiency. A five year timeline has been proposed for all students to attain proficiency. The long-term goal will be the percentage of students making progress towards English proficiency. The state is transitioning to a new assessment with more rigorous performance standards, thus long term goals and measures of interim progress are based on incomplete data. Current baseline estimate is 12.6% of the students are expected to make adequate progress. In order to meet the long-term goal of 75th percentile, this goal will be increased to 26.1% making necessary yearly</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>growth within 5 years. The data used for making these projections are estimates based on incomplete data and will be adjusted once results are available (p 33-34). NH has seen a significant decrease in the percentage of students making progress toward proficiency using the updated WIDA Assessment. Thus, the State believes the goal of increasing the percentage of students making progress toward EL proficiency by just 1.7 percentage points a year is ambitious. This small, incremental improvement in EL progress will take decades to realize the “five-year timeline for all students to achieve English language proficiency” (p. 34). It is confusing that NH mentions both a “within five years” target and 2025 as the endpoint for this goal and unclear how 26.1% was selected as the endpoint.</p> |
| <i>Strengths</i> | NHDOE assesses all students who are identified as limited English proficient using WIDA ACCESS. NHDOE is using Student Growth Percentiles to quantify student growth. |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | <p>The very low percentage of EL students making progress on EL proficiency is concerning. NHDOE is unsure whether the WIDA SGP data will provide accurate results for long-term growth and is basing its projections on incomplete data. Calculating growth in this manner, using a new instrument, may lead to unstable results since the test is not yet stable.</p> <p>A goal of only 26.1% students meeting AGP does not seem rigorous, even if it does attain the current 75th percentile.</p> |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | NHDOE should (1) provide an explanation why such a low AGP is considered rigorous, (2) set ambitious goals for English Language Learners to achieve English proficiency, and (3) confirm the stability of WIDA such that the SGP data will provide accurate results for identifying student growth and long term goal setting and include this assurance in the Consolidated State Plan. |

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> | NHDOE provided the long-term goals and interim targets toward English language proficiency for English learners in Table 6 (p. 35). The interim targets start in 2018 and continue through 2025 (8 years). Interim progress goals are set at 1.7 percentage point increase each of the 8 years for a goal of 26.1% proficient by year 2025. |
| <i>Strengths</i> | The SEA’s goal is attainable. |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | These goals reflect low expectations for EL students to attain English proficiency. No research was provided to show support as to why these interim targets are appropriate for the EL population. |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the</i> | |

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

A.4.iv: Indicators (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B), 1111(c)(4)(E)(ii))

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

A.4.iv.a: Academic Achievement

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

| | <i>Peer Response</i> |
|----------------------|---|
| <i>Peer Analysis</i> | NHDOE measures proficiency in ELA and mathematics using statewide assessments in grades 3-8 and grade 11. For schools participating in the Performance Assessment of Competency Education (PACE) pilot, five different PACE assessments will be used. All other tested grades and subjects will be based on the previously used PACE assessments NHDOE describes the index system used to report the Academic Achievement indicator. The index system uses a 1 to 4 scale will be used for reporting and will be translated into the points used in calculating accountability for each student, along with percentage participation. Data can be disaggregated for each subgroup of students meeting n-size. 95 percent will be used as the denominator unless a greater number of students participate in the assessments (pp 35-36). |
| <i>Strengths</i> | This system provides incentives to move students from Level 1 to 2 and level 3 to 4 as opposed to a set percentage of students scoring proficient. |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | It is unclear if the pilot assessments will be used in all schools or a pilot in just some schools. Because the assessment is a pilot, it is also unclear if it is valid and reliable. How the student score is translated into an index is not included, nor is how |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>much the achievement indicator is factored into the overall model. It is not clear how the indicator aligns to the long term goals.</p> <p>It is not clear how the index is calculated. It is not evident to the peers how the NHDOE's comment on page 35 about numerous reports provided to USED applies to this requirement regarding all schools and all LEAs.</p> |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | NHDOE should provide (1) the formula used for the index, (2) an explanation how the state will ensure that the use of pilot assessments and the other assessments will result in consistency for all schools and that the pilot assessments are valid and reliable, (3) how these relate to NHDOE long term goals, and (4) how the 95% participation in assessments is calculated. |

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

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

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

| | <i>Peer Response</i> |
|----------------------|---|
| <i>Peer Analysis</i> | NHDOE uses Student Growth Percentile (SGP) as a growth indicator, which can be disaggregated for each subgroup of students. All elementary and middle schools across the state will use this indicator. The mean SGP is calculated for each school and evaluated against the same rubric. However, for schools participating in the PACE pilot, growth will be evaluated using a value table approach and cut scores will be developed for the baseline year to be consistent to the distributions of schools using the MGP model to ensure fairness (pp. 36-37). |
| <i>Strengths</i> | The SGP methodology is valid and reliable and has been used in the state for many years and so should be understandable by stakeholders. NHDOE indicates it will align growth on PACE assessment to the current assessment for consistency. |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | |

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

A.4.iv.c: Graduation Rate

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

| | <i>Peer Response</i> |
|----------------------|---|
| <i>Peer Analysis</i> | <p>NHDOE will continue to calculate and report the four-year ACGR and the extended five-year ACGR which will be used by all high schools across the state. The State will use the 5-year ACGR to create an index comprising 4 performance levels. The graduation cut scores presented make sense for the four-year ACGR, but do not differentiate for the 5-year. The State will use the 5-year ACGR to create an index comprising four performance levels (i.e., Levels 1, 2, 3, and 4). While the NHDOE states “each of these levels corresponds to meeting expectations,” it leaves out how the four-year rate is combined with the five-year rate to ensure the calculations meet the ESSA requirements. The index system applied to the adjusted cohort grad rate sets the bar above the minimal 67% grad rate for assigning a school to comprehensive support, and 4 points for meeting the long-term goal of 94% (pp. 37-38).</p> <p>The indicator is valid and reliable and based on the SEA’s long-term goals. The indicator can be disaggregated for each subgroup of students.</p> |
| <i>Strengths</i> | The state recognizes and includes the five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>in the accountability system. The index system is easy to understand and high expectations for schools to attain high rates of graduation incorporated into the index model.</p> <p>A cut score associated with each level is presented that encourages schools to seek to achieve a high level of success.</p> |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | It is unclear how the four and five-year ACGR indicators are calculated into the overall graduation rate. Because level 1 is less than 69%, it appears this is based only on the four-year ACGR. |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | NHDOE needs to clearly articulate how the four-year graduation rate indicator is separate and distinct from the five year extended rate indicator and how the two rates are calculated for accountability and disaggregated for reporting for each subgroup of students. |

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>NHDOE measures English language proficiency using WIDA ACCESS 2.0 for all English learners in each grade level. SGPs will be used to calculate growth toward proficiency based on this assessment. The MGP for the EL students in each school will be the school-level indicator (p. 38). The timeline is not indicated, and how the use of MGP fits with the State’s definition of ELP is not explained.</p> <p>The WIDA assessment is valid and reliable. An index will be developed that is similar to the one applied for growth on the academic assessment (p 38). The four performance levels presented would most likely generate a Level 1 (MGP less than 35) for every school across the state as the baseline data (2017) presented on pg. 34 states 12.6% proficiency and the 8-year goal is 26.1 % proficiency (2025).</p> |
| <i>Strengths</i> | The WIDA ACCESS assessment is valid and reliable. SGPs are a valid and reliable way of determining growth. |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | It is unclear (1) how the SGPs within the four-level system align with proficiency or attaining level 5 on WIDA, (2) how the “mean” of the EL students in each school provide for a valid and reliable measurement of growth, (3) how this indicator is related to the state-determined timeline for attaining English language proficiency, (4) the relationship of the SGP to NHDOE’s definition of English language proficiency. |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | NHDOE should explain (1) how the SGPs within the four-level system align with proficiency or attaining level 5 on WIDA, (2) how the “mean” of the EL students in each school provide a valid and reliable measurement of growth, (3) how this indicator is related to the state-determined timeline for attaining English language proficiency, and (4) the relationship of the MGP to NHDOE’s definition of English language proficiency. |

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

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

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

| | <i>Peer Response</i> |
|----------------------|---|
| <i>Peer Analysis</i> | <p>NHDOE describes two well thought out student success indicators. Both indicators allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance, can be disaggregated by subgroups, will be applied to all schools (for the grade span to which it applies) and are valid, reliable and comparable.</p> <p>(1) Elementary and middle schools will use an indicator designed to focus additional attention on the growth of the lowest achieving students. The growth of the bottom 25% performing students in grades 3-8 is used as one of NHDOE SQ/SS indicators. The indicator will capture the mean SGP for the lowest performing students on the prior years’ assessments. Then four performance levels will be used to report on school performance. These data have been modeled by NHDOE using the minimum n-size of 11 and will be reported for 85% of the elementary and middle schools.</p> <p>(2) High schools will use a career and college readiness indicator. All</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>graduating seniors will be eligible for counting as postsecondary readiness by meeting any two of 10 different indicators such as completion of NH Scholars program of study, SAT scores, AP exam scores, IB exam scores and earning a CTE industry-recognized credential. The total number of graduating seniors meeting at least two of the criteria will be divided by the total number of students in the cohort to form the career and college ready index for schools. The CCR will then be indexed into four performance levels and be translated into an index of 1-4 and the scale for translation provided. The application of the scale is a new concept and will be reevaluated with following collection of 2017-18 data to ensure it is both ambitious and attainable (pp. 39-41).</p> |
| <i>Strengths</i> | <p>The school quality indicators will be indexed into four performance levels and thus maintain the consistency and ease of understanding of the measures. The growth of the Lowest Achieving Students indicator is impressive as it gives extra attention to the low performing students and gives credit to schools that make progress with the most struggling students. The Career and College Readiness indicator is diverse and complements the State’s competency-based approach to education.</p> <p>Both college- and career-ready options are represented in the ten requirements and require students to meet two of an extensive and broad list of potential indicators for college and career readiness. Specifically, the list includes options that were beyond simply “college readiness” and included important “career readiness” indicators.</p> <p>Schools will be incentivized to focus on providing supports and interventions to the school’s lowest achieving students.</p> |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | |

A.4.v: 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> | NHDOE presents the rationale for using a 1 to 4 index scale to aggregate all of the indicators used in the accountability system; the student performance indicator will be calculated using an aggregate of the students across grades. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>The index allows for a common scale across indicators and is transparent. The state lists the 4 levels of classification: not identified, consistently underperforming subgroup targeted support and improvement, low performing subgroup targeted support and improvement, and comprehensive support and improvement (pp. 41-42). The NHDOE has developed decision rules that will be used to identify schools.</p> <p>The performance of all subgroups of students across all schools throughout the state will be reported using this system.</p> |
| <i>Strengths</i> | This is a well-thought out plan; it will provide clear and consistent information to schools and the public about overall standing of schools, and schools will be identified to receive both comprehensive and targeted assistance. The index system is easily understood. Each of the four levels of identification are mutually exclusive which will send a clear message to the LEAs where additional supports are necessary. |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | It is unclear how each indicator is calculated so that it can be confirmed that all students are included in the calculations. |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | |

A.4.v.b: Weighting of Indicators

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

| | <i>Peer Response</i> |
|----------------------|---|
| <i>Peer Analysis</i> | NHDOE will identify the lowest performing 5% of Title 1 schools for schoolwide and targeted assistance using performance on all indicators. For elementary and middle school 60% of the score will be attributed to growth and 40% to achievement. When available, two years of growth data will be used to stabilize this metric. For high schools, all high schools with a graduation rate of 67% or below will be identified for CSI support (it is unclear if this includes the five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate). Of the remaining schools, a combination of achievement (60%) and career and college readiness (40%) will be used to identify any Title I high school in the bottom 5% for CSI support. For elementary and middle schools, it appears as |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>though academic achievement at 40% and progress in ELs achieving proficiency together do not receive “substantial” weight. For high schools, the achievement indicator is weighted at 60% which is substantive, but the career and college readiness seems high at 40% and may not allow for meaningful differentiation at that weight.</p> <p>The weighting for ELs is not described. Schools for which an indicator cannot be calculated due to the minimum number of students is not addressed. The weighting of graduation rate is not provided and it is not clear how achievement and CCR are weighted if graduation is > 67%. For growth, the English Language Performance is included at a proportional level, but it is not clear how growth of the bottom 25% students is included.</p> |
| <i>Strengths</i> | High school achievement weighting is 60%. In elementary and middle schools, identifying students performing in the bottom 25% causes schools to focus on the most struggling students, regardless of other demographics or the overall performance of the school. |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | <p>Elementary/Middle School</p> <p>It is not clear (1) how much each indicator under growth is actually weighted in order to confirm that aggregate of indicators other than SQ/SS are greater than SQ/SS, (2) how the weighting will be adjusted for schools for which an indicator cannot be calculated due to the minimum number of students (EL students, for example).</p> <p>High School</p> <p>The plan does not describe (1) the weighting of English learners based on the percentage of English learners in the school or (2) how graduation rate is weighted in relation to achievement and CCR.</p> |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | NHDOE needs to clearly describe (1) for Elementary/Middle Schools, describe (a) how much weight will be given to each indicator under growth and (b) how meaningful differentiation for small schools is determined; and (2) for High Schools, describe (a) the weighting of English Language Proficiency, (b) how Graduation rate is calculated for the overall grade, (c) how the 5-year graduation cohort is calculated, and (d) how meaningful differentiation is calculated for small schools. |

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

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

| | <i>Peer Response</i> |
|----------------------|---|
| <i>Peer Analysis</i> | NA – NHDOE does not use a different methodology to identify schools for CSI or TSI. |

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

A.4.vi: 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>NHDOE will identify the lowest performing 5% of Title I schools in elementary and middle schools combined, based on the performance on all of the indicators. When available, two years of growth data will be used (p.43).</p> <p>For high schools, all schools falling below the 67% graduation rate will be identified for CSI. The bottom 5% of the remaining high schools will be identified for CSI based on achievement and Career and College Readiness.</p> <p>The first year of identification will be SY 2018-19 based on SY 2017-18 data. The formula will ensure that not less than 5% of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds are identified for CSI and the first year of identification complies with the Department’s guidance.</p> <p>Please see the issues cited in the peer reviewer notes from A.4.v.b: Weighting of Indicators.</p> |
| <i>Strengths</i> | The chart on page 49 clearly outlines the identification and exit criteria schools. NHDOE will identify the lowest 5% from both the elementary/middle schools and the high schools. |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | There is a lack of detail about (1) how student growth towards English language proficiency is weighted proportionately based on the percentage of English learners in the school and (2) how high school graduation intersects with Title I high schools in the bottom five percent on the combination of achievement and CCR index. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | More information is needed about how overall model is calculated for both Elementary/Middle School and High School. |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (2 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (2 peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | NHDOE should provide details about (1) how student growth towards English language proficiency is weighted proportionately based on the percentage of English learners in the school, and (2) how high school graduation intersects with Title I high schools in the bottom five percent on the combination of achievement and CCR index. |

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> | NHDOE states “All Title I high schools that have a graduation rate below 67 percent will be identified as CSI schools (p. 45, section b), although the federal requirement states that all public high schools failing to graduate one third or more of their students will be identified as a comprehensive support and improvement school. It is unclear whether NHDOE plans to use one or more extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates in addition to the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and how NHDOE plans to average data in a uniform averaging procedure across all schools. The SEA will use 2017–2018 school year to identify the initial set of CSI schools beginning in the 2018–2019 school year. |
| <i>Strengths</i> | |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | NHDOE indicates that it is only identifying Title I High Schools; however, the requirement is to identify all high schools falling below 67% graduation rate, not just Title I high schools (p. 45 (b). NHDOE does not state how graduation rate is calculated, and it is not clear how the adjusted cohort graduation rate was calculated and if there a distinction between graduation rate and the adjusted cohort graduation rate. |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information</i> | NHDOE must revise the identification of CSI high schools based on graduation rate to include all public high schools. NHDOE must clearly |

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | describe how the methodology reflects both the four-year adjusted cohort rate and the five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. |
|---|--|

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

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

| | <i>Peer Response</i> |
|--|---|
| <i>Peer Analysis</i> | NHDOE will use data from 2017-18 to identify TSI schools beginning in the 2018-19 school year; those schools with consistently underperforming subgroups – schools with an underperforming subgroup for two consecutive years. Such schools will then qualify to be considered to be labeled as TSI low performing schools and if the subgroup or subgroups do not meet the exit criteria for an additional two years, the school will then be identified as a CSI school. If such schools meet this entry criteria for two consecutive years they will be identified as chronically low performing in 2020-2021SY, and if chronically low performing schools don’t exit by the end of second year, they will be identified as a CSI school in 2022-2023 (p. 46). |
| <i>Strengths</i> | |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | <p>The dates for starting identification seem inconsistent. If after two years a subgroup is underperforming, it appears that identification should occur in the second year; or, in this case, in 2019-20. Waiting until 2020-21 to identify would actually allow for 3 years of low performance for a subgroup to occur before getting flagged. Also, it is not clear if the methodology includes all indicators.</p> <p>The TSI-CUS designation for schools is confusing as it references chronically low performing. It would help to align the State labels with the statutory language.</p> |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | NHDOE needs to clarify (1) when a school will actually be flagged as TSI: in 2019-20 or in (2 years) or 2020-2021 (3 years), and (2) that the methodology includes all indicators. |

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> | NHDOE will identify CSI schools once every three years. |
| <i>Strengths</i> | The first year of identification is indicated in other earlier sections with the necessary clarification for type of schools (pp. 38, 44, 46). |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | |

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

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

| | <i>Peer Response</i> |
|----------------------|---|
| <i>Peer Analysis</i> | <p>NHDOE is using a “multi-pronged” approach to identify schools for TSI based on having a consistently underperforming subgroup. A consistently underperforming subgroup is defined by meeting four criteria which are additive and require meeting interim targets on achievement, graduation and/or ELA proficiency (2 years), performing above statewide average for that subgroup (2 years), growth percentile over 3 years is less than 50. However, it is unclear if the methodology is based on all indicators. For example, the model does not address meeting English Learner Proficiency, or Career and College Readiness targets. It would help to see an example of how this model works for current schools. It is not stated if these schools are identified annually.</p> <p>By requiring that a subgroup meet each indicator for two consecutive years before being named as a consistently underperforming subgroup, the state ensures that the subgroups that are identified are truly underperforming and that the resources go to the neediest schools and subgroups.</p> <p>Consistently underperforming subgroup is defined by meeting all of the following criteria for any one indicator: the subgroup does not meet interim</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | targets, subgroup is performing below state average, the mean growth percentile for the subgroup over a three-year period is less than 50, and the first two listed are true for consecutive years. Schools will be required to work with district leaders in the development of a school improvement plan that the NHDOE will work directly with the schools in developing personalized learning approaches for the students. This is described in section 4.v.b (pp 43-45, 46-47) |
| <i>Strengths</i> | A multi-pronged approach will keep the state from over identifying schools, thus more targeted assistance may be provided. |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | The methodology applied to identify schools for targeted support is very complicated. The model does not address all indicators in the statewide accountability system. Some reviewers stated that it is unclear whether consistently underperforming subgroups will be identified annually. |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | NHDOE should (1) clarify if schools meeting TSI criteria are identified annually, (2) demonstrate that all indicators are included in the HS methodology for identifying TSI, and (3) clarify how the indicators are calculated. |

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

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

| | <i>Peer Response</i> |
|----------------------|---|
| <i>Peer Analysis</i> | <p>NHDOE will use data from 2017-18 to identify the initial set of TSI-CUS (the State’s term for Additional Targeted Support) schools beginning in the 2018-19 school year. If they meet the entry criteria for two years in a row, they will be identified as chronically underperforming in the 2020-21 school year. If those schools do not satisfy the exit criteria for two years, they will be identified as CSI in 2022-23.</p> <p>NHDOE describes its methodology to identify TSI schools: (1) schools that have been identified two years in a row as TSI on the basis of CUS will automatically be qualified for consideration for identification as “Identified for TSI for Low-Performing Subgroups (TSI-LPS)” For a TSI-CUS schools to be relabeled as a TSI-LPS school, they must meet both criteria: (1) identified as</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | TSI-CUS for two consecutive years, and (2) the subgroup(s) that are identified as consistently underperforming on its own would lead to identification of the schools as a comprehensive support school. (pp 43-45, 47-48) |
| <i>Strengths</i> | The requiring consecutive years to both be identified and to exit, ensures that the potential issues, as well as the possible gains, are not anomalies. |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | It is not clear if the methodology to identify Additional Targeted Support schools includes all indicators. It is difficult to determine if the methodology will result in the identification of these schools. |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (1 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (3 peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | NHDOE should explain how the methodology includes all indicators so that the methodology will result in the identification of these schools. |

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> | NA – NHDOE does not include additional statewide categories of schools. |
| <i>Strengths</i> | |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | |

A.4.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> | It appears that NHDOE will report student participation rates for the “all” student group on the state report card and will identify LEAs where |

| | |
|--|--|
| | participation falls below 95% (p.48). The denominator in calculating the achievement index will be the number of students participating in the State or PACE assessments OR 95% of the full academic year enrollment, whichever is greater. |
| <i>Strengths</i> | NHDOE states that the participation rate on its PACE assessment pilot has exceeded 98 percent for all districts. Measurement of indicators can be made even if some factors are lagging, e.g., participation rate. |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | NHDOE does not state the methodology to calculate subgroup participation or that subgroup participation will be reported. It is not clear how the inclusion of 95% participation is calculated, or the impact on a school's accountability grade or achievement indicator if it has fewer than 95% students participating in state assessments. |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | NHDOE needs to (1) describe how it includes the requirement for 95% participation of all students in each subgroup in the statewide mathematics and English/language arts assessments in the accountability system, (2) explain exactly how this looks in the calculation by providing examples of the impact of 95% participation, greater than 95% participation, and below 95% participation. |

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> | NHDOE will exit schools from CSI status when they do not meet the same CSI entrance criteria that caused identification for two years in a row; this demonstration of progress is examined annually. A chart is used to clearly identify criteria necessary for both getting flagged for support and for exiting (pp. 48-49). |
| <i>Strengths</i> | Requiring the school to meet criteria for two consecutive years supports sustainment of effort and helps to ensure that the improvement is not an anomaly. The exit criteria are transparent. |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | |

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

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

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

| | <i>Peer Response</i> |
|--|---|
| <i>Peer Analysis</i> | NHDOE will exit schools from TSI status when they do not meet the same TSI entrance criteria that caused identification for two years in a row. A chart is used to clearly identify criteria necessary for both getting flagged for support and for exiting. In the most basic terms, if the school longer meets the criteria for getting flagged for two consecutive years, they will be exited (p. 49). |
| <i>Strengths</i> | Avoiding entrance criteria for two years is the beginning of sustainability and helps ensure that improvement is not an anomaly. The exit criteria are transparent. |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | There is lack of internal consistency between the text in (b), p. 49 and the Table on page 49. |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | Clarify the apparent lack of internal consistency between the text in (b), p. 49 and the Table on page 49 for exit criteria. |

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> | NH law requires that a progress review team be assigned by NHDOE to evaluate the implementation of the school’s past improvement plan and progress toward State performance targets. In conjunction with a new State Turnaround provider, NHDOE will conduct a comprehensive needs assessment using the Center on School Turnaround (WestEd) constructs. Schools must implement a multi-tiered instructional model and select at least one strong or moderate evidence-based intervention. In addition, the school improvement plan must identify annual performance targets, address family and community involvement, and detail how the district’s budget reflects the goals in the improvement plan. The state has no authority to take control of any public school, but will work with the LEAs to provide TA and resources as well as monitor the improvement plans. A school may access CSI/TSI funds for only four years (pp. 49-52). |
| <i>Strengths</i> | NHDOE blends the Priority and Focus school identification into the CSI-TSI identification, involves an external organization with proven success to assist CSI and TSI schools, ensures that all schools identified for improvement have an external comprehensive needs assessment grounded in a research-based framework, requires a school improvement plan based on needs, and SEA continuous monitoring of LEAs’ school improvement plans. |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | No option for school takeover per state law could potentially leave the school with few options if the school continues to fail. |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | |

A.4.viii.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> | NHDOE will award school improvement funds to LEAs using a formula that ensures equitable distribution and is focused on documented needs. Schools may only access CSI TSI funds for four years and will be expected each year to identify sustainability efforts. Because the small state of NH has 175 LEAs, it is unlikely that any LEA would have a significant number or percentage of CSI or TSI schools. All LEAs with CSI TSI school will be required to review |

| | |
|--|--|
| | resource allocation through the NHDOE on-line grants management system. The NHDOE will provide annual on-site monitoring of CSI and TSI schools and their use of school improvement funds. For LEAs serving multiple CSI or TSI schools, the NHDOE will provide monitoring and technical assistance of the local allocation of Federal funds to be sure the funds are being used to effectively impact the schools' improvement plans (pp. 52-53). |
| <i>Strengths</i> | <p>The NHDOE on-line grants management system addresses a whole school framework and helps to coordinate and make transparent the use of state and federal funds in the context of the school improvement plan. The provision of annual onsite monitoring of CSI and TSI schools could support implementation of programs.</p> <p>The provision of an audit before personnel is provided ensures proper use and implementation initiatives at the LEA level. Technical assistance is one thing, but the offer of personnel assistance is next level. However, ensuring that the LEA actually needs this level of assistance through the use of an audit helps to ensure all other resources have been exhausted first.</p> |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | The frequency of monitoring and TA for LEAs serving multiple CSI and TSI schools is not mentioned. |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | |

A.4.viii.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>The NHDOE will intentionally and thoughtfully provide additional technical assistance to LEAs with a significant number or percentage of schools identified for CSI or TSI with the support of expert providers that have a strong history of turning around low-performing schools. The SEA will assist CSI and TSI schools in engaging the entire community into their continuous improvement conversation and action planning for the sustainability of efforts. In addition, the NHDOE will provide resources from the Office of Student Wellness, such as the NH Student Wellness Toolkit, the NH Universal Design for Learning Academy, a comprehensive environmental scan, needs assessment, gaps analysis tools and information on evidence based practices. The technical assistance that will be provided to LEAs with identified schools</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | will be differentiated for each LEA’s unique needs. LEAs with multiple schools identified will be required to bring the entire community together to discuss improvement and action planning. Resources that include needs assessment, universal design for instruction and gap analysis as well as technical assistance and how to identify evidence-based practices will be provided (pp. 53-54). |
| <i>Strengths</i> | NHDOE provides a supportive environment for evidence-based promising practices, involves turnaround experts with the schools, LEAs, and communities, and requires the entire community be brought into the conversation and planning when multiple schools within an LEA are identified as either Comprehensive or Targeted. Schools implementing evidence-based practices “will be required to demonstrate validity and effectiveness in improving student achievement.” |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | |

A.4.viii.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> | NHDOE is seeing early results of the PACE pilot program as effective for students at risk for subpar performance and will be considered for LEAs with a high percentage of CSI or TSI schools. PACE is built on a reciprocal approach to accountability where the State is a full partner with districts to provide training and support to help shift to competency-based educational approaches focused on deeper thinking. NHDOE will reach out to State membership organizations of principals, superintendents and school boards and others regarding professional learning and supporting school improvement efforts in CSI and TSI schools. However, specific actions and timelines are not described (pp. 54-55). |
| <i>Strengths</i> | NHDOE is collaborative and innovative in addressing school improvement supports and efforts. |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | The potential actions and strategies described are vague and lack implementation timelines. |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (1 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (3 peer reviewer(s)) |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | NHDOE should describe the specific actions it will implement to initiate additional improvement in any LEA and the timeline for implementation of these actions. |
|--|--|

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> | NHDOE provides definitions for ineffective, out of field, and inexperienced. However, the definition for out of field is the amount of time a principal may assign a teacher outside of the appropriate level of content knowledge. In addition, no data are provided as to how many courses are taught by ineffective, out of field, or inexperienced teachers, or the extent that minority or low-income students are served by these teachers. No information is provided regarding how the State reports progress in this area (pp. 55-57).NHDOE has a USED approved Equity Plan. The NH Equity Plan focuses on recruiting and retaining excellent educators. The state has identified schools that have high percentages of beginning educators and students in poverty. In the 2016-17 school year NHDOE began to reach out to these schools to offer support and TA. The protocol engaged stakeholders in focus groups to determine equity gaps and root causes. The focus groups identified priority areas for consideration and planning. However, the resources provided and the steps to determine intervention are school improvement strategies and processes to determine evidence-based practices. The support is not aimed at improving access to excellent educators. |
| <i>Strengths</i> | NHDOE has developed a multi-faceted model to talent management that is being implemented to support schools and LEAs to ensure all students have |

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.

| | |
|--|---|
| | equitable access to excellent teachers and leaders. NHDOE’s Ensuring Equitable Access for all Students to Excellent Educators Plan indicates that the state is committed to addressing this access for all students. |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | NHDOE does not describe the extent that either minority children or low-income children enrolled in Title I, Part A schools 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, or the measures it will use to evaluate and publicly report its progress with respect to how these children are not served at disproportionate rates by such teachers. |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | NHDOE must address each of the following areas: (1) The extent that low-income and minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field (see #2 below), or inexperienced teachers, and (2) The measures (e.g., data used to calculate the disproportionate rates) it will use to evaluate and publicly report its progress with respect to how low-income and minority children are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers. |

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

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

| | <i>Peer Response</i> |
|----------------------|---|
| <i>Peer Analysis</i> | NHDOE does not directly address how it supports LEAs to reduce the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom or the use of aversive discipline practices other than restraint (pp 57-62). However, NHDOE does have a plethora of resources available supporting the whole child, including a State office dedicated to student wellness. NHDOE describes extensive efforts to focus broadly on student wellness that involve parents, families/caregivers, and whole-child student wellness, including grants and state-level system of care, and implementation of universal design for learning to realize goals for personalized learning. It is reasonable to expect that implementation of these holistic efforts will enhance positive school conditions for learning. These resources include a focus on PE and Health classes, arts programs in schools, a wellness framework using a multi-tiered system of support for behavior and wellness, a Safe Schools grant, a Project AWARE grant, a State-level System of Care grant, and a focus on personalized learning through Universal Design for Learning State Plan. The |

| | |
|--|---|
| | State addresses bullying and harassment through RSD 193-F4,II which requires all school boards and boards of trustees of charter schools to adopt a written policy prohibiting bullying and cyberbullying. The NHDOE provides on-line tutorials regarding bullying. RSA 126-U governs child restraint and seclusion practices. The NHDOE provides technical assistance to schools to ensure students are educated in safe respectful, and non- restrictive environments. |
| <i>Strengths</i> | The NHDOE is committed to supporting school communities and is actively engaged in a wide variety of services and supports for students, parents, families/caregivers to promote social emotional health, and has a comprehensive list of supports to improve school conditions for student learning available to all schools. The NHDOE model for student wellness and implementation of universal design for learning are supportive of positive school conditions for learning. |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | The NHDOE does not mention how it supports LEAs in reducing the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom, or identify how it works with schools to reduce the use of aversive discipline practices other than restraint. There is a lack of adequate explanation about the practices that will be implemented, timeline of their availability, and how these will be deployed to schools. |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | NHDOE should describe the supports in place to help LEAs reduce the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom and the use of aversive discipline practices. |

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> | The NHDOE lists specific priorities it has to support secondary transitions but specifics about implementation and results of these are not described. Additionally, comprehensive explanations about several programs related to transition and how these programs decrease risk of students dropping out; including Next Steps program, professional development and coaching in cohort schools, ELO project, and vocational rehabilitation transition services, are needed (pp 63-65). The NHDOE recognizes the need for transition support at all levels of schooling providing resources to address vertical transitions from home or care to formal schooling, through the key transition levels, to college/career/life. The NHDOE also recognizes the need for support |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>horizontally such as from special education to general education and ELP to English, as well as curriculum and programs students may be enrolled in within or across school settings. The state describes this as “being very engaged in transition-focused education that keeps the focus on the student’s journey to adulthood” and outlines transition planning, early learning, secondary transitions, Next Steps, family engagement, Title I State Plans, credit bearing courses outside the classroom and Voc Rehab supports. The state has developed a deep and thorough array of services and supports supporting key transition points for students; from pre-school/home to elementary school to post HS graduation as well as in-school transitions from special education to general education, general curriculum classes to advanced classes, etc., students as well as parents are supported. NHDOE describes a system of transition that transcends schools and grade levels, includes four elements of transition planning, and use of existing resources, tools, and partnerships. NHDOE describes transition planning for students with IEPs.</p> |
| <i>Strengths</i> | <p>The resources available to ensure system-wide transitions encompass all levels of the NHDOE system both vertically and horizontally. NHDOE describes programs that support positive transitions in early childhood and that appropriate curriculum can support transition at all grade levels. Many supports are available from the beginning entry into school as well as throughout high school with regards to pathways, Extended Learning Opportunities, and the Vocational Rehabilitation training. Supports and resources for the schools include community involvement and outreach. The SEA recognizes the need for transitional supports and may be one reason why the state’s high school graduation rate is so high.</p> |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | <p>NHDOE provides little description regarding programs to support elementary to middle school transition, middle to high school transition, and their effectiveness in preventing the drop out of students.</p> |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))</p> |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | <p>NHDOE should provide more information regarding transition efforts into and exiting middle school as well as specifically what the drop-out recovery efforts entail.</p> <p>NHDOE should clearly describe the secondary transition programs and their effectiveness in preventing drop out of students transitioning to middle grades and high school.</p> |

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

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

- Does the SEA describe how it will establish and implement, with timely and meaningful consultation with LEAs representing the geographic diversity of the State, standardized statewide entrance and exit procedures for English learners, including a description of how, if applicable, a State will ensure that local input included in the exit procedures, such as teacher input or a portfolio, will be applied statewide?

- Does the SEA’s description include an assurance that all students who may be English learners are assessed for such status within 30 days of enrollment in a school in the State?

| | <i>Peer Response</i> |
|--|---|
| <i>Peer Analysis</i> | <p>NHDOE publishes the State ESOL Guidance on the State Webpage. Entrance criteria require LEAs to ensure all families complete a Home Language Survey and must provide an interpreter if requested. If the survey indicates that a language other than English exists in a student’s home a certified teacher will conduct an initial assessment using WIDA screeners. Screeners must be administered within 30 days BOY or within 14 days of enrollment. Exit criteria require LEAs to administer the ACCESS 2.0 exam, once the student meets the statewide ELP benchmark the student will be placed in Monitor status for 4 years and LEAs will conduct quarterly progress checks. Should the child show any academic barriers due to language difficulties the child, following consultation with the parents, may be referred to services once again (p. 82).</p> <p>NHDOE did not describe how it established and implemented timely and meaningful consultation with LEAs representing the geographic diversity of the State to establish 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.</p> |
| <i>Strengths</i> | Very clearly communicated ESOL guidance, entrance, and exit criteria. |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | The SEA did not include a description of its consultation with various stakeholders throughout the state when determining the entrance and exit procedures. |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | NHDOE should describe how stakeholders were consulted in developing the entrance and exit procedures. |

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

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

| | <i>Peer Response</i> |
|----------------------|--|
| <i>Peer Analysis</i> | While the long term and interim goals are set, the specifics of “how” the State will assist LEAs in improving the performance rates in ELP and meeting state standards are not provided. Although NHDOE states it will work closely with |

| | |
|--|---|
| | LEAs in analyzing ELP data and academic assessments of English Learners and will collaborate with LEAs in designing evidence-based professional development, the SEA did not offer any information on other ways it will ensure that ELs meet the state’s challenging academic standards (p. 83). |
| <i>Strengths</i> | |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | Based on the information provided, there are low expectations for EL students. The response lacks specificity in how NHDOE will assist LEAs to ensure that English learners meet state academic standards and the measurements of interim progress towards English language proficiency. Although NHDOE mentions provision of professional learning as one way it will aid LEAs in helping to ensure that the ELs meet the state’s challenging academic standards, other strategies that it will implemented to assist LEAs, such as providing technical assistance, monitoring, providing additional funding and resources, etc., need to be described. |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | NHDOE should (1) establish and submit ambitious goals for English Language Learners to achieve English proficiency, (2) set ambitious goals for English Language Learners to achieve English/Language Arts and mathematics standards, and (3) determine and describe how it will assist LEAs in reaching long term goals for EL students. |

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> | Districts were required to write a summative analysis on how the district has met the State’s ELP benchmark. The SEA required LEAs to critically examine the strengths and weaknesses of their EL program and to submit a one-paragraph explanation of each to the SEA. These were due in February. As a follow up, the SEA met with each district from late May to June, to discuss program coordination and improvement. Based on these consultations, the NHDOE will apply a rubric to determine risk for each district. Based on the risk assessment, each LEA is scheduled for onsite monitoring once every two years. No rationale is provided as to why the analysis is due in February and consultations begin in May, seemingly losing opportunities to begin adjustments until the following school year. Specific steps the SEA will take to further assist eligible entities if strategies are not effective are not presented. It appears as though the ELP data and the EL performance data are not seen as an urgent need. |

| | |
|--|--|
| | State meetings with LEAs at the beginning of the year and mid-year will be held to review program policies and fiscal responsibilities. Targeted professional development will be provided. |
| <i>Strengths</i> | |
| <i>Weaknesses</i> | NHDOE appears to lack a sense of urgency in addressing the needs of EL students. The length of time scheduled to conduct LEA analyses and receive technical assistance may prevent implementation of strategies that will address weaknesses. Specific steps the SEA will take to further assist eligible entities if strategies are not effective are not presented. More detail could be provided regarding the rubric that will be used to evaluate the schools/LEAs as well as more information regarding the additional services that will be made available. |
| <i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s)) |
| <i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i> | NHDOE should (1) describe how it will monitor the Title III districts based on need (not every two years), (2) describe the steps it will take to assist districts that are not effectively supporting EL students. NHDOE should recognize the urgent need of EL students when just 12.6 percent of EL students are making progress toward EL proficiency; (3) revise the length of time scheduled to conduct these analyses and receive technical assistance as well as the specific steps the SEA will take to further assist eligible entities if strategies are not effective. |