

# STATE PLAN PEER REVIEW CRITERIA Peer Review Panel Notes Template

---

STATE: New Jersey



**U.S. Department of Education**  
April 5, 2017

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

### A.1: Challenging State Academic Standards and Assessments

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

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

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

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

- If applicable,<sup>1</sup> does the SEA describe, regarding the 8<sup>th</sup> 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>	<p>New Jersey met the requirement to outline strategies to provide all students' access to middle school advanced mathematics. They note that certain historically underserved student groups are underrepresented in advanced middle school course work, specifically Algebra I. As described in the weakness section, NJ could add more data in to further illustrate why they believe these are the right strategies.</p> <p>New Jersey met this requirement because the response spoke to a systemic approach and included the following:</p>

---

<sup>1</sup> In order for an SEA to exempt an 8<sup>th</sup> grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in 8<sup>th</sup> 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 8<sup>th</sup> 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).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of LEAs in need of support through data analysis;</li> <li>• Professional development to support teacher changes/growth</li> <li>• Program design through the multiple pathways model</li> </ul>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>NJ uses data to provide evidence that ED and minority students are underrepresented in eighth grade Algebra I classes and how that matters for their course-taking patterns in high school. They state that they encourage data driven placement decisions by their LEAs for these courses. Their strategies focus on math preparation at earlier points in the pipeline to prepare all students for advanced middle school math.</p> <p>Data was provided around the lack of representation of underrepresented subgroups in Algebra I courses in 8<sup>th</sup> grade. Included a strong professional development outcomes based component to focus on shifting/improving teacher beliefs and skills</p> <p>Plan provides access to the 8<sup>th</sup> grade math exception for all middle school students and administers the end-of-course mathematics assessment that most closely matches students' coursework rather than the grade level exam. Plan identifies and describes planning for closing the opportunity gap for economically disadvantaged and Black and Hispanic students.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA does not provide data points or cite research that would indicate the strategies outlined in their plan are sufficient to address the gaps that exist in advanced math course taking. The State does not outline whether these strategies will be used in all schools or whether the strategies will be tailored based on the data coming out of specific schools and districts. It is recommended the State dig deeper into its course taking data to ascertain whether the strategies they describe address the barriers in all schools or whether it makes sense to target specific strategies in specific schools or districts. Readiness and achievement gaps are likely the problem in some schools and thus many of the strategies may make sense. However, it would be helpful to know if there are places where "ready" ED or minority students are not enrolled in these course, which would be contrary to the State's encouragement of "data-driven approaches". If this is the case, it seems strategies need to be crafted to address either differential access (eg counseling) or access generally, which may indicate a need for a licensed teacher or other virtual solutions.</p> <p>Since the plan did not indicate specifically that data would be examined other than holistically, it is suggested that the State disaggregates data to identify those subgroups who are not historically represented in higher level coursework to assess any higher performing students who are members in historically under represented subgroups and examine those students' performance through a strengths based lens rather than a deficit model. No specific reference was made for how to ensure there is an increase in numbers of the underrepresented subgroups.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the</i>	

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

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

#### **A.3.i: Definition**

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The State’s response was partially complete.</p> <p>The SEA provides a clear definition that uses data to define languages that are present to a significant extent in the State. The SEA does not describe all of the elements required in the regulations.</p> <p>The State failed to fully address the disaggregation across grade levels of EL students and identify specific districts that may have an EL population to ‘a significant extent’.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>NJ convened a stakeholder group to decide upon the criteria used to identify languages other than English that are present to a significant extent. The definition uses data in the aggregate and disaggregated by grade and county to determine which languages are present to a significant extent.</p> <p>A strength is the use of a focus group in defining languages other than English that are present to a significant extent.</p> <p>The State included a broad range of stakeholders when defining languages present to a significant extent.</p>

<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The plan fails to address the all of the regulatory requirements, specifically the regulation requiring the State to describe how it considered languages....spoken by distinct populations.</p> <p>It appears that the State used a State-wide approach in the designation of EL present ‘to a significant extent’ without considering individual LEAs that may have an EL population present to ‘a significant extent’. The state did not include disaggregation of data across grade levels.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>State must address 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.</p> <p>The State must describe how it considered languages other than English that are spoken by a significant portion of the participating student population in one or more of the State’s LEAs. (Bullet 5)</p>

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The State’s response meets the requirement.</p> <p>This area was met as language and grade levels are indicated.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>All grade levels, 3-12, in math have an assessment in Spanish.</p> <p>Biology competency test was included.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	N/A
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this</i>	

<i>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>	This area was met as it was indicated that currently the State assessment is only available in Spanish for math and science.
<i>Strengths</i>	State administers science and math required assessments in Spanish.  All grade levels, 3-12, in math have an assessment in Spanish.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Plan does not provide evidence to support the need or the validity of providing yearly student English language arts academic assessment in the language other than English that is present to a significant extent (i.e. Spanish).  It is recommended that the State include more support for the need for ELA assessment in Spanish. There is a question of validity. An explanation would be helpful.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

**A.3.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>	<p>The State’s response was complete.</p> <p>This area was met but lacked specificity.</p> <p>All questions above were addressed.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Input was obtained through a focus group (p.48 – Section 3B.iv.) and email opportunities.</p> <p>The State obtained broad stakeholder input.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The State plan needs to include more information about their assessment program. It is unclear why the State was issuing RFPs if the State already had these exams.</p> <p>The language used in describing the timeline was weak (e.g. “explore the possibilities”).</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The State's response was complete.</p> <p>This area was met as a result of information located in Appendix A.</p> <p>The State needs to clarify if it is reporting on students with disabilities, EL, and economically disadvantaged for accountability purposes.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Section lists the subgroups the State will include in the accountability system, as well as two ways that the accountability system drives improvement in achievement for ED and minority students.</p> <p>All major ethnic and racial groups were represented and a subgroup of '2 or more races' was included as well.</p> <p>The plan describes the State's approach to closing the achievement gap for students classified as economically disadvantaged and/or minority.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	N/A
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The State's response was complete.

	All major ethnic and racial groups were represented and a subgroup of ‘2 or more races’ was included as well.  The State includes the group of “former children with disabilities” in the children with disabilities, which is flagged as not meeting the criteria.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The plan includes former students with disabilities in the students with disabilities subgroup, which is not allowable.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The plan must remove the inclusion of former children with disabilities in their special education subgroup.

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>	This question is not applicable.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	N/A
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The State’s response was complete.</p> <p>The n size for both reporting and accountability are acceptable.</p> <p>The reviewers urge caution in using suppression rules.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Plan makes a compelling arguments for its choice of an n count of 20, which balances “reliability and representativeness”.</p> <p>The lowest possible n size of 10 for reporting and an n of 20 for school accountability for each subgroup indicated is statistically sound.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The plan makes an argument for why NJ used the SGPs as the indicator to evaluate the stability of their n count. However, it would be helpful for NJ to provide evidence of the stability of this n count for other indicators.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an</i>	

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

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

- Is the selected minimum number of students statistically sound?<sup>2</sup>

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The State’s response was complete.</p> <p>The State provides evidence from its analysis to support the stability of the n count chosen. This is likely to reduce the noise in their system and ensure confidence in their accountability determinations.</p> <p>It seems like the State is taking a population approach rather than a cohort approach. The State made a strong case for their choice in terms of the SGPs, but it is unclear whether they are worried about sampling error in other areas. There are concerns among the reviewers regarding samples and various types of errors. The State might consider their perspective and the issue of introducing error.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The State’s accountability system indicators are ranked against all schools in the State. Schools are not held to targets set off of prior cohort’s data. Given this the State seems to take a population perspective and thus sampling error is not a factor for the accountability system. As such, the focus on SGPs as the data analyzed for choosing the n-size seems like a good decision. The plan describes how the State used their TAC’s recommended stability threshold to inform their decision.</p> <p>The n size included broad stakeholder input.</p>

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<i>Weaknesses</i>	It is recommended the State evaluate the stability of their n count as they move to implementation.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.ii.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 State's response was complete.</p> <p>The State based their n count off a combination of statistical reliability and their goals related to equity. The State described extensive engagement on this topic with stakeholders. The State provided multiple opportunities for feedback and provided information on this topic, including resources in Spanish.</p> <p>Processes used allowed for extensive input by a variety of constituent group indicating this area is met.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>NJ makes a strong argument for their choice of an n size that takes into account their focus on equity and statistical soundness.</p> <p>The State's broad range of input from constituent groups was impressive.</p> <p>Plan provides evidence to support the selection of 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.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	N/A
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers)

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

A.4.ii.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?<sup>3</sup>

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The State's response was complete.  The State will use an n count of 10 for reporting. The State's n size is based on their historical practice and stakeholder support.  A description of suppression rules is included.
<i>Strengths</i>	An n-size of 10 is a best practice using FERPA guidelines.  State provides a detailed statistical analysis for how it arrived at the n of 20 for accountability.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	N/A
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an</i>	

<sup>3</sup> See footnote 5 above for further guidance.

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

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

- If the SEA’s minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is lower than the minimum number of students for accountability purposes, does 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>	<p>The State’s response was complete.</p> <p>The tables provided helped analyze the response.</p> <p>They did what was asked, but it was not clear if enough was done to support student privacy. Individual student privacy remains a concern. Some reviewers expressed discomfort. They urge caution.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The use of an n count of 10 is “best practice.”</p> <p>The State complied with constituent request regarding n size.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>It is unclear whether SGPs will be reported for n counts less than 20. The State needs to make this clear. Given the evidence in the plan, an n count of 10 for SGP reporting is inadvisable from a statistical soundness perspective.</p> <p>The State needs to provide more clarity and detail about how the n size of 10 for reporting purposes will protect student privacy.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The goals require a complete closure of achievement gaps, which is very ambitious according to one reviewer.</p> <p>The SEA failed to meet the item indicated above regarding setting ambitious goals for EL, Black and Hispanic students in all content areas.</p> <p>The 80% figure does not account for existing differential growth rates, pressures some groups, and does not sufficiently challenge other groups. For example, it does not account for proficient students and movement between levels.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The goal establishes a target that is the same for both all student groups and all students. The timeline established is based off of the year that students entering Kindergarten in the fall will be graduating. According to one reviewer, the goal is very ambitious both from an all student performance and subgroup perspective.</p> <p>The State’s plan provides for long-term goals for all students for improved academic achievement and is consistent with the 2017-2018 Kindergarten cohort experience.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Based on the change in grade-level proficiency from 2015 to 2016 (10% in ELA and 17% in math), the State might consider taking into account the differential growth trajectories in each subject. The State might consider examining the rate of growth from 2015 to 2016 to determine whether or not the long term goal expects a rate of growth that is realistic based on historical data. If not, it is worth considering what changes will be made that specifically target the underserved students. Finally, it would be interesting to understand the theory of change the State is using that will lead all groups to a uniform point by 2030.</p>

	<p>There is not consensus on whether the State’s long term goals for Black and Hispanic students are ambitious and will close the achievement gap as indicated by the table in Appendix A; the end achievement rate of 80% of students achieving learning targets at the end of the timeframe indicated will not close achievement gaps. There is not consensus on whether EL student goals are ambitious in the first 5 years as indicated by the tables in Appendix A. SEA identified long term achievement goals but failed to provide a narrative description of them. SEA plan consistently indicates Title I schools rather than all schools.</p> <p>For some subgroups at some grade levels, the plan provides for decreases in student performance according to the long-term goals for all students for improved academic achievement. For some subgroups, the plan may be overly ambitious; for other subgroups, the plan may not be sufficiently ambitious.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	To meet this requirement, specific information or clarification is needed regarding whether the plan is ambitious enough. A re-examination and adjustment of the goals for EL, Black, and Hispanic students is needed to make the goals sufficiently ambitious. (1 reviewer)

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>The State’s response was complete.</p> <p>State provides measures broken out by grades and subject for each subgroup and all students.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	State broke out targets for each grade.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	For some subgroups at some grade levels, the plan provides for decreases in student performance according to the long-term goals for all students for improved academic achievement. For some subgroups, the plan may be overly ambitious; for other subgroups, the plan may not be sufficiently ambitious. There is a risk of compounding effect for missing annual target(s).
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The long term goals were very ambitious for student groups and would result in the complete closing of achievement gaps by their target date.</p> <p>The long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for the rate of improvement in the earlier years in the tables in Appendix A are not ambitious for EL, Black and Hispanic students.</p> <p>Due to the large gap size, for at least 2 subgroups, reaching the same rate as everyone else is a concern.</p> <p>The timeline reflects the cohort beginning in Kindergarten.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The State had very ambitious targets.</p> <p>The State’s tables are very clearly laid out for all areas and subgroups.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>It would be worth providing additional evidence related to current growth rates.</p> <p>There is not consensus on whether the early years in tables provide ambitious rates of growth for Black, EL and Hispanic students to achieve the long-term goals.</p> <p>For some subgroups at some grade levels, the plan provides for decreases in student performance according to the long-term goals for all students for improved academic achievement. For some subgroups, the plan may be overly ambitious; for other subgroups, the plan may not be sufficiently ambitious.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer)

<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The rate of gain for EL, Black, and Hispanic students is disproportionately weighted toward the latter years in the table. More ambitious targets are needed in the earlier years indicated in the table in Appendix A for all areas.
--	---

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The State aims to completely close graduation rate achievement gaps. The baseline data may need to revise due to updated graduation requirements mentioned in the State’s plan.</p> <p>It would have been helpful to know what it takes to graduate in NJ.</p> <p>The uniformity of 95% is an issue. The logic is not obvious.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The theory of action that guides the achievement targets is the same that guides the graduation rate targets. The targets aim to completely close achievement gaps.</p> <p>Table format in Appendix A makes this information easy to determine if the areas were addressed.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>It is unclear whether the target is ambitious enough.</p> <p>Reviewers question why the State would lower the expectations for Asian students.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (2 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (2 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or</i>	The State needs to provide specific information about the level of ambitiousness of the goals. A rationale for the targets would be helpful.

<i>clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The Asian student group regression is not ambitious.
--	--

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>The State’s response was partially complete.</p> <p>The State uses the same approach to set extended graduation rates that is used for four year rates. This goal is ambitious due to its gap closure expectations.</p> <p>The area met all requirements listed above with the exception of Asian students as indicated in the weakness below.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The State sets the same goal for all students. The goal is based on currently available data.</p> <p>Tables in Appendix A aid in understanding the interim targets.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>It is unclear why Asian students are expected to graduate at a lower rate in years subsequent to the baseline data used. Additionally, the weighting is not the same in the chart on page 51 (4.1) and narrative on page 53.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (1 peer reviewer)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (3 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this</i>	<p>The State needs to re-examine the years 4 and 5 graduation groups’ targets for Asian students. If these targets are not changed, please address the rationale for them in the text of the plan on page 53. Additionally, the State must align the weighting percentage in the text (p. 53) and Figure 4.1 on p. 51.</p>

<i>requirement</i>	
--------------------	--

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The State's response was complete.  There is concern that the targets are general and too uniform across groups.
<i>Strengths</i>	Information is clearly provided in a table.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	It is unclear whether the interim measures of progress in graduation rate coherently reflect the theory of action guiding the choice of 2030 as the target year. SEA could provide more details on how the differential expectations for rates of progress can be achieved in graduation rate.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The State's response was complete.

	The State's goals require complete closure of gaps.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The location of this information was not part of the required reading by peer reviewers making it difficult to find as it wasn't included in Section 4.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The State's response was complete.
<i>Strengths</i>	The State takes into account a student's initial level of ELP and years a student has been enrolled in a LEA. Research suggests these are important characteristics in EL progress.  Goals were based on extensive stakeholder feedback. The growth expected is ambitious.  The State will re-evaluate goals based on updated baseline data from ACCESS 2.0. The State uses a research based methodology that aligns with their long-term EL definition.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The baseline is an estimate.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The State's response was complete.  This area is met with a detailed description of expected increases.
<i>Strengths</i>	The charts provided made this area easy to assess.  The State provided a sufficient explanation for goal-setting on a 5-year plan, based on recent increases in later-grade immigrant student population.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	N/A
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

A.4.iv.a: Academic Achievement

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The State’s response was complete.
<i>Strengths</i>	This indicator is a very clear, transparent metric and is easy to compare and understand across schools.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The use of proficiency rates to hold schools accountable, especially without a growth indicator for high school, will pick up many factors external to the school. This could lead to unintended consequences.  The 95% is only reflected in the participation rate section. This section does not confirm this indicator for at least 95% of all students.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.iv.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>	<p>NJ plans to use a school’s median SGP for elementary and secondary schools as a measure of student growth. This is a single year measure. This measure will be available for all students and student groups. Math and ELA performance will be weighted equally.</p> <p>The use of SGPs allows the state to measure a student’ growth in a given year relative to his or her peers. This approach will provide an incentive for schools to focus on the growth of all students, not just those around the proficiency threshold. The high weight of this indicator will reward schools making significant progress in student growth. It will also allow for more accurate identification of schools most in need of support.</p> <p>The formula for calculating SGPs is not included in the plan. It would be helpful if they included the formula.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	N/A
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to</i>	

fully meet this requirement

A.4.iv.c: Graduation Rate

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The State’s response was complete.  The SEA might consider monitoring patterns in four and extended year graduation rates to ensure the weighting does not dis-incentivize growth in the four year graduation rates.
<i>Strengths</i>	The State’s plan to calculate graduation rate includes alternative diploma students.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The State’s plan to weight four and extended year rates equally may not place as great of an incentive on the four year goal. The plan describes a strategy for reassigning EL students’ to cohorts other than the cohort of a student’s year first entered ninth grade in some circumstances. It is unclear whether this is legally permissible. However, this approach does reflect research.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Indicator is included for all schools that meet EL counts. It uses data from ACCESS which is a valid and reliable assessment. The indicator is based on achieving proficiency in 5 years.  The measure is ACCESS. There is not consensus on whether there is sufficient evidence to support the claim of validity and reliability of this measure.
<i>Strengths</i>	The indicator incorporates characteristics related to EL proficiency and aligns with definition of long term ELs.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	There is not consensus on the description of the validity and reliability of the measure for this indicator.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA must provide specific information on how the indicator will be valid.

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The State’s response was complete.  SEA provides clear rationale for choosing this metric. They gathered lots of feedback on this indicator and this indicator had broad support. They also cite research supporting its validity and reliability. Plan indicates the State has a wide distribution of rates and can be disaggregated.
<i>Strengths</i>	This is a metric that the State has reported since 2011-12. State will look for ways to continuously improve this indicator. The plan outlines examples of why this metric is actionable and within the locus of control of schools.  The plan includes acknowledgement of high-interest for input on this indicator by stakeholders.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The plan links to reports that cite data. It would be helpful to include some in the plan.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

**A.4.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>	The State’s response was complete.
<i>Strengths</i>	System provides annual progress towards targets for all students/indicators and also one for each indicator and subgroup combination.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA is still developing the displays. It would be helpful to allow the user to drill into the percentile. Although this does not need to be addressed in the plan, it will be useful for the State to think through the technical approach to ties, rounding, and other technical aspects of using percentiles, including the definition of a percentile. It will also be useful to provide help understanding the percentiles and how schools can drill down to find actionable data. For example, a school could meet all targets but if all schools are meeting all targets they could still be at a low percentile rank. Helping folks make sense of this is will be a large challenge.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

**A.4.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>	The State's response was complete.  Schools without ELPA redistribute the weight to the other indicators, with the most going towards grad rate or progress. With the exception of ELPA, it is unclear where the weight goes if a subgroup has enough data for some but not all indicators.
<i>Strengths</i>	The weighting is very transparent and easy to understand.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	What happens if some but not all indicators are present for a student group? More clarity and detail would help.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.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>	The State's response was complete.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The plan does not make it clear whether P-2 schools will receive only a summative rating of the school they feed into or whether they will receive subgroup ratings as well.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the</i>	

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

**A.4.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>	There is not consensus on whether or not the timeline for identification is an issue. It is not clear whether the timeline is feasible. There are concerns about the time needed to measure and evaluate the data, and disagreements about what is actually possible given the state of the ELPA assessment.
<i>Strengths</i>	The methodology used to identify the bottom 5% is based off of the percentiles used for summative ratings.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The State uses only one year of data for this high stakes decision, which may result in more instability for comprehensive support schools than desired.  The State might consider performing an analysis to see if any of the schools that meet this criteria have a median SGP that indicates the school is on a growth trajectory that seems to suggest improvement.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	For the State to fully meet this requirement, it should provide specific information or clarification on the year in which it will first identify these schools, in compliance with Department guidance.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan lacks clarity for the State’s timeline for identification.
<i>Strengths</i>	The focus on 4 year rates for this identification places increased emphasis on getting students through in a timely manner, which matters.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The year of identification of these schools is not compliant with Department guidance.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	For the State to fully meet this requirement, it should provide specific information or clarification on the year in which it will first identify these schools, in compliance with Department guidance.

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>	<p>Title I schools that are identified as in need of targeted support for three or more years will be identified for comprehensive support.</p> <p>The State aims to identify the first set of Additional Targeted Support schools in January of 2018. Since the methodology provided states that schools who do not exit Additional Targeted Support status within three years will become Comprehensive Support schools it does not seem plausible to identify this type of Comprehensive Support schools.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	It is not entirely clear when the first identification of these schools will be made. Will it be based off of not exiting within three years from the 2018 cohort or the 2019 cohort? It is not clear whether a school has to be identified for three consecutive years for the same reason.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	For the State to fully meet this requirement, it should provide specific information or clarification on the year in which it will first identify these schools, in compliance with Department guidance.

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>	<p>The State’s response was complete.</p> <p>It is not clear what will happen with interventions in schools that are near the bottom 5% in the preliminary list but not identified and then enter the bottom 5% on the final list due to the inclusion of ELPA data. It is also not clear</p>

	<p>what options are available for these schools in this scenario.</p> <p>The descriptions here and in some other questions are not always clear enough to present the full picture for the reviewers to evaluate.</p> <p>It might be worth considering the use of Title II money for schools that come off the list or are close to being on the list (the “cusp” schools). These would be schools that are close to being in the bottom 5% when the January 2018 list is run.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The frequency to identify the first two pathways is the same.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The identification of schools for comprehensive support in 2018 and then again in 2019 seems like it may be confusing and lead to issues with interventions. How will the State ensure stability if there are a large number of schools that exit in 2019 and new schools that come onto the list?
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The State’s response was complete.
<i>Strengths</i>	The method takes into account two years of data.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	It is not clear how the all students’ criteria relates to a given subgroup of students. All indicators are used for the all students’ criteria but not for the subgroups. The confidence interval used is fairly wide.

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

A.4.vi.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>The State’s response was complete.</p> <p>It appears that NJ is identifying from the Title I schools the bottom 5% as well as the schools consistently having 1 or more underperforming subgroups.</p> <p>Since scores are standardized, it seems this method is based on a relative rather than absolute standard. The relative approach is not a weakness. The relative nature of this approach is not obvious to a novice user.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The State’s plan includes an easy to digest method.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The plan provides for the first identification of these schools in 2018.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or</i>	

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

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

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The State's response was complete.
<i>Strengths</i>	The plan includes an easy to understand approach. The approach increases the penalty the further away a school is from the required participation rate.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	It is unclear whether this method provides an incentive that is large enough to get schools to test all students.

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

**A.4.viii: 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>	<p>The State’s plan was complete.</p> <p>This method is based on an assumption that the State as a whole will make progress over time. If this assumption does not hold true, this criteria would not ensure progress for student achievement in these schools.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The criteria is aligned to how schools are identified.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	“Successfully implemented” is not defined.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The State’s response was complete.  There is an assumption of continuous improvement, which might not be the case. This approach is all relative, so in a scenario in which the State as a whole regresses ( <i>i.e.</i> , by 6%), a school that regresses could exit because it is not as bad as the other schools that are regressing ( <i>i.e.</i> , by 1%).
<i>Strengths</i>	The criteria aligns with identification.  Timelines in the tables included in this section aided the readers in locating needed information.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	It is possible if the State as a whole is not progressing, that a school could exit not by improving but by regressing less than other schools.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The State's response was complete.
<i>Strengths</i>	The State provides a list of options which will be used only after a data review. This will allow for appropriate consideration of context.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Due to the array of options presented, the State does not outline strong external accountability pressure for these schools if they do not improve. Again, this is good for providing differential supports but it does not provide a clear picture of the sanction.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The State's response was complete.  The State will conduct internal and external annual reviews of resource allocation of LEAs annually in conjunction with the districts to determine areas of inequity. Conducting this review annually allows the SEA to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of its state-lead interventions. The State produces a comparability report that examines inequities in funding allocation. The State may weight school improvement funds according to LEA need. The differential distribution of funds will prioritize the LEAs according to need.
<i>Strengths</i>	Reviews will occur annually.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	N/A
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The State's response was complete.
<i>Strengths</i>	The process described involves true collaboration with the LEA. The support of these LEAs falls into the theory of LEA support by the State. The interventions will be based on the data from the LEA. This differential support will be based on evidence.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Although it is not required, more information about the LEA accountability system would be helpful since it is mentioned in the tiered supports. Are the LEAs with many targeted or comprehensive support schools also those that are identified as needing improvement in district accountability? If not, why and what is the reason?
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>

<sup>4</sup> 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.

<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The response was partially complete.  Effective teacher and out-of-field access gaps exist between low-income and minority students and their peers. All students are served in high rates by inexperienced teachers. Data is provided in appendix.
<i>Strengths</i>	Strategies and root causes provided. The strategies and root causes appear to be comprehensive. The State reports this data on a website for the public.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The definition for inexperienced teacher takes into account a teacher's LEA experience. One reviewer couldn't find a citation for this decision.  The root causes include several explanations for between school disparities but do not address within school inequitable access. In other words, the causes all assume a lack of supply in certain schools rather than an issue with assignment. It is possible that this is suggested by the data but the data provided does not make that clear.  Plan does not include raw data or descriptive information on presented percentages, which would be helpful in understanding the percentages.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA needs to provide specific information that describes the measures that it will use to evaluate and publicly report its progress. The raw data would be helpful in order to understand the percentages. The relationship of the data to the measurements is unclear. (1 reviewer)

#### **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>	The use of LEAs to reduce aversive behaviors is not described. More depth of description is necessary. It is not clear what mechanisms are in place regarding seclusion and restraint.

	<p>The “training” usually addresses response to bullying behavior rather than reduction of bullying in the first place, which deals with symptoms rather than causes. It would be helpful to address the root causes of bullying, or the bullying may reoccur.</p> <p>With the numbers of students in NJ, it seems likely that the State has a robust policy for bullying, but this is not described.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Plan builds off of the State’s current work. The work the State has engaged in has led to reduced referrals and discipline actions.</p> <p>The plan includes referenced evidence based practices and a tiered system of supports.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Explicit actions on the part of the State for identifying root causes of bullying were not included.</p> <p>Improved school conditions for student learning, and the overuse of negative discipline practices, e.g., restraint and seclusion practices, are not addressed.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (2 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (2 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>There is a concern that the only mention of bullying was on page 123, where it is stated “LEAs are able to use Title IA funds ... to address issues such as bullying...” The State must include in the narrative the measures the State will take to support LEAs in the reduction of bullying practices specifically. Although PBSIS addresses a variety of discipline issues, it doesn’t always get to the root cause for bullying in order to ameliorate the situation for the student that is causing the bullying behavior.</p> <p>The State must provide greater clarity and description on the reduction of aversive behaviors, including seclusion and restraint.</p>

**A.7: School Transitions (ESEA 111(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 State’s response was not complete.
<i>Strengths</i>	The plan goes into detail about the State’s approach to early childhood transitions.

	<p>Transition processes/activities for preschool to kindergarten was articulated in a detailed manner.</p> <p>Plan provides strategies for effective transitions in early childhood to elementary school.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Although the strategies will deal with middle to high school grade transitions the State does not explicitly address this transition.</p> <p>The State did not include a description of transition activities for elementary-middle and middle-high school. No differentiation in the support provided for LEAs for their Title vs. non-Title schools was included.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>A description of transition activities from elementary to middle, as well as middle to high school, is needed, as well as information about how LEAs are supported differently for their Title I schools.</p> <p>The SEA description must 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.</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>The State’s response was not complete.</p> <p>It appears there is a plan, but it does not seem to include consultation with LEAs representing geographic diversity.</p>

	The plan says that home language is assessed within 30 days of enrollment, but it is not clear whether the appropriateness of EL services is determined within 30 days of enrollment.
<i>Strengths</i>	The process of entrance and exit is clear. Some guidance is provided in the appendix.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Plan does not include 30 day assurance.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The State must include an assurance that all students who may be English learners are assessed for such status within 30 days of enrollment in a school in the State.</p> <p>The plan must provide specific information or clarification on meaningful consultation with LEAs and local input.</p>

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The State response was complete.</p> <p>NJ will collaborate with stakeholders to identify best practices and to provide LEAs assistance in meeting learning goals. The State will support ELs through PD aligned with measurements. The State provides a variety of delivery platforms to support districts. This variety will allow all districts to interact with the opportunities provided regardless of geographic location.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	N/A
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to</i>	

fully meet this requirement

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The State’s response was not complete.</p> <p>The discussion of monitoring was insufficiently detailed.</p> <p>The discussion does not clearly describe how the State will identify eligible entities.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	Descriptions of the entities was comprehensive.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Progress monitoring processes for Title III do not appear to be present.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The plan needs a description of how the entities’ progress will be monitored, as well as the additional steps/technical assistance the State will undertake if strategies used by the entities are not effective.