

# STATE PLAN PEER REVIEW CRITERIA Peer Review Notes Template

---

STATE: New York



**U.S. Department of Education**

## Background

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

### Role of the Peer Reviewers

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

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

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

### How to Use This Document

The peer review criteria are intended to: 1) support States as they develop their consolidated State plans, and 2) inform peer reviewer panels as they evaluate each consolidated State plan. This document outlines the required elements that an SEA must address in its State plan in order to fully meet the applicable statutory and regulatory requirements. If an SEA has provided insufficient information for peer reviewers to determine whether any requirement is fully addressed, peer reviewers should indicate that the SEA has not fully addressed that requirement and identify what additional information or clarification may be needed. Note that responses to some elements are required only if the specific circumstances addressed in the question are applicable to the SEA submitting the consolidated State plan (*e.g.*, if the SEA establishes an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate in addition to a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate in item A.4.iii.b.2 below). For these particular questions, if the circumstances addressed in the question

do not apply to the SEA, the SEA is not required to answer the question in order to fully address the statutory and regulatory requirements.

### **Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- If applicable,<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>The SEA states 95% of 8<sup>th</sup> graders scored proficient taking the high school math assessment in both 2014 – 2015 and 2015 – 2016 school years (pp. 31 - 33).</p> <p>The SEA has described a thorough and clearly written plan, largely built on stakeholder consultation and supportive of students being provided multiple methods for the opportunity to enroll in and participate in advanced mathematics coursework in middle school (p. 22).</p> <p>The SEA explains it will apply the 8<sup>th</sup> grade math exception and describes its strategies to provide all students in the State the opportunity to be prepared for and take advanced mathematics coursework in middle school (pp. 31-33).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA provided limited details regarding options provided to English Language Learners (ELL) and Multi-Language Learners (MLL) students,

<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).

	specifically regarding their opportunity to participate in these exams.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

**A.3.i: Definition**

- Does the SEA provide its definition of “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population”?
- Does the SEA identify the specific languages that meet that definition?
- 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>	The SEA identifies “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population” from its ELLs/MLLs, which represent 8.8% of all students. This definition for languages other than English is based on 5% or more of the student population speaking a language other than English. The SEA identifies Spanish and Chinese, which constitute 74.4% of languages spoken other than English. Other languages include Arabic, Bengali, Russian, Urdu, Haitian-Creole, French, Karen, and Nepali (p. 24).
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA’s description acknowledges the many different urban centers in the state and identifies those with 5% of more of the student population from these geographic areas. For these geographic areas, the SEA seeks to make “culturally responsive materials for parents and guardians of ELLs/MLLs accessible in each of the 10 languages spoken most prevalently by the state’s ELLs/MLLs... to ensure accessibility of educational materials” (p. 24).
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that</i>	

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

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 SEA identifies existing assessments it makes available and describes its efforts with its legislature to “expand translations of content-area assessments into additional languages, based on demographic changes within the State’s population” (p. 25). Translated assessments are available in Grades 3 – 8 math and Regents exams for five languages including Spanish and Chinese (Traditional), Haitian Creole, Korean, Russian, Spanish; elementary and intermediate Science assessments are available in Haitian Creole, and Chinese (Traditional), and Spanish (p. 25).</p> <p>The SEA continues to seek funding for 8 additional languages (p. 26-27).</p> <p>Currently, the SEA does not offer reading/language arts assessments in any language other than English, due to need for additional funding.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.3.iii: Assessments not Available and Needed

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA describes that it continues to seek funding from the legislature to expand the translation of math and science assessments into additional languages (p. 25-27).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA could improve this response by explaining why it is not pursuing the translation of assessments into Urdu, French, Karen, and Nepali, especially as these languages are within the top 10 languages spoken by ELLs/MLLs.

	Because of this, peer reviewers expressed concern that many other students that speak languages other than English will be left without support. The SEA could improve this response by providing specific data of the number of students impacted by not offering these assessments.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<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 SEA describes its effort to develop assessments in languages other than English, proposing an outline for development and gathering meaningful input.</p> <p>The SEA has identified additional assessments that need to be developed in Math, Science and Language Arts, and explains that funding is the primary reason it has not been able to complete the development of such assessments and states that if funding is secured in “fiscal year 2018, the Department anticipates the first operational assessments will be administered in the 2021-22 school year.” Though funding has yet to be secured, the SEA has determined what funding is needed, the vendor(s) who would be responsible for the assessment creation, and a timeline for implementation (p. 27).</p> <p>The SEA describes how different stakeholders, including State senior leaders, directors, organizations, leadership councils and advocates representing English Language Learners, have provided consultation to gather meaningful input on the needs for assessments in other languages.</p>

<i>Strengths</i>	Consultation with statewide stakeholders is systematic and on-going.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Though the SEA describes its engagement of different stakeholders, it does not appear stakeholder representation includes parents or students (p. 27).  One peer reviewer expressed that the SEA’s plan could be improved by explaining how it has made every effort beyond requesting additional funding (e.g. consult with other states to join efforts to develop assessments) (p. 26).
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No 2
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	To fully meet this requirement, the SEA must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe how consulted with parents and families of English learners and students regarding its efforts to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population.</li> </ul>

**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 SEA lists American Indian/Alaska Native; Asian; Black/African American; Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander; White; Hispanic/Latino, and Multiracial as major racial and ethnic groups for use in its accountability system</p> <p>The SEA also lists other subgroups (Students with Disabilities; English Language Learners; Economically Disadvantaged; Gender; Migrant; Foster Care; Homeless; and Armed Forces Child).</p> <p>The SEA has clear definitions for each racial and ethnic group included in its accountability system (p. 28).</p> <p>The variety of the type of student subgroups the SEA describes (e.g. transgender youth) appears to promote inclusivity.</p> <p>Considering that the range and multitude of languages spoken by students in the State reflect a significant degree of racial and ethnic diversity, one peer reviewer felt that the “Asian” student subgroup combined many distinct Asian racial and ethnic groups into one student subgroup instead of disaggregating them further.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	

<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<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 SEA states it does not include any additional subgroups “beyond economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, children with disabilities, and English learners in its statewide accountability system.” However, it lists Gender; Migrant; Foster Care; Homeless; and Armed Forces Child as subgroups in A.4.i.a.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA could improve its response by clarifying that its Gender; Migrant; Foster Care; Homeless; and Armed Forces Child subgroups are used for reporting purposes only (and not used in its statewide accountability system).
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

*Note: This peer review criterion applies only if a State selects the third option in item A.4.i.d in the consolidated State plan template for recently arrived English learners under which the State applies the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i) or the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii) to a recently arrived English learner.*

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA states it will exempt recently arrived ELLs/MLLs from its State reading/language arts accountability assessment for one year.  As the SEA chose to apply the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i), this section is not applicable.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<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>	The SEA proposes a minimum number of 40 students for determining participation rate and a minimum number of 30 students for accountability purposes, including annual meaningful differentiation and identification of schools (p. 30).  The same number will be used for all students and each subgroup of students.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must</i>	

<i>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 SEA cites the Institute of Educational Sciences “Best Practices for Determining Subgroup Size in Accountability Systems” as its basis for the minimum number of 30 students. As the minimum number is supported by this research, it appears to be statistically sound.</p> <p>The SEA states the purpose of minimum number of 40 students used to determine participation rates is so that the non-participation of two students does not result in a group of students failing to meet the 95% participation rate (p. 30).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<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>	The SEA describes how they will pool data from the previous year when the current year’s subgroup is fewer than 30 students for accountability purposes.

---

<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.

	<p>Data are included to show the percentage of schools' accountability by subgroup n-size and the percent of students attending the schools held accountable that would be held accountable under this n-size. Charts are included to show how the varying n-size impacts of different subgroups.</p> <p>The SEA provides an extensive description of stakeholder consultation, including the different approaches stakeholders considered in establishing the n-size. The SEA uses several stakeholder groups, including those that compose the Think Tank and the Committee of Practitioners, who reported to their different constituents which included school personnel, parents, community members and others. The Challenging Academic Standards and Assessments work group specifically formulated proposals related to how the state would determine the minimum number of students within a subgroup to compose the n-size (pp. 10, 31).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA includes supporting data (e.g. charts) that help justify its State-determined minimum number of students. Additionally, the SEA describes the approach it will use if the minimum number of students is fewer than 30.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<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 SEA describes the reporting of all students and student subgroups. The SEA stated that they will not display reporting statistics for student populations fewer than five students and will also suppress when necessary to protect student privacy.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA's concern for student privacy for the lowest population group and the next lowest population group is clearly outlined. The SEA provides examples of annual reporting for performance and accountability using all required groups and subgroups of students (pp. 34-35).

---

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

	For small racial and ethnic student subgroups, data will be combined to a “small group total” (p. 33).
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

- If the SEA’s minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is lower than the minimum number of students for accountability purposes, does 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>	As outlined in A.4.ii.d., the SEA explains it uses an n-size of five when reporting annual data, and describes its procedures to protect student confidentiality, including reporting the “combined performance results for all of the small subgroups” that fail to meet the threshold into a separate category. The SEA’s description is clear and its practices adhere to FERPA and IES guidance (p. 33).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<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 SEA describes how it uses an index to establish an “end” goal that represents proficiency for most students and to determine its long-term goal. The long-term goals (the first of which is set for 2021-2022), are established by reducing by 20% the gap (based on the Proficiency Index) between baseline performance and the end goal. New long-term goals are set annually “five years in the future” to “reflect the rapidity with which schools and subgroups are making progress toward achieving the end goals established by the State.” The goals are ambitious especially for certain subgroups who have a greater distance to close the achievement gap. P. 39-40</p> <p>While the SEA’s End Goals are ambitious, several long-term goals and interim measurements of progress do not appear to be realistic. To move one student subgroup from 194 to 200 over seven years is far different than moving a student subgroup from 85 or 98 to 200 in the same time period. For example, the SEA expects to move one SPED student subgroup from 108 to 200 in mathematics in one year (Appendix A).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA’s approach to setting long-term goals five years into the future based on recent performance appears to support a responsive and flexible process of continuous improvement.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	NY charts the measurements of interim progress towards meeting the long-term goals for all students and each student subgroup for each required assessment. The SEA’s gap-reduction methodology ensures subgroups with the largest gaps must make the largest gains over time (pp. 197-201, Appendix A).
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA provides additional information to describe the gap from the End Goal, the five-year gap reduction goal, and the yearly goal reduction goal needed to meet the established End Goal.

<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<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>	The SEA uses baseline data to determine the progress needed for subgroups of students, including subgroups with lower performance, who need to make significant progress to close the statewide proficiency gaps (p. 40, Appendix A).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	One peer reviewer expressed concern regarding the improvement necessary to successfully address (i.e. close) statewide proficiency gaps and expressed the SEA’s plan could be improved by a description of the strategies necessary to close statewide proficiency gaps for student subgroups that are lower achieving (p. 42).
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No 1
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	To fully meet this requirement, the SEA must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate how it took into account the improvement necessary for subgroups of students who are behind to make significant progress in reaching the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress in closing statewide proficiency gaps (e.g. describing the strategies necessary to close statewide proficiency gaps for student subgroups that are lower achieving).</li> </ul>

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 SEA identifies long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and student subgroups and provides baseline data for each group. The timeline is the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students (p. 40).</p> <p>Each year following 2021-2022 a new long-term goal will be set. This new long-term goal it is set for 5 years in the future, promoting continuous movement toward goals (p. 41).</p> <p>In addition to long-term goals, the SEA establishes “End Goals.” End Goals represents the level of performance in the future that the SEA aims toward for each subgroup state and within each school to achieve (p. 37).</p> <p>Adjusted target for each subgroup of students is based on 2015-16 baseline date and the goal established for 2021-2022.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Peer reviewers expressed concern that the long-term goals for English Learners and Students with Disabilities are not ambitious, especially considering that the respective long-term goals for these two subgroups are lower than 67%.</p> <p>Peer reviewers expressed concern that the End Goal (i.e. 95%) is not realistic considering the long-term goals for specific student subgroups (e.g. 56% for English Language Learners, 63% Students with Disabilities) (p. 40, 208).</p> <p>The SEA does not provide a timeline for when End Goals will be achieved.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No 1
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>To fully meet this requirement, the SEA must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate the long-term goals are ambitious for each subgroup of students (i.e. English Learners and Students with Disabilities).</li> </ul>

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 SEA describes long-term goals beginning with baseline data for 5-year and 6-year cohorts and identifies goals for all students and subgroups of students. The SEA uses the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students.</p> <p>The long-term goals for the SEA’s five- and six-year adjusted cohort graduation rates are more rigorous (by a 1% increase) than the long-term goals set for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (pp. 42-43).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Peer reviewers expressed concern that the long-term goals for English Learners and Students with Disabilities are not ambitious, especially considering that the respective long-term goals for these two subgroups are lower than 67%.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No 1
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>To fully meet this requirement, the SEA must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate the long-term goals are ambitious for each subgroup of students (i.e. English Learners and Students with Disabilities).</li> </ul>

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 SEA provides measurements of interim progress toward long-term goals for four-, five-, and six-year adjusted cohort graduation rates for all students and each subgroup of students (Appendix A).
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA provides clear data charts for each adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and each subgroup of students.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet</i>	

<i>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 SEA explains the gap reduction methodology used to determine the interim measurements of progress was designed to ensure all subgroups with the largest gap must show the greatest gains annually to close the gap (pp. 43-44).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	One peer reviewer expressed concern regarding the improvement necessary to successfully address (i.e. close) statewide proficiency gaps. For example, it will take six years to get English Language Learner students from 46.6% to 56.3% by 2021-22, which is far from 95% End Goal. The peer reviewer expressed the SEA’s plan could be improved by a description of the strategies necessary to close statewide proficiency gaps for student subgroups that are lower achieving (p. 42).
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No 1
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	To fully meet this requirement, the SEA must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate how it took into account the improvement necessary for subgroups of students who are behind to make significant progress in reaching the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress in closing statewide proficiency gaps (e.g. describing the strategies necessary to close statewide proficiency gaps for student subgroups that are lower achieving).</li> </ul>

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 SEA identifies a long-term goal of 53% by 2021-2022 regarding the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language

	<p>proficiency. The SEA uses its Transition Matrix, which evaluates expected growth per year against actual student growth) to measure this progress.</p> <p>The SEA provides criteria to identify and determine baseline data using first the New York State Identification Test for English Language Learners (NYSITELL) and on an annual basis the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT) to determine placement for the following year (pp. 44-47).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA’s approach to measuring increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency is responsive to different types of student growth (i.e. even, incremental growth annually vs. uneven growth over time).</p> <p>The SEA clearly describes its process for developing its long-term goals, which reflect considerable stakeholder input.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>One peer reviewer expressed concern regarding how the SEA considered including additional types of student populations or demographics (e.g. Students with Interrupted Formal Education) when determining these long-term goals.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<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>	<p>After reviewing its baseline data (i.e. 43% of English Language Learners are making progress to English Language proficiency), the SEA established a mathematical, incremental approach to achieve its End Goal (95%), resulting in an annual gap reduction goal of 2% (p. 47).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA obtained considerable stakeholder consultation.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<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>	<p>The SEA describes how its performance index is calculated for the Academic Achievement indicator. For elementary and middle schools, the Academic Achievement indicator includes reading/language arts, mathematics, and science (all of which appear to have the same weight); for high schools, this indicator includes reading/language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies (for which reading/language arts and mathematics receive equal weight relative to each other and greater weight compared to science and social studies).</p> <p>The SEA uses Performance Indices for Academic Achievement, providing details regarding its methodology to calculate performance on this indicator. The SEA states the same indices are used for all schools and all content areas including reading/language arts and mathematics. In addition to grade-level proficiency, the Indices allow for partial credit for students who achieve partial proficiency, which helps develop an incentive for schools and acknowledges progress.</p> <p>The indicator is based on the SEA’s long-term goals, can be disaggregated for each subgroup of students, and measures the performance of at least 95 percent of all students and all students in each subgroup.</p> <p>The SEA explains the validity of its Index and provides supporting documentation (e.g. New York State Testing Program 2015: Grades 3-8 ELA &amp; Math technical report) to justify the specific uses and interpretations of scores for each assessment tool (pp. 47-52).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	It is unclear if the performance of advanced students will negate the

	<p>performance of those that are non- or partially proficient (p. 48).</p> <p>The criteria do not permit the inclusion of Science and Social Studies in the Academic Achievement indicator (p. 48).</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No 4
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>To fully meet this requirement, the SEA must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove science and social studies from the Academic Achievement indicator.</li> </ul>

**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>The SEA measures growth and progress using two different methodologies.</p> <p>The SEA states it uses Mean Growth Percentiles (MGP) as part of the accountability for reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 4 – 8, which includes all secondary schools that are not high schools. The SEA explains how the MGP model is converted into a growth index. The SEA states it will use a school’s and subgroup’s unweighted three-year average MGP for reading/language arts and mathematics for school accountability purposes.</p> <p>The SEA states it uses a Progress Measures to show how a subgroup performs in relation to the SEA’s long-term goals (pp. 53-54).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA provides clear data and information to illustrate its MGP and Progress measures.</p>

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

A.4.iv.c: Graduation Rate

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA states the same Graduation Rate indicator will be used for all high schools across the state and describes the calculation based on the four-, five-, and six-year adjusted cohort graduation rates. The SEA describes how it includes its four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates (i.e. the three graduation rates (i.e. indices) are averaged for subgroups). Schools that exceed expectations receive a higher index.</p> <p>The SEA’s Graduation Rate indicator is based on the long-term goal, the four-year adjusted graduation rate, and can be disaggregated for each subgroup of students (pp. 54-56).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA’s use of extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates in its Graduation Rate indicator allows for schools to receive credit on the Index continuing to support students in obtaining a diploma that may not graduate within four years.</p>

	The SEA has partnered with Institutions of Higher Education and industry partners to provide students with the opportunity to obtain college credit, associate’s degrees, and \ employment offers while in high school (p. 55).
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA uses a Transition Matrix to evaluate the percentage of English learners’ progress to achieving English language proficiency grades 1 through 12. This model is “based on initial English language proficiency level and incorporates expected growth per year against actual growth” (p. 57).</p> <p>The SEA’s timeline for English learners to achieve English language proficiency—up to 5 years—is aligned to its long-term goals.</p> <p>The SEA states progress in achieving English Language Proficiency in the state is measured by the same indicator across all grade levels and at all schools. The SEA presents evidence from the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing research to support the indicator’s validity and reliability (pp. 56-57, 44-47).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA’s approach to measuring increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency is responsive to different types of student growth (i.e. even, incremental growth annually vs. uneven growth over time). For example, if a student exceeds growth in one year but does not meet growth target in the next year, as long as the expected proficiency level is met according to that trajectory, the student receives credit for that progress. This allows schools to receive credit for students obtaining growth even if the proficiency target is not yet realized and can provide an incentive for schools, teachers, and students to continue</p>

	<p>making progress towards English language proficiency.</p> <p>The SEA states it will review the stability and consistency of this indicator by reviewing multiple years of data.</p> <p>The SEA’s plan here is extensive and, once again, reflects excellent stakeholder consultation.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA describes two measures of school quality and student success: chronic absenteeism, and College, Career, and Civic Readiness.</p> <p>Chronic absenteeism is a statewide indicator. The SEA justifies the need for this indicator based on research that attendance has a direct correlation with student performance. The SEA describes that its calculation of chronic absenteeism is adjusted based on criteria including: enrollment, suspensions, and medical reasons (where instruction is occurring). The SEA states this measure meaningfully differentiates school performance.</p> <p>The SEA will implement a measure of College, Career and Civic Readiness at the high school level. The indicator promotes supporting students to graduate with the most rigorous high school credentials (instead of only focusing on</p>

	<p>completion). The research-based indicator aligns with the mission statement of the New York State Board of Regents. A weighting index is provided that discusses various measures including the type of diploma achieved, participation in higher level coursework, as well as a local diploma, high school equivalency, and no high school credit obtainment. The SEA explains that both indicators convert to an Index Level to differentiate progress and can be measured across all schools and for each subgroup (pp. 57-62).</p> <p>The SEA has planned for additional data elements to be collected to enable the SEA to add additional measurements (e.g. school climate, student access to highly qualified teachers, access to staffing resources, integration of students, high school credits for coursework, licenses/certification obtainment, teacher turnover and absences).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>One peer reviewer expressed concern that threshold for determining chronic absenteeism (i.e. missing 10% or more of school days) may be too high.</p> <p>The SEA does not provide long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for chronic absenteeism or College, Career, and Civic Readiness which, according to the SEA’s approach to its methodology regarding its Performance Indices, is necessary to calculate a school’s performance on this indicator (i.e. meaningfully differentiate school performance).</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No 4
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>To fully meet this requirement, the SEA must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide additional information (i.e. the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for chronic absenteeism and College, Career, and Civic Readiness) to illustrate how performance on the indicator is calculated and demonstrate the indicator allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance.</li> </ul>

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA describes how its process of annual meaningful differentiation is based on all indicators and applies to all schools in the State’s accountability system, including all students and subgroups of students.</p> <p>The SEA will identify schools into different categories for accountability. These include: Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools, Targeted Support and Improvement Schools, Schools in Good Standing, and</p>

	Recognition Schools (pp. 63-64).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The criteria do not permit the inclusion of Science and Social Studies in the Academic Achievement indicator (p. 48).
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No 4
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	To fully meet this requirement, the SEA must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove science and social studies from the Academic Achievement indicator.</li> </ul>

#### A.4.v.b: Weighting of Indicators

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA does not explicitly describe the relative weighting of measures for the Other Academic and School Quality or Student Success indicators.</p> <p>A series of decision rules used to identify for comprehensive support and improvement state that the “greatest weight” is given to “academic achievement and growth (in elementary and middle schools) and academic achievement and graduation rate (in high schools). The SEA states Progress toward English language proficiency is weighted more than are academic progress, chronic absenteeism, and the college- and career-readiness index, which are weighted equally, but less than achievement, growth and the graduation rate. The SEA further explains that, within the Achievement Index, language arts and math are weighted equally, and science and social studies are weighted lower (pp. 63-64, 170).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>While the SEA provides an explanation of relative weighting, it is still not clear that Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicators each receive substantial weight individually and 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.</p> <p>The SEA does not clearly explain how weighting of indicators will be adjusted</p>

	<p>when an indicator cannot be calculated due to the minimum number of students.</p> <p>The criteria do not permit the inclusion of the Science and Social Studies in the Academic Achievement indicator; however, the SEA may choose to include these subjects in the School Quality and Student Success indicator.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No 4
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>To fully meet this requirement, the SEA must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate what weight is assigned to each indicator through the decision rules (e.g. provide a sample school calculation).</li> <li>• Demonstrate that the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicators each receive substantial weight individually (e.g. provide a sample school calculation).</li> <li>• Demonstrate that 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 (e.g. provide a sample school calculation).</li> <li>• Illustrate how the weighting is adjusted for schools for which an indicator cannot be calculated due to the minimum number of students (e.g. provide a sample school calculation).</li> <li>• Remove science and social studies from the Academic Achievement indicator.</li> </ul>

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>	<p>The SEA uses different methodologies for schools in which grade 1 or 2 is the terminal grade; schools serving only kindergarten; schools with any configuration of grades K through 12 that do not participate in the regular State assessment program; small schools with previous State assessment history that do not participate in the State assessment program; and schools for which data are not available yet, e.g. a newly-opened high school (pp. 64-65).</p> <p>Where accountability determination cannot be made using the standard method, the SEA discusses its different methodologies for annual meaningful differentiation. For example, NYSED specifies that schools that do not participate in the regular state assessment program are required to submit nationally normed (if available) achievement test data for English language arts and mathematics. Schools with grades 1 and 2 will be held accountable</p>

	<p>with the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade assessments. Kindergarten only schools will use the Self-Assessment System for School for 2016-2017.</p> <p>The SEA also provides alternative options for metrics. For example, the SEA has established a system of local assessment self-reporting for schools not having a grade participate in state assessments. For schools ending at grade 2, the results from grade 3 are used to measure the K-2 school's success (pp. 64-65).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The Self-Assessment of School Performance for the School Year provides a detailed, appropriate measurement for meaningful differentiation.</p> <p>Having data reported from nationally-normed assessments for schools not participating in state assessments is a way to ensure all schools are held accountable for student outcomes.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	One peer reviewer expressed concern regarding how the SEA upholds or ensures consistent quality of local assessments across the State.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.vi: Identification of Schools (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D), 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D))

A.4.vi.a Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools—Lowest Performing

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement including, if applicable, how it averages data (e.g., does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- Does the SEA's methodology result in the identification of not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement?
- Does the SEA include the year in which it will first identify these schools for comprehensive support and improvement (i.e., does the timeline comply with the Department's guidance)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA states it will begin identification with the 2017-18 school year, using the 2018-19 school year for planning and 2019-20 for implementation.</p> <p>The SEA describes the process to identify the lowest-performing schools receiving Title I funding for comprehensive support and improvement. This process involves providing a Level 1-4 ranking on each indicator, then applying a series of decision rules to determine identification (pp. 65-67).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA goes above and beyond the criteria by providing support and improvement (e.g. technical assistance, funding, professional development) to non-Title I schools and Title I schools that were not identified by the statewide

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Beginning the 2017 – 2018 school year accountability, the SEA states that schools “that have graduation rates below 67% for the four-year graduation rate cohort and do not have graduation rates at or above 67% for the five- or six-year cohorts will be preliminarily identified” for comprehensive support and improvement.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Two reviewers expressed that, as the SEA states these schools will be “preliminarily identified”, it is not clear that “preliminarily” regarding the the SEA’s methodology results in the identification of all public high schools in the State failing to graduate one-third or more of their students for support and improvement.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No 2
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	To fully meet this requirement, the SEA must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate the SEA’s methodology results 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 (i.e. confirm that schools which are “preliminarily identified” for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to graduate one-third or more of their students are identified for comprehensive support and improvement, provided data are accurate).</li> </ul>

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>	The SEA will identify schools that have received additional targeted support that have not met the exit criteria for comprehensive support and improvement beginning the 2020-2021 school year and will reassess every three years.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA does not provide adequate detail regarding the “specified level of improvement” expected of schools identified for additional targeted support.  It is unclear how the SEA plans to commence identification with 2020-21 school year data when it states its first year of identification for additional targeted support is in the same year (section A.4.vi.f).
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No 4
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	To fully meet this requirement, the SEA must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describe how the SEA defines the “specified level of improvement” expected of schools identified for additional targeted support.</li> <li>• Explain how the SEA will identify schools that have received additional targeted support that have not met the exit criteria for comprehensive support and improvement beginning in the 2020-2021 school year when it also plans to identify schools for additional targeted support in the same year.</li> </ul>

A.4.vi.d: Frequency of Identification

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA has established a three-year cycle for identifying schools for comprehensive support and improvement, beginning with the 2017 – 2018 school year (p. 67).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4

<i>all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA identifies schools for target support and improvement (i.e. schools with consistently underperforming subgroups) by using its process to identify schools for comprehensive support and improvement. This methodology identifies schools based on the lowest 5% of schools’ subgroups used in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation.</p> <p>The SEA explains that if a school had been identified as a Priority or Focus School in the 2017-18 school year and the school is identified as among the lowest 5% of public school for a subgroup, based on 2017-18 school year data, the school will be identified for targeted support and improvement (i.e. schools with consistently underperforming subgroups).</p> <p>The SEA states identification will occur annually (pp. 67-68).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<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 SEA states it will identify for additional targeted support “beginning with the 2020-21 school year and annually thereafter” (p. 68).</p> <p>The SEA’s methodology identifies schools for additional targeted from among the schools identified as schools with one more consistently underperforming subgroups.</p> <p>The SEA’s methodology results in the identification of any school that, on its own, would lead to identification as the lowest-performing 5% of Title I schools for comprehensive support and improvement.</p> <p>If a school remains underperforming for any subgroup for which it was identified for targeted support and improvement (i.e. consistently underperforming) for three consecutive years, the school will be identified for additional targeted support.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA states it will identify a school for additional targeted support “if the school remains underperforming for any subgroup for which it has been identified for TSI for three consecutive years.” However, the SEA does not specifically describe how it will average data. The SEA needs to clarify this part of its methodology used to identify schools for additional targeted support (p. 68).</p> <p>The SEA must identify schools for additional targeted support no later than the beginning of the 2018-19 school year.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No 4
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>To fully meet this requirement, the SEA must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describe how the SEA averages data (regarding its methodology to identify schools for additional target support).</li> <li>• Include the year in which the State will first identify schools for additional targeted support (i.e., by the start of 2018-2019 school year).</li> </ul>

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA states that it will differentiate schools by placing them into the following categories: Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools, Targeted Support and Improvement Schools, Schools in Good Standing, and Recognition Schools (p. 63). The SEA states it will “identify schools for recognition in accordance with criteria established by the Commissioner” (p. 68).</p> <p>The SEA describes “Target Districts” which are based on one or more comprehensive or targeted support and improvement schools in the district, or if the district is performing at the level that would have caused a school to be identified as comprehensive or target support and improvement schools (p. 68).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	Schools not identified for comprehensive improvement or targeted improvement that perform at a Level 1 on any accountability measure for any one subgroup will be required to conduct a needs assessment. Based on the needs assessment, the district will be required to include supports offered to the school in the district’s consolidated plan.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA does not describe the Schools in Good Standing category.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No 4
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>To fully meet this requirement, the SEA must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a description for Schools in Good Standing (an additional statewide category of schools).</li> </ul>

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA describes a scaled approach to address student participation in statewide assessments that includes self-assessments, improvements plans, audits at the school, district, and state level, providing support through Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES).</p> <p>The SEA also discusses its efforts to increase participation by receiving ongoing feedback and input from stakeholders. In addition, the SEA has engaged the advice from technical advisors to help ensure test quality (p. 69-70).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	Schools consistently falling below the 95% participation rate are required to

	<p>write a plan to address “institutional exclusion while recognizing the rights of parents and students” lack of testing participation; this plan is approved by the SEA. Failure to make improvements in participation rate will be required to conduct a participation rate audit.</p> <p>The SEA takes a proactive approach to improve test participation by engaging, responding, and implementing stakeholder feedback (e.g. the SEA reduced the number of assessment items). Test have fewer items based on feedback from stakeholders, this change will hopefully increase participation rates.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<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 SEA describes the clear exit criteria for comprehensive support and improvement schools. The exit criteria states “a CSI school must for two consecutive years be above the levels that would cause it to be identified for CSI status” and that “alternatively, if a school is not on the new list of schools that are created every third year, as a consequence of the school having improved performance on the measures used to identify schools, the school will be removed from identification” (p. 70).</p> <p>The SEA’s exit criteria are aligned the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No

<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 SEA’s clear, concise exit criteria for schools receiving additional targeted support specifies each school must be “above the levels” that caused a school to be identified due to low performing subgroups for two consecutive years. The criteria for initial identification are aligned with the SEA’s long-term goals and measurement of interim progress and reflects the improvement necessary to close statewide proficiency and the graduation gaps (p. 71).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<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 SEA provides a thorough description of its “tiered approach toward

	<p>accountability” that results in more rigorous interventions for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the State’s exit criteria. Actions include re-identifying the school for an additional three years and further interventions under the New York Receivership Program.</p> <p>The SEA has a unique approach to schools that had been identified as a Priority or Focus school in the 2017-2018 school year as the State transitions to its new accountability system under the Every Student Succeeds Act. If a school had been identified as a Priority or Focus School in the 2017-2018 school year, and the school is identified as among the lowest 5% of public schools for a subgroup, based on 2017-2018 school year data, the school will be identified as consistently underperforming (p. 68).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Through receivership, the SEA establishes a high level of accountability to improve outcomes for schools.</p> <p>The SEA provides an extensive state-led intervention program that establishes shared responsibility between the district and SEA based on a thorough needs assessment process.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<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 SEA describes the Resource Audit procedures will be utilized periodically to determine the resource allocations and their effectiveness towards school improvement. The SEA identifies that professional development can be a significant factor in the school improvement process so it will be analyzed for effectiveness during this process (p. 96).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must</i>	

<i>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 SEA offers training to support all schools in improvement status aligned to the key functions established by the state improvement process. The SEA describes the technical assistance it provides to schools identified as having the greatest need which includes schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement. The technical assistance is inclusive of various areas and offers support, training, data, allocation, monitoring of funding and provides oversight to help improve student outcomes (p. 96-97).
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA demonstrates its commitment to provide assistance and intensive support to districts to ensure student success.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	One peer reviewer expressed the SEA’s plan could be improved by clearly identifying and providing State-approved evidence interventions.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<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>	The SEA states it is currently piloting a district-level Technical Assistance Review process and commits to expanding this support and implementing a district-level review to assist districts with multiple-identified schools (p. 101).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No

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

**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>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA’s use of data is key to improvement practices; the SEA includes these data in the State’s annual equity report, which allows for trend analysis and documentations of improvements. The SEA charts and describes the percentage of low-income and minority students being taught by disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field and inexperienced teachers. The SEA defines ineffective teachers based on the rating the teacher receives on the composite rating; out-of-field teachers based on the (lack of) certification for the courses they are teaching; and inexperienced teachers based on those with three or fewer years of teaching experience (pp. 101-106).
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA provides clear definitions of the terms for ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers and data that explain the current status for each sub-group and access to highly effective teachers.</p> <p>The SEA provides considerable data on effects of an ineffective teacher (e.g. minority children are thirteen times more likely to be in classes with ineffective teachers) to demonstrate the urgency with which it is addressing persistent subgroup achievement gaps.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No

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

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

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

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA describes the support available to all schools to improve student learning, reduce incidences of bullying and harassment, reduce the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom and the use of aversive behaviors that may compromise health and safety. The SEA states the priorities as defined by the Board of Regents that include fostering a climate of culture and climate that makes school and school functions safe places. The New York Dignity for All Students provides students with a safe and supportive environment that is supportive against any discrimination or cultural basis including bullying and harassment.</p> <p>The SEA’s description indicates active stakeholder participation.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA has implemented several practices and supports for districts to improve the school conditions at Title I schools. These include Equity, Dignity, Social-Emotional Wellness, Reducing Exclusionary Discipline, eliminate aversive behavioral and implementing a statewide school climate survey. Consideration for including the climate survey in ESSA accountability in the future is a step to evaluating the effectiveness of implemented supports. The use of school climate surveys allows stakeholders to provide input to support the schools’ and Districts’ efforts to reduce negative practices in schools.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

**A.7: School Transitions (ESEA 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>	<p>The SEA describes how it assists all students in all grades through the development of resources, coordination of aligned initiatives, and provision of technical assistance and support to districts. The SEA outlines specific transition programs from Early Childhood Education to Elementary School; Elementary School to Middle School; Middle School to High School; and High School to Post Secondary opportunities. In addition, the SEA outlines various programs and opportunities within each grade span to meet the unique needs of students and decrease the risk of students dropping out (p. 113-121).</p> <p>One peer reviewer expressed the SEA’s plan could be improved if the SEA described the resources (e.g. technical assistance, professional development) it will apply to ensure that schools identified by its statewide accountability system has access to these transition programs (p. 117-126).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA has implemented a plan to improve its access to early learning for all students, this practice is supported by the Governor and Legislature. Districts have leveraged Federal Title I and Title III funds to have home visits with pre-K families to teach parents tools to help their children be ready for school. Additional training and support is provided for students and families when students are preparing to transition from elementary to middle school and middle school to high school. These coordination meetings include outcome expectation training, graduation requirements, and optional courses available in HS (i.e. AP, IB, etc.) The State has several partnerships assisting students and families in preparing for HS and beyond.</p> <p>Partnerships with other programs and institutions support the initiatives promoted by the NYSED. These partnerships help address the at-risk student, reduce the dropout rate and provide incentives and opportunities to keep students in school. These include: The Liberty Partnerships Program; The Science and Technology Entry Program; the Smart Scholars College High School Program; and NYS Pathways in Technology (P-TECH).</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

## 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 SEA describes the establishment and implementation of statewide entrance and exit procedures for English Learners was based on Commissioner Regulations effective in 2014. Stakeholder input was gathered beginning in 2012 to develop the procedures now in place.</p> <p>The SEA requires a new student to be assessed within ten days of enrollment to ensure services are available immediately. The SEA describes its exit procedures and how the teachers and other qualified personnel trained in cultural competency, language development, and the needs of English Language Learners will conduct the student interview, review student performance, and student work samples (p. 167).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA presents strong entrance and exit procedures that could be a model for other SEAs (e.g. assessing within ten days allow students to have access to educational opportunities as needed).
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

### 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>	The SEA describes its plan to assist schools and districts meet challenging

	State academic standards and its long-term goal for English proficiency by providing resources, support, and technical assistance through the eight Regional Bilingual Education Resource Network (RBERN) support centers. Each center has responsibilities for professional development and providing resources to support schools and districts to meet their goals: English proficiency, academic content, improvement in student performance, reduction of dropout rates, and increase in graduation rates. The resource centers also provide opportunities for parents and provide support at the school level for individual teachers and programs (pp. 45-46, 168-169, 174-176).
<i>Strengths</i>	There are groups of technical assistance centers (BOCES) to support and provide resources to bilingual educators. Each center provides 200-400 professional development opportunities each year to support teachers of English Language students. These groups provide systematic ongoing technical assistance to districts.  The SEA describes its efforts to promote inclusivity and advocacy amongst parents (e.g. developing a “bill of rights” which is available in multiple languages).
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

- Does the SEA describe how it will monitor the progress of each eligible entity receiving a Title III, Part A sub grant 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>	The SEA requires LEAs to identify and review evidence regarding the quality of their ELL/MLL programs. If the District strategies are ineffective or not in compliance, the SEA will “conduct in-person monitoring, as well as provide technical assistance, including data analysis and professional development for educators and administrators” should the LEAs’ “strategies and practices” are found to be “ineffective or out of compliance” (p. 170).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4 <input type="checkbox"/> No
<i>If no, describe the specific information</i>	

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