



**CONSOLIDATED STATE PLAN:
ON-SITE PEER REVIEWER
TRAINING
MAY 22, 2017**

INTRODUCTIONS

- U.S. Department of Education staff
- Peer reviewers



REMINDER: CONFIDENTIALITY

- Peer reviewers should not disclose the State plans that they are reviewing in public spaces during and after this review
- Peer reviewers should only discuss State plans in specified panel rooms with all peer reviewers and a Department staff member present
- Peer reviewers should not disclose the names of any peers. The Department will release the names of all peers after the conclusion of the peer review process in fall 2017



OBJECTIVES

- Provide logistical information about the on-site review
- Review significant State plan requirements
- Discuss best practices for effective panel discussions

AGENDA

- Reminder of peer review overview and expectations
- Review particular State plan requirements
- Tips for panel discussions and final notes
- Questions
- Resources

PEER REVIEW OVERVIEW

PURPOSE

- The purpose of peer review is to:
 - Maximize collaboration with each State
 - Promote effective implementation of the challenging State academic standards through State and local innovation
 - Provide transparent, timely, and objective feedback to States designed to strengthen the technical and overall quality of the State plans

PEER REVIEW OVERVIEW

PURPOSE

- Peer reviewers apply their professional judgment and experience
- Peer reviewers 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 plan

PEER REVIEW OVERVIEW

PROCESS

- The Department has assembled panels of four peer reviewers
- Each panel is reviewing one or two State plans
- Peer reviewers have already independently reviewed and evaluated each plan and prepared individual notes during the off-site review period
- This week, peer reviewers work together to discuss assigned plans to strengthen their understanding and evaluate each plan

PEER REVIEW OVERVIEW

PEER REVIEW NOTES

- This on-site review will result in a single set of final panel notes that will be shared with the State and posted on the Department's website
- The panel notes should reflect the evaluation of each and every panel member
- Peers do not need to reach consensus on all elements of the State plan; the notes may indicate a disagreement among the peers

PEER REVIEW OVERVIEW

PEER REVIEW NOTES

- The peer review panel notes serve three important purposes:
 - Provide recommendations to the Secretary to determine what, if any, additional information to request from the SEA
 - Constitute the official record of the peer review panel regarding how an SEA's State plan addresses the statutory and regulatory requirements
 - Provide technical assistance to the SEA on how to improve its plan



PEER REVIEW OVERVIEW

AGENDA

- Day 1:
 - 8:30-9:45am: Welcome and Orientation
 - 10:00am: State Plan #1 Discussion and Peer Panel Notes
- Day 2:
 - 8:30: State Plan #2 Discussion and Peer Panel Notes
- Day 3:
 - 8:30: Finish State Plan discussions and finalize Peer Panel Notes for both plans in the panel rooms



PEER REVIEW OVERVIEW

PANEL DISCUSSIONS

- All peer reviewers and Department staff must be present for deliberations
- Discussions may vary in length between plans and requirements
- Discussions should result in complete peer panel notes for each plan, including:
 - Peer Analysis
 - Strengths
 - Weaknesses
 - Assessment. If applicable, specific information or clarification that peers believe an SEA must provide to fully meet the requirement



ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

PANEL MONITORS

- Facilitate panel discussions
- Manage time during panel discussions
- Will not participate in substantive discussion on individual State plans
- Verify that there is a consolidated, final set of peer panel notes for each assigned State



ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

NOTETAKERS

- Capture key points from panel discussions
- Update consolidated peer panel notes during panel discussion
- Will NOT edit the notes for content or consistency

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

EXPECTATIONS FOR PEER REVIEWERS

- Be prepared with full individual analysis of each State plan
- Maintain confidentiality and discretion
- Respect other peers and engage in panel discussions professionally

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

EXPECTATIONS FOR PEER REVIEWERS

- Each peer reviewer will be responsible for editing and finalizing the panel notes for one application
 - Two peer reviewers may be asked to work together to finalize the notes
- Responsibilities will include:
 - Ensuring notes accurately capture panel discussion
 - Edit for clarity, consistency, and grammar
- Review and sign final set of peer panel notes



PEER REVIEW OVERVIEW

PROCESS

- Once the notes are completed, peer reviewers upload the final document in OMB Max and notify Panel Monitors
- Panel Monitors will notify peer reviewers:
 - If there are any necessary revisions or if the notes are incomplete or
 - The notes are complete
- Once the notes are complete, peer reviewers must **sign the final panel notes** prior to departure on Wednesday by visiting the LuxSource office



NEXT STEPS AFTER PEER REVIEW

DEPARTMENT RESPONSIBILITIES

- Based on peer reviewer recommendations and internal review, the Department will send a single letter to each State
- This letter will:
 - Cover all relevant sections of the consolidated state plan, including those that were not subject to peer review
 - Include the full peer notes as an attachment
- Note that the Secretary's final determination will be informed by, but may differ from, peer reviewer recommendations





SELECT STATE PLAN REQUIREMENTS

STATE PLAN TEMPLATE

REVIEWING REQUIREMENTS

- In the State plan, each SEA may, but is not required to, include supplemental information such as its overall vision for improving outcomes for all students and its efforts to consult with and engage stakeholders when developing its consolidated State plan
- Peer reviewers should only review information that is responsive to the Revised Consolidated State Plan template, released on March 13, 2017

STATE PLAN TEMPLATE

CROSSWALK

- When evaluating a State plan that uses a State plan template closely aligned to the Department's November 29, 2016 template, peer reviewers can reference:
 - Department's crosswalk document
 - Webinar presentation: Revised State Plan template
 - This presentation walks through each revised requirement and identifies the similar question in the prior template
- Both documents are available at:
<https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplan17/plans.html>



SELECT STATE PLAN REQUIREMENTS

A.3.I: DEFINITION OF NATIVE LANGUAGES

- Requirement: Provide definition for “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population” and identify the specific languages that meet the definition
- Peer Review Criteria:
 - 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’s definition include at least the most populous language other than English spoken by the State’s participating student population?



SELECT STATE PLAN REQUIREMENTS

SUBGROUPS

- Requirement: List each major racial and ethnic group the State includes as a subgroup of students, consistent with ESEA section 1111(c)(2)(B)
- Requirement: If applicable, describe any additional subgroups of students other than the statutorily required subgroups (i.e., economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, children with disabilities, and English learners) used in the Statewide accountability system



SELECT STATE PLAN REQUIREMENTS

SUBGROUPS

- Former children with disabilities: The ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, **does not permit** States to include former children with disabilities in the children with disabilities subgroup for accountability purposes
- If a State notes that it will include former children with disabilities in the children with disabilities subgroup, peer reviewers should indicate that the State does not meet the requirement in A.4.i:
Subgroups



SELECT STATE PLAN REQUIREMENTS

A.4.iii ESTABLISHMENT OF LONG-TERM GOALS

- In cases where a State provides simulated data for long-term goals, peers should:
 - Consider whether the State has a legitimate reason for not having actual baseline data
 - Focus on the State's methodology for establishing long-term goals and if that methodology is likely to result in long-term goals that meet all statutory requirements

SELECT STATE PLAN REQUIREMENTS

A.4.iv.a ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT INDICATOR

- Requirement: Describe the Academic Achievement indicator, including a description of how the indicator **(i) is based on the long-term goals; (ii) is measured by proficiency on the annual Statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments; (iii) annually measures academic achievement for all students and separately for each subgroup of students; and (iv) at the State's discretion, for each public high school in the State, includes a measure of student growth, as measured by the annual Statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments**



SELECT STATE PLAN REQUIREMENTS

INDICATOR FOR PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS THAT ARE NOT HIGH SCHOOLS

- Requirement: Describe the Other Academic indicator, including how it annually measures the performance for all students and separately for each subgroup of students. If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, the description must include a demonstration that the indicator is a valid and reliable statewide academic indicator that allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance
- *Note: This is only for schools that are NOT high schools*



SELECT STATE PLAN REQUIREMENTS

A.4.vi: IDENTIFICATION OF SCHOOLS

**Lowest-performing
5 percent of Title I
schools**
(comprehensive)

**Low graduation rate
high schools**
(comprehensive)

**Additional targeted
support Title I
schools not exiting
status** (comprehensive)

**Schools with
consistently
underperforming
subgroups** (targeted)

**Additional targeted
support and
improvement
schools** (targeted)

**Additional
statewide categories
of schools**
(*optional)

TIMELINE FOR SCHOOL IDENTIFICATION

DEAR COLLEAGUE LETTER APRIL 10, 2017

- A State must identify, **by the start of the 2018–2019 school year:**
 - (1) schools for comprehensive support and improvement and
 - (2) schools in which any subgroup of students, on its own, would place the school among the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds and that must implement targeted support and improvement plans
- Identification of these schools must be based on the State’s new system, as set forth in its plan



IDENTIFICATION OF SCHOOLS (1111(c)(4)(D))

COMPREHENSIVE SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT SCHOOLS

Previous Template:
4.2.A and B

- Requirement A.4.vi.a-c: Describe the State's methodology, including the year in which the State will first identify such schools, for identifying:
 - Not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State
 - All public high schools in the State that are failing to graduate one third or more of their students
 - Public schools receiving Title I, Part A funds that have received additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C) and that have not satisfied the statewide exit criteria within a State-determined number of years



IDENTIFICATION OF SCHOOLS (1111(c)(4)(D))

FREQUENCY OF IDENTIFICATION

Previous Template:
4.2.A and B

- Requirement A.4.vi.d: Provide, for each type of school identified for comprehensive support and improvement, the frequency with which the State will, thereafter, identify such schools
- Note that these schools must be identified **at least once every three years**



IDENTIFICATION OF SCHOOLS (1111(c)(4)(D))

TARGETED SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT

Previous Template:
4.2.A and B

- Requirement A.4.vi.e: Describe the State's methodology for **annually** identifying any school with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students, based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation, including the State's definition for determining consistent underperformance (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C)(iii))



IDENTIFICATION OF SCHOOLS (1111(c)(4)(D))

ADDITIONAL TARGETED SUPPORT

Previous Template:
4.2.A and B

- Requirement A.4.vi.f: Describe the State's methodology for identifying schools in which 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), including the year in which the State will first identify such schools and the frequency with which the State will, thereafter, identify such schools (ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D))
- Description should include whether the State identifies these schools from among all public schools or from among only schools identified as having one or more consistently underperforming subgroups (either is permissible)



IDENTIFICATION OF SCHOOLS (1111(c)(4)(D))

ADDITIONAL STATEWIDE CATEGORIES OF SCHOOLS

Previous Template:
4.2.A and B

- Requirement A.4.vi.g: If the State chooses, at its discretion, to include additional statewide categories of schools, describe those categories



SELECT STATE PLAN REQUIREMENTS

A.5 DISPROPORTIONATE RATES OF ACCESS TO EDUCATORS

- Requirement: Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators (*ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B)*): Describe how low-income and minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, and the measures the SEA will use to evaluate and publicly report the progress of the SEA with respect to such description



SELECT STATE PLAN REQUIREMENTS

A.5 DISPROPORTIONATE RATES OF ACCESS TO EDUCATORS

- Related Requirement in Title II, Part A: Use of Funds to Improve Equitable Access to Teachers in Title I, Part A Schools (ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(E)): If an SEA plans to use Title II, Part A funds to improve equitable access to effective teachers, consistent with ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B), describe how such funds will be used for this purpose



TIPS FOR PANEL DISCUSSION

TIPS FOR EFFECTIVE PANEL DISCUSSIONS

- Arrive on time
- Offer up questions/issues for discussion
- Consider the perspectives of other peer reviewers in reaching your individual conclusion
- Put aside personal opinions about a State or a policy



TIPS FOR PANEL NOTES

- Final panel notes should:
 - Reflect objective peer feedback to the State about the educational and technical quality of the plan overall and for each element
 - Include the extent to which the SEA has addressed the requirement fully and with high quality
 - Be independent (against the requirements), not a comparison to other State plans
 - Be based only on the content of the plan and materials provided by the State
 - Address strengths, weaknesses, and information the peer reviewers believe necessary for a State to meet statutory and regulatory requirements



TIPS FOR PANEL NOTES

- Be professional, clear, and constructive
- Check for complete, coherent sentences with proper grammar and spelling
- Use simple, declarative sentences (not questions) whenever possible
- Explain why the panel reached its conclusions.
- Point to specific information in the plan that supports and verifies comments
- As appropriate, the consolidated set of peer panel notes may reflect differing comments among peers



REMINDERS

- All peer reviewers must be present for discussions regarding plans
- All peer reviewers must be available and on-site for the duration of the peer review, including in the evenings
- A panel monitor or Department staff member must be present during discussions
- Do not discuss State plans in public spaces or disclose the plans that you are reviewing





QUESTIONS

RESOURCES

- Peer review criteria

<https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplan17/essastateplanpeerreviewcriteria.pdf>

- Revised Consolidated State Plan Template

<https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplan17/revisedessastateplanguidance.docx>

- Copy of ESEA, as amended by ESSA:

<http://www2.ed.gov/documents/essa-act-of-1965.pdf>



RESOURCES

- Title III non-regulatory guidance
<https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/essatitleiiiiguidenglishlearners92016.pdf>
- Dear Colleague Letter – April 10, 2017
<https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/dcltr410207.pdf>
- Other ESSA resources
<https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/index.html>

