CONSOLIDATED STATE PLAN: ON-SITE PEER REVIEWER TRAINING
OCTOBER 30, 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.
- Peer reviewers should only discuss State plans in specified panel rooms with all peer reviewers and a U.S. Department of Education staff member present.
- Peer reviewers should not disclose the names of any other peers. ED will release the names of all peers after the conclusion of the review process in winter 2018.
OBJECTIVES

- Provide the process and schedule for on-site review
- Review expectations for final panel notes
- Discuss best practices for effective panel discussions
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 experiences
  - 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
  - Provide 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

- ED has assembled panels of four peer reviewers
- Each panel is reviewing three 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 are together to discuss your assigned plans to strengthen their understanding and to evaluate each plan
REVIEWING ESEA PLANS

PEER REVIEWER NOTES

States submit plan

Peers independently review and prepare notes

ED compiles individual peer reviewer notes into one document

On-site panel discussion

Assigned peer reviewer prepares final panel notes
This on-site review will result in a single set of final panel notes for each State.

The panel notes should reflect the evaluation of each and every peer reviewer.

- Peer reviewers do not need to reach consensus on all elements of the State plan; the notes may indicate a disagreement among the peer reviewers.
The peer review notes serve three important purposes:

- Provide recommendations to the Secretary to determine what, if any, additional information to request from the SEA in order to meet statutory requirements
- Provide technical and objective feedback to the SEA on how to improve its plan
- Constitute the official record of the peer review panel regarding how an SEA’s State plan addresses the statutory and regulatory requirements
PEER REVIEW OVERVIEW

SCHEDULE

- **Day 1:**
  - 8:30-9:45m: Peer reviewer training session
  - 10:00am-finish: State Plan #1 Discussion and Peer Panel Notes

- **Days 2-4:**
  - 8:30-finish: State Plan #2 and #3 Discussion and Peer Panel Notes

- **Mid-day 4- Day 5:**
  - 8:30-finish: Finish State Plan discussions and finalize Peer Panel Notes for all plans

- **Breaks/lunch time will be determined by each individual panel**
PEER REVIEW OVERVIEW

PANEL DISCUSSIONS

- All peer reviewers and at least one ED staff member must be present for deliberations.
- Discussions may vary in length between State plans and requirements.
  - Panel must discuss each requirement to ensure complete final panel notes.
- All peer reviewers are expected to work on Thursday and Friday to finalize discussion and notes.
ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

PEER REVIEWERS

- Be prepared with full individual analysis of each State plan
- Participate actively in panel discussions
- Be available throughout entire review process, including evenings
- Maintain confidentiality and discretion
- Respect other peers and engage in panel discussions professionally
- Review and sign final set of peer panel notes
ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

LEAD PEER REVIEWER

- Identified by Panel Monitor at the start of panel discussion
- Take notes using laptop and large monitor during panel conversation
- Upload notes to OMB Max at the end of each day
- Responsible for finalizing panel notes for that State, including:
  - Ensuring notes capture full panel discussion
  - Editing for clarity and consistency
  - Raising any questions to the panel for discussion
  - Making any revisions based on ED feedback
ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

PANEL MONITORS

- Facilitate panel discussions, including asking pointed questions to ensure panel addresses all aspects of each requirement and fully evaluates the State's proposal
- Manage time during panel discussions
- Will not participate in substantive discussion on individual State plans
- Review final set of peer panel notes for each assigned State
ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

ED NOTE TAKER

- ED note taker in each panel room assists Lead Peer Reviewer:
  - Capture key points from panel discussions, including peer vote on each requirement
  - Identify areas of disagreement and agreement among peers
  - Serve as a reference for Lead Peer Reviewer
  - Notes will be added to OMB Max
ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

OTHER ED STAFF

- **Peer Review Support Team:** ED staff members who will provide support and guidance for all panels during the onsite review and approve final panel notes

- **LuxSource:** Logistics contractor that supports travel, hotel, A/V, check out process, etc.
ONSITE PEER REVIEWER NOTES PROCESS

1. Lead peer finalizes notes, uploads in Max.gov & alerts ED Panel Monitor (PM) by email, cc: ESSA.PeerReview@ed.gov

2. ED PM reviews & adds comment bubbles, uploads in Max.gov & emails peers, cc: ESSA box

3. Peers make updates and re-uploads in Max.gov, notify ED PM, cc: ESSA box

4. When PM approves, email ESSA box to say comments are ready for review, specify version

5. ED review team reads notes & adds comments, uploads in Max.gov & emails SL

6. Peers make updates and re-upload in Max.gov, notifying PM, cc: ESSA box

7. When notes approved, ED team will email SL, panel monitor, and LuxSource

8. LuxSource prints final notes

9. Each peer signs final notes at checkout
**Please cc: ESSA.PeerReview@ed.gov on all communication regarding peer reviewer notes.**

1. Once the notes are completed, the lead peer reviewer for the State uploads the final document in OMB Max and emails the ED panel monitors (PMs), cc: ESSA.PeerReview@ed.gov.
2. PM reviews notes and provides feedback to Lead Peer Reviewer in OMB Max, emailing all peers and copying the ESSA.PeerReview@ed.gov mailbox to indicate that comments are available.

3. Lead Peer Reviewer makes updates, with input from peer reviewer panel. When finished, the lead peer again uploads in OMB Max and emails the PM, cc: ESSA.PeerReview@ed.gov.

[Note: Steps 2 & 3 repeat until the PM approves.]
4. PM emails the ESSA.PeerReview@ed.gov mailbox and specifies the version in OMB Max that is ready for ED Peer Review Support Team review.
5. The ED Peer Review Support team reviews and uploads comments in Max.gov. When uploading a new version, ED team emails PM, PM notifies peers.

6. Lead Peer Reviewer makes updates, with input from peer reviewer panel, as needed. When finished, the lead peer again uploads in OMB Max and emails the PM, cc: ESSA.PeerReview@ed.gov.

[Note: Steps 5 & 6 repeat until the ED Peer Review Support Team approves as final.]
7. When notes are approved by ED Peer Review Support Team, that team will notify the State lead, panel monitor, and LuxSource

8. LuxSource will print the final panel notes.

9. All peer reviewers must check out with LuxSource prior to departure and sign each set of final panel notes.
QUESTIONS
PANEL NOTES

EXPECTATIONS
The final panel notes will use the same notes template as the individual peer reviewer notes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Analysis</th>
<th>Peer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</td>
<td>☐ Yes (# peer reviewer(s))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ No (# peer reviewer(s))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peer Reviewer Notes

Template

- **Peer Analysis:** Describe the peer reviewer’s justification for why an SEA did or did not meet the requirements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT meets all the criteria for establishing long-term goals, regrettably, the goals are set for growth, not academic achievement. CT identifies their long-term goals in terms of student growth over achievement rationalizing the decision with stakeholder feedback and explaining ‘students will increase their proficiency on the annual state assessment if they evidence growth.’ If this is true, then CT should also have provided goals measuring achievement to prove out this point. Just measuring growth will not provide an understanding as to whether students are achieving grade level proficiency because even if 100% of students are making growth, there could be 0% of students proficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT provides an example of how the interim targets of growth will be set, but will not actually set goals until the 2016-17 base line data is available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals for measuring improved academic achievement as measured by grade level proficiency is requirement for the state plan. The establishment of growth goals would be an innovative and welcome addition to goal setting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PEER REVIEW PROCESSES

EXEMPLAR PEER NOTES – PEER ANALYSIS (ADDITIONAL TARGETED SUPPORT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSSE proposes that “schools will exit Comprehensive Support status if they no longer meet eligibility criteria of initial identification when the lists are re-run in three-year cycles. We also recognize that there may be situations where schools are making substantial progress, even if they have not met the exit criteria within three years” (page 33). OSSE does not define what progress, nor “substantial progress” is towards meeting student and school academic achievement and improvement goals are. OSSE does not state how this criteria is or is not aligned with state long term goals or measurements of interim progress. OSSE does not provide an explanation for how the exit criteria would ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in the State.
### PEER REVIEW PROCESSES

**WHAT NOT TO DO: PEER NOTES – PEER ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer Analysis</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PEER REVIEWER NOTES

 TEMPLATE

 ▪ **Strengths**: Summarize the strengths in the SEA’s response to the State plan requirement.
**PEER REVIEW PROCESSES**

**EXEMPLAR PEER NOTES – STRENGTHS (MINIMUM N-SIZE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Peer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.4.ii.c</td>
<td>NJ makes a strong argument for their choice of an n size that takes into account their focus on equity and statistical soundness. The State’s broad range of input from constituent groups was impressive. Plan provides evidence to support the selection of the minimum number of students that the State determines is necessary to meet the requirements of any provisions under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that require disaggregation of information by each subgroup of students for accountability purposes, including annual meaningful differentiation and identification of schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PEER REVIEW PROCESSES

**WHAT NOT TO DO: PEER NOTES – STRENGTHS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Peer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan is in place to meet this goal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Weaknesses: Summarize the weaknesses of the SEA’s response to the State plan requirement, including by identifying any issues, describing a lack of clarity, and providing possible technical assistance suggestions.
### PEER REVIEW PROCESSES

**EXEMPLAR PEER NOTES – WEAKNESS (ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT INDICATOR)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>Peer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information provided is very sparse, and includes information on neither the relative weighting of ELA and math nor on how validity and reliability was determined. According to the statute, social studies and science may not be used as an academic achievement indicator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alignment/growth from PSAT 10 to SAT will not be included in 2016-2017. DDOE is revisiting its school-level aggregate growth methodology, which can’t be replicated currently by schools. It is unclear how DDOE will measure HS growth and school wide growth. DDOE does not provide calculations or benchmarks of interim progress for growth and 9th grade on track rates; or for school quality and student success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DDOE does not state if they will produce a summative index score for each LEA and for the state. DDOE presents unclear and vague information regarding the determination of growth in ELA and in mathematics as well as Growth of the Lowest Quartile and Growth of the Highest Quartile in high school. DDOE provides no definitive consequence for a school or LEA or for the state should they fail to meet the 95% statutory participation requirement Growth from the PSAT 10 to the SAT will not be included in 2017-18, which is the baseline for the ESSA accountability. It was noted that a thorough review of resources and a review of technical quality are needed. In the light of this challenge, the DDOE does not provide an alternative measure until this is taking place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
<td>Peer Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nevada should clarify how the indicator will be disaggregated by subgroup given that it requires a comparison by subgroups. E.g. - the Hispanic population, will the gap be Hispanic-black, Hispanic-white, etc.? Nevada does not provide information on how Closing Opportunity Gaps scores from separate ELA and Math analyses are combined to create one indicator that is used for 20% of the Total Index Score for ES and MS. At the HS level, additional explanation is needed regarding how points are calculated what percent of the Total Index Score is determined at the HS level through these analyses. In addition, a more complete explanation is needed on how results are used to apply conjunctive triggers against points earned when subgroups do not meet graduation targets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment: Determine if the SEA met the State plan requirement (indicated by Yes/No); and

- If the peer reviewer indicates ‘no’ above, the peer must describe the specific information or clarification that a State must provide in order to meet the requirement
### Peer Review Processes

**Exemplar Peer Notes – Overall (Measurements of Interim Progress)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Response</th>
<th>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒ Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement | Tennessee will need to apply the methodology to only those schools receiving Title I funds in order to appropriately identify the lowest-performing five percent of Title I schools. This Title I identification must occur first, but would not prohibit Tennessee from identifying additional low performing schools |

---

---
## PEER REVIEW PROCESSES

### EXEMPLAR PEER NOTES – DO NOT REACH CONSENSUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Analysis</th>
<th>Peer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong></td>
<td>DDOE provides measurements of interim progress towards long-term goals for four, five and six-year adjusted cohort graduation rates. DDOE used three year interim benchmarks to 2030.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weaknesses</strong></td>
<td>DDOE provides a misalignment between the body of the application and tables provided within the Appendix. On page 11 of their application regarding the 6-year ACGR data, there is a discrepancy between this data and that which displayed on page 125 of the Appendix. Two reviewers expressed the concern that DDOE’s measurements of interim progress are only incremented every three years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒ Yes (2 peer reviewer(s))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ No (2 peer reviewer(s))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Peer Review Processes**

**Exemplar Peer Notes – Overall (Measurements of Interim Progress)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Response</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer Analysis</strong></td>
<td>The SEA addressed the measurements of interim progress toward meeting Long-Term goals in the different content areas and grade levels for all students including subgroups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong></td>
<td>The SEA provided a thorough charting of interim progress for all students including subgroups for the different content areas and subgroups. For example, the English Learners had a baseline of 14% for 2014 – 2015, a projected increase to 19.4% for 2015 – 2016, 24.8% for 2016 – 2017, 30.1% 2017 – 2018 and annual increments up to 2024 – 2025. The timeline met required guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weaknesses</strong></td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</strong></td>
<td>☒ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PEER REVIEW PROCESSES

EXPECTATIONS FOR COMMENTS

- **Evaluate** the content of the State application against the statutory requirements

- **Analyze** the technical and educational soundness of the State’s approach

- **Explain** how the State did or did not meet the requirements

- **Provide** evidence from the State to support your conclusions

- **Describe** what information was needed in order for the State to meet the requirements, if applicable
PEER REVIEW PROCESSES

TIPS FOR WRITING GOOD COMMENTS

- Be professional, clear, and constructive
- Include page numbers for easy reference during panel discussions
- In your notes, check for complete, coherent sentences with proper grammar and spelling
- Use simple, declarative sentences (not questions) whenever possible
- During panel discussions, peers will work to create a single set of notes that may reflect differing comments among peers
DO NOT simply summarize the SEA’s response

DO NOT focus on personal thoughts about what a better plan might have been

DO NOT do independent research or use as evidence information that is not in the plan

DO NOT write in the first person – “I feel,” “I think,” etc.

DO NOT wait until the last minute to review the plan
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

Notes should meet the following requirements:

- 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 peers 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 other ED staff must be present during discussions
 Do not discuss State plans in public spaces or disclose the plans that you are reviewing
ED NEXT STEPS POST-PEER REVIEW

ED STAFF

- Based on peer recommendations and internal review, ED will send a single feedback letter to the State.

- This letter will cover all relevant sections of the consolidated state plan, including those that were not subject to the peer review.

- This letter will include the full peer notes as an attachment.

- Note that the Secretary’s final determination may differ from, but will be informed by, peer recommendations.
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:
RESOURCES

- Dear Colleague Letter – April 10, 2017

- Other ESSA resources