

STATE PLAN
PEER REVIEW CRITERIA
Peer Review Panel Notes Template

STATE: Pennsylvania



U.S. Department of Education

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

A.1: Challenging State Academic Standards and Assessments

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

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

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

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

- If applicable,¹ does the SEA describe, regarding the 8th grade math exception, its strategies to provide all students in the State the opportunity to be prepared for and take advanced mathematics coursework in middle school (e.g., appropriate data and evidence that the strategies are likely to provide all students in the State that opportunity)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	SEA will not provide an 8 th grade math exception. SEA states the additional costs needed to implement this exemption are a major factor and the SEA states a concern about additional testing pressure on middle school students. P. 34 NA – as state is not selecting this option
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A (4 peer reviewers)
<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))

¹ In order for an SEA to exempt an 8th grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in 8th grade under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(aa), it must ensure that: a. the student instead takes the end-of-course mathematics assessment

A.3.i: Definition

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>SEA defines languages other than English as languages spoken by more than one-half of one percent of students. Only Spanish is spoken by more than one-half of one percent of students. The SEA provides data for other language groups including Arabic (approximately 3,200), Chinese/Mandarin (approximately 2,500), Nepali (approximately 1,800), and Vietnamese (approximately 1,200). P. 34-35</p> <p>No mention is made of concentrations of languages represented to a significant extent in various LEAs or by grade level. Tests are given in an English-Spanish side-by-side format.</p> <p>One Peer Reviewer noted that SEA addressed the needs of migratory students indicating “most migratory children are also English learners.” P. 34-35 ,111, 117</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA does not 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.</p> <p>SEA did not discuss specific language concentrations by LEA or by grade levels. (P. 34-35).</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The following information is needed to meet this criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SEA needs to 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. • The SEA needs to include data that demonstrates languages of a

	significant extent spoken by a significant portion of participating student population in one or more LEAs as well as languages spoken by a significant portion of the participating student population across grade levels.
--	--

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	SEA identifies existing assessments in Spanish. These include: math grades 3-8, Algebra I end of course. Science grades 4 and 8, and Biology end of course. P. 35
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.3.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>	While the SEA included some of the required assessments in available languages, the SEA did not list Language Arts or Social Science in Spanish as not available and needed in the respective language(s) present to a significant extent in the participating student population. The SEA did not provide data on concentration of languages at the LEA level. P. 35 Three Reviewers believed this was N/A and one Reviewer said No because the SEA did not include data demonstrating the concentration of any languages represented to a significant extent in any LEAs as stated in A.3.i.,
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA did not mention its access for Language Arts or Social Science assessments in a language other than English. The SEA did not include these assessments in its not available list nor did the SEA include a timeline for development of these assessments. Pg. 35

	Since the SEA did not provide the total population of languages represented to a significant extent in LEAs or by grade level, it is unclear if the languages included are ones that would warrant developing an assessment for the State.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The following information is needed to meet this criteria:</p> <p>The SEA needs to indicate the languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population based on LEA demographics and grade levels for which yearly student academic assessments are not available and are needed.</p> <p>The SEA needs to provide a detailed description on how the SEA will develop the Language Arts and Social Science assessments in Spanish as this language meets the states definition of languages present to a significant extent.</p>

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 explains there is no language other than English that is present to a significant extent for which assessments are not currently available. The SEA states it “monitors home language data on an annual basis, and will develop plans for providing assessments and assessment materials in additional languages, as appropriate” (P. 35). SEA meets the criteria of providing assessments in Spanish as it is the only language identified as being present to a significant extent in the participating student population based on the SEA’s definition. P. 35</p> <p>Three Reviewers thought this was met because the State has developed assessments and has listed Spanish as the only qualifying language across the</p>

	<p>State and one Reviewer said it was not met because of a lack of information of LEA demographics.</p> <p>The SEA explains there is no language other than English that is present to a significant extent for which assessments are not currently available. The SEA states it “monitors home language data on an annual basis, and will develop plans for providing assessments and assessment materials in additional languages, as appropriate” (P. 35). SEA meets the criteria of providing assessments in Spanish as it is the only language identified as being present to a significant extent in the participating student population based on the SEA’s definition. P. 35</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	One reviewer stated that ELA and Social Science assessments were not available in Spanish which meets the SEA’s definition of language present to a significant extent. pg. 35
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA needs to provide a detailed description on how the SEA will develop the Language Arts and Social Science assessments in Spanish as this language meets the State’s definition of languages present to a significant extent.

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>	SEA lists the major racial and ethnic groups as well as the subgroups in its accountability system. Race/ethnicity groups include: African-American/Black; American Indian or Alaskan Native; Asian (not Hispanic); Hawaiian Native or Pacific Islander; Hispanic; Multi-Racial (not Hispanic); White. Subgroups include: All students, Economically Disadvantaged Students, English Learners and Students with Disabilities. These subgroups are identified in the Office of Civil Rights data collection definitions.. P. 42
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	This section could be improved by including the specific definitions for each subgroup - for example, the definitions of Asian (not Hispanic) and Multi-Racial (not Hispanic). P.42
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewer)
<i>If no, describe the specific information</i>	

<i>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 does not include any additional subgroups of students other than the statutorily required subgroups. P. 42
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.i.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 has proposed a fourth option that includes exempting recently arrived English learners from language arts and mathematics the first year of enrollment. P. 44
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA proposal includes exempting recently arrived English learners from language arts (as allowed in year 1) but also includes exempting recently arrived English learners from mathematics in year 1 which is not allowed in ESSA.

	The SEA did not choose one of the options allowed in ESSA.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The following information is needed to meet this criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SEA needs to choose one of the three allowable options for recently arrived ELs participation in the State’s ELA assessment. • The SEA needs to remove math from this indicator as ESSA does not allow recently arrived ELs to participate in the State’s ELP assessment in place of the State’s math assessment <p>Please see Recently Arrived English Learner exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i) or the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii) for a recently arrived English learner.</p>

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA will use a minimum number of 20 students for accountability and reporting purposes. P. 44</p> <p>The SEA states it is considering aggregating data across “buildings at the district or LEA level to reach the minimum N for reporting purposes only” when there is an insufficient number of English Learners to meet the minimum N size (P. 44).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA includes the minimum N-size of 20, which is lower than the State’s prior N-size. The SEA states its “minimum N is informed by a series of discussions with the State’s Technical Advisory Committee, engagement with education and other stakeholders, and review of data describing the number and percentage of public schools and public school students statewide that would be included or excluded in accountability determinations” (P. 44).</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA states “To ensure statistically reliable accountability data for the small number of schools that fall below the minimum N in the all student group, Pennsylvania will aggregate data across as many years as necessary to reach the minimum N for at least two accountability indicators.”</p> <p>The SEA does not list how many years of data it will use for these districts; it may be helpful to establish a number of years of data that will be used to assist districts with understanding their accountability calculations. The SEA states it will use “as many years as necessary” in order to obtain minimum n-size.</p>

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

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

➤ Is the selected minimum number of students statistically sound?²

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The n-size of 20 is lower than a previously stated n-size of 40. This change will result in more schools being included in the accountability reports. . P. 44</p> <p>One Reviewer stated that SEA’s minimum number of students is statistically sound. SEA justifies the use of the n-size based on the fact the n-size provides: transparency in achievement and accountability data at the subgroup level, protections for student privacy, and the need for reasonable stability in measurement in high-stakes decision making P. 44.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The State needs to determine the minimum number of students necessary in each year to determine if the n-size is statistically sound considering the SEA states that the data aggregation will include “as many years as necessary”</p> <p>Three Reviewers expressed concerns with the n-size because the State did not describe the minimum number of students with data aggregation across a specific timeframe. “Pennsylvania will aggregate data across as many years as necessary to reach the minimum N for at least two accountability indicators” P. 44.As the SEA states it “will aggregate data across as many years as necessary to reach the minimum N”, peer reviewers expressed concern that the minimum number of students may not be statistically sound, considering the number of years of data the minimum number of students may reflect. The SEA needs to provide additional information to demonstrate the minimum number of students used for the</p>

² Consistent with ESEA section 1111(i), information collected or disseminated under ESEA section 1111 shall be collected and disseminated in a manner that protects the privacy of individuals consistent with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g, commonly known as the “Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974”). When selecting a minimum n-size for reporting, States should consult the Institute of Education Sciences report “[Best Practices for Determining Subgroup Size in Accountability Systems While Protecting Personally Identifiable Student Information](#)” to identify appropriate statistical disclosure limitation strategies for protecting student privacy.

	minimum-N is statistically sound (e.g. explain if it adopted a population or sampling approach when determining its minimum number of students). (P. 44).
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (1 peer reviewer) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (3 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The following information is needed to meet this criteria:</p> <p>The SEA needs to provide additional information to demonstrate that the minimum number of students used for the minimum-N is statistically sound (e.g. explain if it adopted a population or sampling approach when determining its minimum number of students).</p> <p>The SEA needs to describe its minimum n-size with regard to the number of years it aggregates data for n-size, in particular describe its approach (population vs sampling method in determining this n-size to ensure the undetermined number of years of student data will not negatively impact statistical soundness If the SEA uses the sampling method, the SEA needs to describe how the margin of error will differ between using 1 year of data and 10 years of data.</p>

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA provided data on a range of N sizes, reviewed the data and selected a minimum n-size of 20.</p> <p>The SEA states its “minimum N” is informed by a series of discussions with the State’s Technical Advisory Committee [and] engagement with education and other stakeholders” There is a brief description of stakeholder engagement but it does not describe the nature of collaboration.</p> <p>State does describe how it arrived at n-size of 20. P. 44-45</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA’s description does not explicitly include how the State collaborated with teachers, principals, other school leaders, and parents in determining its minimum number. The SEA does not include the types of stakeholders, therefore it is unclear if stakeholders representing all subgroups were included in this review.</p> <p>Only the selected minimum n-size data is provided, there is no description on how the SEA came to this decision.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • . • The SEA needs to provide additional clarity on how the State collaborated with teachers, principals, other school leaders, parents, and other

<i>an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	stakeholders when determining such minimum number?
---	--

A.4.ii.d: Minimum N-Size and Ensuring Student Privacy (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)(iii))

- Does the SEA describe how it ensures that the minimum number of students will protect the privacy of individual students?³

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	SEA includes information regarding the State policies towards the governance of data based on FERPA and the Student Data Access and Use Policy. In addition, SEA assures individual-level data will not include student names or other personally identifiable information. P.45 While the SEA states its policy on Student Data Access and Use, the plan does not include anything about how the student privacy will be assured at the LEA level. It is unclear what steps the SEA takes to provide guidance to LEAs on their assurance of privacy.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA is using the same n-size for both accountability and reporting (P. 44).
<i>Strengths</i>	

³ See footnote 5 above for further guidance.

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

A.4.iii: 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>	The long-term goals include baseline data, apply the same timeline for all students and subgroup of students, and its long-term goals appear to be ambitious. The SEA provided the formula used to determine the long term goals: each is derived from: $(100 \text{ percent} - \text{baseline percentage})/2 + \text{baseline}$. (P. 8-12).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	While the SEA has provided data with the long-term goal, there is still a 15% or greater gap between the subgroup categories and the all students category. For some subgroups the long term goal is only a few percentage points higher than the baseline, while for other subgroups the gap is wider, therefore the goals are more ambitious for some subgroups than others P. 8-12.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.iii.a.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>	The SEA provides measurements of interim progress towards meeting the long-term goals for all students and for each subgroup of students. Charts are provided that demonstrate the expected timeline for each group P. 144 Appendix 147-. P. 8+ 144 & 147
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Three Reviewers believe that SEA’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress take into account the improvement needed for subgroups. SEA provides a chart to describe the anticipated rates of improvement taking into consideration the need for greater rates of improvement for subgroups of students who are lower achieving. P. 128, 144. Appendix A P.147 – 150
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The plan seems to allow significant gaps for a few subgroups of students. Although there is an understanding that subgroups have different starting points, the long term goals are different for each group. For example: Long term goals are highest for Asian students at 89% at proficient or advanced and only 55.9% for EL, 62.7% for students with disabilities, 68.4% for African American/Black. Appendix A P.147 – 150
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet</i>	The following information is needed to meet this criteria: The State needs to provide its rationale on how its long terms goals and MIPs take into account the improvement necessary to make significant progress to close the statewide proficiency gaps for ELs, African American/Black students, and SWDs.

this requirement

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 states it “aims to reduce, by half, the statewide percentage of non-graduating students as measured by both the four- and five-year adjusted cohort graduation rates (ACGR) by the end of the 2029-30 school year (P. 10).</p> <p>The SEA’s description includes baseline data, applies the same timeline for all students and each subgroup of students, and its long-term goals appear to be ambitious. Subgroups with a lower baseline graduation rate have a more rigorous graduation goal than those having a higher baseline graduation rate.</p> <p>The goals appear to be ambitious and are based on meeting each established goal by 2030. P. 10, Appendix B 149</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.iii.b.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>	The SEA states it “aims to reduce, by half, the statewide percentage of non-graduating students as measured by both the four- and five-year adjusted cohort graduation rates (ACGR) by the end of the 2029-30 school year (P. 10 – 12, 39, Appendix B P. 150
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The long-term goal for the Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander subgroup does not appear to be more rigorous than the long-term goal set for the four-year Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander adjusted cohort graduation rate.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The following information is needed to meet this criteria:</p> <p>The SEA needs to provide its rationale and data to address why the long-term goal for the Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander subgroup does not appear to be more rigorous than the long-term goal set for the Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.</p>

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 annual measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for its four-year and five-year adjusted cohort graduation rates for all students and each subgroup of students. Appendix B P. 149 - 150. P. 149-150.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for the four-year and five-year adjusted cohort graduation rates 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. P. 12 Appendix B 149-150.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The State does not intend to set the same graduation rate for all students. By 2029-30 a gap of 14% between the Asian and EL student subgroup will remain. While the panel appreciates that there is a significantly larger gap to be closed for some subgroups the plan does not eliminate those gaps in the graduation rate. P. 15, 148-150 This section could be improved by including the specific definitions for each subgroup - for example, the definitions of Asian (not Hispanic) and Multi-Racial (not Hispanic) P.42
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The following information is needed to meet this criteria: The SEA needs to describe how it will address the graduation gap between the Asian and EL subgroups. One peer reviewer found that though the State has made an attempt to close the existing graduation achievement gap, if the goal was met there would remain a 14% gap between the English learner subgroup and Asian subgroup and was not satisfied that a 14% difference was a great enough rate of improvement to close the graduation gap.

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA identifies and describes 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. SEA includes baseline data as well as the timeline for English language proficiency. .p 10, 15 – 17, 40.</p> <p>The SEA uses index scores to establish its long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency. As such, the long-term goal expects schools to meet the 2029-2030 goal of “an average index score of .75, the value at the current 75th percentile.” The 75th percentile is based on recommendations from the WIDA consortium. The SEA explains that that the “first six years [have a growth rate of .1 annually] allow for capacity building at the LEA and school levels. The annual growth requirement increases to .2 per year after this point” (P. 17).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA has collaborated with its Early Learning partner to assist English Learners in enrolling in K-12 schools ready to learn. The SEA worked with its ELP assessment research office and stakeholders to set proficiency targets. The SEA considers both the initial ELP assessment and the grade in which an EL enters the program in its growth targets.</p> <p>The SEA has created an additional consideration for students missing to meet the long term goal by a couple years. “Some additional credit will be given for students who exceed their growth targets or attain proficiency prior to the student’s target year, but SEA will cap the growth is capped at 0.1. Also partial credit is given for students who attain proficiency after the student’s target year.” P.15.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Need supporting data on how many schools currently meet the baseline, long term and interim goals and to determine if the goals stated are ambitious.</p> <p>According to the plan, the average index score of .75, the value at the current 75th percentile does not appear ambitious considering the average index score at the current 25th percentile is .56. This would mean that moving .1 in the first six years and .2 per year after that. The SEA believes this is ambitious the panel does not. The panel would like to know the current distribution of LEA targets, for example: the value at the 50th percentile in order to determine whether or not this is more ambitious than it currently appears. (P. 17)</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The following information is needed to meet this criteria:</p> <p>The SEA needs to provide supporting data on how many schools currently meet the baseline, long term and interim goals and to determine if the goals stated are ambitious.</p>

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA provides non-linear measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency, as LEAs are expected to make slower growth in the first six years and greater growth afterward. The SEA provided a baseline target for 2018-19 with goal expectation in 2029-30. There is an expectation of .1% growth in first 6 years and .2% thereafter in order to reach 75% percentile. P. 16 -17
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

A.4.iv.a: Academic Achievement

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
--	----------------------

<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA describes the Academic Achievement indicator and explains this measure describes the performance of students on state assessments of content standards and the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced on the state assessment in grades 3-8 in English Language Arts and Math, the end of course exams and the state’s alternate system of assessment.</p> <p>The SEA provides data to support the Academic Achievement indicator is based on the state’s long-term goals. SEA provides evidence the indicator can be disaggregated for each subgroup. P. 38-39, 50-51, 147</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA does not include a description that the Academic Achievement indicator is implemented consistently for all schools in all LEAs across the State.</p> <p>The SEA’s description does not include the weighting of the reading/language arts achievement relative to mathematics achievement. There is no description of differentiation used at the high school level or if the data is averaged across several years. Without these details it is difficult to determine if the indicator is valid and reliable, based on the long term goals or other required disaggregation.</p> <p>The SEA provides a response but it does not address the specific question on how it factors in participation rate of 95percent of all students and 95 percent of all students in each subgroup in the accountability system. P. 53</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The following information is needed to meet this criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a detailed description of the weighting for ELA and Math. • Provide the relative weightings and averaging information for ELA achievement relative to mathematics achievement and how it averages data across years and/or grades to determine if these measures are valid and reliable. • Describe how the indicator measures the performance of at least 95 percent of all students and 95 percent of all students in each subgroup • Provide clarity on how it averages data uniformly across all schools.

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>	SEA describes using the Average Growth Index based on the Pennsylvania Value-Added Assessment System (PVAAS) which will be used to determine if each group of students gain, maintain or decline in overall performance in Math grades 4-9/Algebra I, English/Language Arts grades 4-8/Literature and /or science grades 4 and 8 th grade Biology. SEA explains the state will use the average of two years of measures across subjects. P.. 39, 51 Little information was provided on the index therefore some peer reviewers could not tell if averaging of data was applied.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA provided little information on the calculation of its index. The SEA states it will use an "average of two years of measures across subjects", however, it is difficult to determine how the SEA is averaging these two years, for example: weighted average or unweighted average.. (P.50)
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The following information is needed to meet this criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide how the SEA averages data. For example: weighted average vs. unweighted average.

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>	SEA addresses each element of the Graduation Rate being used as an indicator in its statewide accountability system. SEA describes the Graduation Rate indicator as the percentage of students in a school who earn a high school diploma within four or five years. SEA explains the graduation rate is for the year prior due to the availability of the data. The SEA will report both 4 year and 5 year graduation cohort rates separately. (P. 39).P. 10 -11,39 Appendix B P. 149-150
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>There is no description of the weighting of this indicator or averaging of data. Without this information, the validity/reliability of this calculation can not be determined. The SEA proposes using the 5 yr. graduation cohort to be the measure of accountability, which is not allowable under the ESSA.</p> <p>The SEA provides no information on how the four-year rate would be combined with the five-year rate and how the four year rate is used for accountability purposes under this indicator.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The following information is needed to meet this criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide clarity on how it averages data uniformly across all schools for all indicators and how the SEA is addressing the graduation rate for very small schools that do not meet the minimum n-size for all students and for each subgroup of students. • Clarify how the SEA is calculating its four year graduation rate, how the SEA is averaging data, and how many years the SEA is using to average its four year graduation rate. • It is not clear the state is using the four-year graduation rate as the SEA states that they want to use the five-year graduation cohort rate. Provide additional information that confirms whether the state is using the four-year graduation rate or not. • The SEA needs to include a description how the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is combined with the rate of the state’ extended-

	<p>yard adjusted cohort rate. The SEA needs to describe how the SEA is averaging the data between its four-year and five-year adjusted cohort graduation rates. SEA stated that it will report the two rates separately, but has not described how it will average that data for the two grad rate cohorts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SEA needs to clarify that the calculation is consistent for all high schools, in all LEAs, across the State.
--	--

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 states English Learners “are expected to attain proficiency in English in up to six years depending on their initial proficiency level” and “the calculation is based on a student’s overall composite proficiency level score from the ACCESS for ELLs...The expectation of LEAs is that all students make adequate growth each year to remain on a trajectory to attain proficiency on time” (P. 40).</p> <p>SEA describes the Progress in Achieving English Language proficiency indicator in its statewide accountability system and verifies the validity and reliability of the indicator. SEA verifies the indicator is aligned with the state determined timeline and based on the graphics provided, the indicator will be used to measure the statewide progress of all ELs in the assessment grades. SEA utilizes ACCESS, the statewide assessment instrument. P. 14-17, 40</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA does not include the specific grade levels that are included in this calculation.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (1 peer reviewer) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (3 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully</i>	<p>The following information is needed to meet this criteria:</p> <p>The SEA needs to specific the grades/grade levels included in the Progress toward English Proficiency Indicator. Is the SEA including each of grades 3 through 8 and in the grade for which such English learners are otherwise</p>

<i>meet this requirement</i>	assessed under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) during grades 9 through 12 or all grades as permissible by adequate growth?
------------------------------	---

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 has two school quality indicators that address absenteeism and career readiness. These indicators include all grade levels of school and all subgroups.</p> <p>SEA clarifies chronic absenteeism a K-12 indicator is correlated with instructional time lost so the goal will be to keep students in school. The SEA defines chronic absenteeism as “students who have missed more than 10 percent of school days across the academic year; this represents roughly 18 days in a 180-day school year” (P. 40).</p> <p>SEA shares that these indicators will be utilized to allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance. P. 3, 27 – 28. 40-41, 55, 80, 91, 99, 108</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA has two school quality indicators – Chronic Absenteeism and Career Readiness, both of these indicators include all grade levels in a school district.</p> <p>The Chronic Absenteeism calculation is applied when a student who is enrolled more than one-third of the academic year misses more than 10% of the school days. This calculation is applied to all schools in the state. If a student is enrolled for less than one-third of the academic school year, the student is excluded from the calculation as the school has not had sufficient intervention time to address the chronic absenteeism.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>One peer reviewer had a concern that having 18 days as the determiner for “who is chronically absent” is too many days and may impact academic achievement for students.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information</i>	<p>The following information is needed to meet this criteria:</p>

<i>or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SEA needs to provide research that supports its reason for 18 days being the determiner for chronic absenteeism.
---	--

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 has two school quality indicators that address absenteeism and career readiness. These indicators include all grade levels of school and all subgroups.</p> <p>SEA describes the Career Readiness indicator which will be used to benchmark student career exploration in accordance with District Comprehensive Plans and K-12 Guidance Plans. The Future Ready SEA index will utilize a dashboard model to display information to communicate student success based on determined benchmarks. The SEA states the “Career Readiness Benchmark represents the percent of students who demonstrate engagement in activities to satisfy the Career Education and Work Academic Standards...through separate measures based on grade level” (P. 41). This measure measures career readiness at the end of grades 5, 8, and 11.</p> <p>SEA shares that these indicators will be utilized to allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance. P. 3, 27 – 28. 40-41, 55, 80, 91, 99, 108</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA has two school quality indicators – Chronic Absenteeism and Career Readiness, both of these indicators include all grade levels in a school district.</p> <p>The Career Readiness calculation is based on a state law which requires all school districts to teach students four content areas associated with the state career education and work standards. The state requirement includes an end of grade level benchmark for each grade level. This calculation represents the percentage of student who demonstrate engagement in the required state career/work standards. Pgs. 40-41 The SEA’s inclusion of a career readiness to help students explore and develop career goals throughout their schooling.</p>

<i>Weaknesses</i>	The details of how the state receives the data for the career readiness indicator or the particulars around its calculation are not clear.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The following information is needed to meet this criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SEA must provide clarity that demonstrates how the state is able to meaningful differentiate school performance for the career readiness benchmark indicator. • The SEA needs to demonstrate how the career readiness benchmark indicatory is valid, reliable, comparable, used statewide in all schools (for the grade span to which it applies), and calculated in a consistent way.

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 states it will “initially categorize schools as eligible for identification based on performance in two domains—academic achievement and academic growth. The achievement measure will be derived from a weighted average of the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced on state assessments in English language arts and mathematics combined over two years.” The SEA will also combine data over two years for growth (P. 50-51). The SEA plots both academic achievement and academic growth, ensuring that “academic achievement and growth function as substantially weighted indicators in the overall accountability system” (P. 51). However, the criteria are clear that an SEA must ensure that the Academic Achievement, Other Academic Indicator, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving ELP indicators as an aggregate have substantially greater weight than the SQSS indicators. The state plan only addressed the Academic Achievement and Other Academic Indicators as having substantially greater weight than the remaining indicators.</p> <p>The SEA states that in step 2 of its system of annual meaningful differentiation, it will “examine the performance” of the previously identified “eligible” schools based on the remaining indicators. The SEA states that “chronic absenteeism will be an additional indicator for all schools” while it will use “other possible indicators, depending on school configuration and</p>

	<p>subgroup size, include: high school graduation rate, career readiness, and progress in moving English Learners to proficiency” [any of these schools] that also fall in the bottom quartile on one or more of these indicators may be identified for purposes of CSI” (P. 51).</p> <p>Step 3 of the SEA’s system of annual meaningful differentiation identifies “any such high schools not already identified through Steps 1 and 2 through evaluation of the four- and five-year adjusted cohort graduation rates” (P. 52).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA identifies “high school graduation rate, career readiness, and progress in moving English Learners to proficiency” as “other possible indicators” included to examine the performance of low achievement and low growth schools, it is unclear if and whether or not these indicators will be decisively used for the accountability determinations and Annual Meaningful Differentiation. Subgroup inclusion is not included in the state’s description of annual meaningful differentiation. P. 38-41, -50 – 52</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The following information is needed to meet this criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a description on the SEA’s system of annual meaningful differentiation including all indicators in the State’s accountability system. (These indicators include: Academic Achievement, Other Academic Achievement, Graduation Rate, and Progress Achieving ELP) for all students and for each subgroup of students. The SEA’s current plan states that the academic achievement and other academic achievement indicator amount to substantially greater weight than the other indicators.

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>SEA states that data will be weighed, but provides no indication of how, nor how it would be adjusted When the number of students present doesn’t meet the minimum n size. SEA does say that other measures will be used, but, again, nothing about weighting. The SEA’s business rules included in its description of its system of annual meaningful differentiation do not apply explicit weights but more weight is clearly given to the Academic Achievement and Other Academic indicators. P. 50– 52</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	

<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>There is no specific weighting information in this section of the plan, since there is no weighting provided there is no inclusion of how the state will address minimum n-size issues except to state that the SEA will use additional school years' data to reach the required number of students to include schools, without specifying the number of additional school years. The SEA does not state which two other indicators it will use in its second step of its system of annual meaningful differentiation.</p> <p>It is unclear if Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency, in the aggregate, receive much greater weight than the chronic absenteeism and career readiness indicators.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The following information is needed to meet this criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the weighting of each specific indicator. • Describe how the SEA will adjust the weight when an indicator cannot be calculated due to minimum n-size. • Describe how the Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicators receive substantial weight individually. • Describe how the weights for the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicators receive, in the aggregate, a much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s), in the aggregate.

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 states that for schools with variant grade configurations, and for schools “with both elementary and high school grade spans [it] will report all available data and will [treat these schools] as high schools for the purposes of CSI identification” (P. 53).</p> <p>The SEA states that for schools “that fall below the minimum N at the all student group, [it] will aggregate data across as many years as necessary to reach the minimum N for at least two accountability indicators” (P. 53).</p> <p>The SEA states that for “newly opened schools, accountability decisions will</p>

	be delayed until at least two years of data are available for at least two indicators” (P. 54).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA does not indicate which specific schools it would use for this calculation nor the number of schools. The SEA does not describe its methodology to identify these schools for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement.</p> <p>The SEA states it will use at least two indicators to identify schools for CSI and TSI determinations for which no grade level is assessed, but does not include which two indicators will be used nor the weighting of these indicators. (P.53)</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The following information is needed to meet this criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the 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 for each of the following list of schools: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ for schools in which no grade level is assessed under the State’s academic assessment system ○ for schools with variant grade configuration ○ for small schools that fall below the minimum N size for all student groups including how the SEA ensures that all indicators are used ○ newly opened schools; and ○ Special schools that serve different student population. Specifically, how the SEA will determine if the SEA will include these schools. The SEA stated the accountability system has not historically differentiated schools designed to serve special populations from other public schools. What criteria is the SEA using to evaluate whether this differential is appropriate for this groups of special schools.

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 takes a “three-step approach for identifying the lowest 5 percent of Title I schools” beginning with the 2018-19 school year.(P. 54). The SEA states its “three-step system of annual meaningful differentiation” applies “to all public schools, including charter schools, to identify schools for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and schools exceeding federal accountability targets” (P. 50).</p> <p>The SEA states it will “initially categorize schools as eligible for identification based on performance in two domains—academic achievement and academic growth. The achievement measure will be derived from a weighted average of the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced on state assessments in English language arts and mathematics combined over two years.” P. 50-51 The SEA plots both academic achievement and academic growth, ensuring that “academic achievement and growth function as substantially weighted indicators in the overall accountability system” P. 50- 52.</p> <p>The SEA states that in step 2 of its system of annual meaningful differentiation, it will “examine the performance” of the previously identified “eligible” schools based on the remaining indicators. The SEA states that “chronic absenteeism will be an additional indicator for all schools” while “other possible indicators, depending on school configuration and subgroup size, include: high school graduation rate, career readiness, and progress in moving English Learners to proficiency...[any of these schools] that also fall in the bottom quartile on one or more of these indicators may be identified for purposes of CSI” P. 51.</p> <p>Step 3 of the SEA’s system of annual meaningful differentiation identifies “any such high schools not already identified through Steps 1 and 2 through evaluation of the four- and five-year adjusted cohort graduation rates” P. 52.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>As the SEA identifies “high school graduation rate, career readiness, and progress in moving English Learners to proficiency” as “other possible indicators” included to examine the performance of low achievement and low growth schools, it is unclear if and how these indicators will be used for the accountability determinations.</p> <p>It is unclear if the SEA’s methodology will 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.</p> <p>SEA shares a footnote (#27) where it discusses if more than 5% of schools are identified, additional criteria to further differentiate school performance will be considered but this is not shared in the state plan. P.51</p>

<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The following information is needed to meet this criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe how the methodology includes all indicators for schools. Please clarify how the SEA is averaging data including specific weighting for “two year across subjects.” P. 51. Provide clarify how the SEA will aggregate data for small schools that fall under minimum N size across as many years as needed for at least two indicators, include how the SEA will determine which indicators it will select. The SEA needs to provide additional details that their methodology (decision rules) ensuring that the methodology will result in identifying not less than the lowest performing 5% of Title I Part A schools for comprehensive support and improvement. P 51 Please provide more information on footnote #27 (define discretion school performance) based on statistically sound.

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>	<p>The SEA states it will only use a five year graduation cohort rate for identifying schools with low graduation percentages. (P. 54)</p> <p>SEA discusses identifying schools as Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools based on failing to graduate one-third or more of their students if initial identification criteria has not already identified the school. SEA states high schools will be evaluated for eligibility based on the four and five-year cohort rates.</p> <p>SEA states 2018 is the first year Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools will be determined. P. 51-52, 54</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The methodology is not consistent (P.52, 54) on the identification of high schools. It is unclear how the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is being included.</p>

<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (1 peer reviewer) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (3 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The following information is needed to meet this criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify how the SEA will identify schools based on graduation rates. And specify whether or not schools will be identified based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate or the five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. The SEA provides information on page 54 regarding the use of a 5 year rate for CSI identification, but on page 52 the SEA states it will use either 4 and/or 5 year grade rate. ESSA requires that CSI-graduation must be based on a 4 year graduation rate. • Clarify if the SEA will use the 5 year graduation rate, which must be in addition to the 4 year. • If the SEA will use both the 4 year and 5 year graduation rates, include how the SEA will average the data.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The exit criteria is not yet established therefore it is difficult to determine if the identification of schools will meet its expected timeline. P. 50 – 56. The description is very brief and does specify 2018 as the year for initial ID of the schools needing this support. Methodology is apparently that spelled out on P. 51 and would identify such schools.</p> <p>The SEA states that “Title I schools identified for Additional Targeted Support and Improvement that fail to satisfy [the SEA’s] exit criteria over a four-year span will be eligible for CSI” (P. 54).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The exit criteria for schools identified as CSI/TSI/ or ATSI is not yet determined, the SEA proposes to include this measure in the fall of 2018 when the first CSI schools are identified. The SEA does not describe its methodology to identify schools identified for additional targeted support that have not satisfied the statewide exit criteria for comprehensive support and improvement. As the SEA states these schools “will be eligible for CSI”, it is unclear if the methodology will result in the identification of such schools for comprehensive support and improvement (P. 55).</p>

	The SEA needs to finalize their exit criteria plan. (bottom P.54)
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The following information is needed to meet this criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please clarify the phrase “will be eligible” phrase” P.54. ESSA states that if an identified school does not exit based on the state’s exit criteria; the school must enter the CSI additional targeted support category. • Provide the state’s exit criteria. • Provide the year in which the SEA will first identify these schools for comprehensive support and improvement, ensuring that this timelines is compliant with the Department’s guidance.

A.4.vi.d: Frequency of Identification

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA states it will “identify CSI schools in the fall of 2018 and every three years thereafter” (P. 54).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA does identify based on the required annual timeline however the lack of weighting of indicators in the annual meaningful differentiation makes

	it difficult to determine if all indicators are included in this identification. Beginning in 2019-20, the SEA states “schools with one or more subgroups performing at or below the CSI threshold in any single year will be identified for Consistently Underperforming Subgroup Targeted Support and Improvement (CUS-TSI)...This designation will serve as an early warning system for schools that may be at risk for identification as an Additional Targeted Support and Improvement or CSI school” (P. 55).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The methodology is based on the state 3 step process in which the plan does not include the weighting of the specific indicators. It is unclear by the annual meaningful differentiation that all indicators are included. Based on the description of the methodology for annual meaningful differentiation, it is unclear if the SEA’s methodology is based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The following information is needed to meet this criteria: The SEA needs to include all indicators in the identification of TSI schools and provide a description of how this process occurs.

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 that schools with subgroups designated as consistently underperforming “two or more times over a three-year window will receive additional targeted supports.” This designation annually when “schools with one or more subgroups performing at or below the CSI threshold in any single year” (P. 55).</p> <p>SEA addresses the methodology to identify the performance of any subgroup of students which would lead to Targeted Support and Improvement School with additional target support using the same criteria used to identify Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools.</p>

<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA has not included its methodology to identify schools that based on performance of any subgroup would lead to identification under ESSA pg. 55 The SEA does not provide detail regarding its CSI threshold. P. 55</p> <p>SEA needs to identify the additional targeted support by 2019-2020 is not permissible and the SEA must identify by the beginning of 2018-19. The frequency for identification after the first year is missing.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The following information is needed to meet this criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SEA needs to address the methodology as requested in Comprehensive support and improvement (A.4.vi.c:) and provide how the SEA’s methodology will result in the identification of Targeted Support and Intervention Schools. (CSI methodology questions listed below to assist the SEA in their response). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CSI Methodology action: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Describe how the methodology includes all indicators for schools. Please clarify how the SEA is averaging data including specific weighting for “two year across subjects.” P. 51. • Review the proposed timeline to determine what impact having an initial targeting timeline in 2019-2020 impacts the additional targeting timeline. Provide a description on timeline adjustments after the SEA has completed its review. • Provide the frequency with which the State will identify such schools after the first year of identification?

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>	The SEA provided no additional statewide categories.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must</i>	

provide to fully meet this requirement

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 included the participation in its state report cards but did not include how it calculates participation in state assessments as part of its accountability plan.</p> <p>The SEA states “schools with rates below 95 percent will be required to develop and implement state-approved improvement plans, and may be required to complete a school- or LEA-level assessment audit” (P. 53). Although SEA requires a 95% participation rate, the state does not describe how it factors the requirement for all students and all subgroups of students. SEA provides consequences for not meeting the requirement. P. 53</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA does not include how it factors in the 95% participation requirement in its accountability system for any of the subgroup groups. P. 53</p> <p>The SEA does not 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.</p> <p>SEA does not discuss how the 95% participation rate for mathematics and reading/language arts will be factored into the accountability system for all students and all subgroups of students.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The following information is needed to meet this criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe how the SEA factors in 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. • 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 (<i>e.g.</i>, 92 percent participation rate vs. 70 percent participation).

A.4.viii: Continued Support for School and Local Educational Agency Improvement (ESEA Section 1111(d)(3)(A))

A.4.viii.a: Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(I))

- Does the SEA describe its statewide exit criteria for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, which may include how the exit criteria are aligned with the State’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress?
- Does the SEA’s description include the number of years within which schools are expected to meet such criteria?
- Is the number of years no more than four years?
- Do the exit criteria ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in the State (e.g., do the exit criteria improve student outcomes and ensure that a school that exits no longer meets the criteria under which the school was identified)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>Did not see an exit plan that details school (and, as appropriate, LEA-level) activities in response to the school-level needs assessment; and participate in state sponsored technical assistance activities. SEA also shares they are requesting flexibility to finalize their plan in 2018. P. 54</p> <p>P. 54- 55. While there is language about exiting, the criteria are general and would not give schools or districts guidance on what constitutes exiting. The SEA “requests flexibility to finalize uniform statewide exit criteria in the Fall of 2018, based on subgroup level of these additional data elements”. (P.54)</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The state has not addressed its exit criteria as required by ESSA.</p> <p>The SEA does not include its exit criteria for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement.</p> <p>The SEA does not include the number of years within which schools are expected to meet the criteria.</p> <p>It is unclear if minimum requirements for the exit criteria would ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in the State.</p> <p>SEA does not have a complete description of their exit criteria plan and how it is aligned with their long term goals and measurements of interim progress as well as the timeline for schools to meet this plan. SEA does not articulate how the plan will ensure continued progress and to improve student academic achievement and school success.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must</i>	<p>The following information is needed to meet this criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEA must describe its statewide exit criteria for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, which may include how the

<i>provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>exit criteria are aligned with the State’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEA’s description include the number of years within which schools are expected to meet such criteria? And in the description must not be more than four years? • Describe how the exit criteria ensures 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).
---	--

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>	<p>The SEA states “Title I schools identified for Additional Targeted Support and Improvement that fail to satisfy [the SEA’s] exit criteria over a four-year span will be eligible for CSI” (P. 54).</p> <p>SEA also shares Title I schools identified for Additional Targeted Support and Improvement that fail to satisfy Pennsylvania’s exit criteria over a four-year span will be eligible for CSI. P. 55-56</p> <p>SEA does not include the exit criteria for schools receiving Additional Targeted Support and proposes to finalize their plan in 2018 based on subgroup analysis of including two additional indicators; Chronic absenteeism and Career Readiness. P. 55</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The state has not addressed its exit criteria as required by ESSA.</p> <p>The SEA does not describe its statewide exit criteria for schools receiving additional targeted support.</p> <p>The SEA does not provide exit criteria to ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in the State.</p> <p>SEA did not address the exit criteria.</p>

	It is unclear what the timeline is for exit criteria.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The following information is needed to meet this criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEA needs to include 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. SEA needs to clarify the number of years within which schools are expected to meet such criteria. SEA needs to include 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)?

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>	<p>Without specified exit criteria, it is difficult to determine if these are the standard activities or more rigorous interventions for schools failing to meet the exit criteria.</p> <p>While the SEA, provides a range of actions that the state may take, it is impossible to determine if these actions are more rigorous without the exit criteria being established. . P. 59-60</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	As the exit criteria is not yet established, it is difficult to determine if these proposed activities are standard ones implemented for all CSI schools or only for those CSI schools not making their exit criteria.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must</i>	<p>The following information is needed to meet this criteria:</p> <p>Please address the exit criteria action items and provide a description of the more rigorous interventions once the exit criteria is determined.</p>

<i>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>	SEA shares it will periodically review resource allocations to support school improvement during the monitoring process with reporting and evaluation requirements from the school concerning the use of resources and use of evidence based strategies. SEA discusses the use of a formula to determine funding to be allocated for first year assistance versus a competitive grant process to ensure schools needing assistance are given the opportunities through State resources. P. 56, 60 State says that LEAs will have opportunity to ID specific resource needs prior to awarding funds, but emphasis here seems to be on “potential inequities and funding gaps”. Nothing said about schools and districts identifying what they need. The “how” here is very general. P. 60
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.viii.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>	SEA describes the technical assistance the State will provide to Districts based on a two-prong approach that is built on two foundational frameworks: Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (PBIS). Technical assistance includes the provision of resources, personnel, professional development each supported by research based practices. The model includes 29 intermediate units and three branches of a training, TA network that’s provides support to teams at the district and school

	level so local empowerment can occur. . Plan does differentiate resources and interventions thru State System of Support. SEA shares support will be available to schools not yet identified for comprehensive or targeted support as well as the schools who are eligible based on identification though their needs assessments and improvement plans. P. 28, 57 – 59
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA includes its list of resources for technical assistance to support CSI and TSI schools. This support is based in pro-active data-informed approaches that address not only academic needs but also social-emotional needs of students. SEA will offer additional support for all districts through its use of workshops for federal programs coordinators which will focus on compliance and best practices. P. 32-33
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	NA P. 56 and 57
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

- Does the SEA describe the extent, if any that low-income children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced

teachers, which may include the State definition of ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers?

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>While the SEA included the definition of effective teachers and that the SEA will report out the data on percentage of teachers identified as unqualified, inexperienced or out of field, no data was provided on the disproportionate rates of minority students being served by these teachers. The SEA states it will “use the annual state report card to present data regarding the percentage of teachers identified in each LEA as ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced.</p> <p>SEA reported there is a teacher equity issue in the state and reviewed specific concerns regarding the number of non-qualified teaching candidates, high rates of turnover among teachers and administrators. SEA states the problem is both rural and urban and affects low income and minority students. For example, SEA provides statistical data regarding the number of undergraduate education majors in Pennsylvania has declined by 55 percent, while the number of newly certified teachers has dropped by 63 percent since 2010. SEA provided its Educator Equity Plan to address gaps. P. 61 - 71,72 - 73 74-76</p> <p>The SEA provided no current data with respect to teaching force for low income students. There is no definition of ineffective or out of field teachers. The SEA did not include what measures are used to calculate rates the SEA will publically report.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>SEA has identified and analyzed root causes including: limited pool of effective, diverse candidates to fill teacher vacancies, achievement gaps for historically marginalized subgroups, lack of high quality professional development, lack of teacher and principal preparedness in low income and culturally diverse schools, fiscal inequity, and missing, inaccurate and /or inaccessible data regarding teacher vacancies, staffing issues and workforce needs.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA includes a reference to its Equity Plan and states that minority students are more likely to be served by unqualified, inexperience or out of</p>

⁴ Consistent with ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B), this description should not be construed as requiring a State to develop or implement a teacher, principal or other school leader evaluation system.

	field teachers, No data on the breakdown of the impact of subgroups in this area. There is no definition for unqualified, inexperienced or out of field teachers. The SEA does not describe the measures used to calculation the disproportional rates. (P. 74-75).
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The following information is needed to meet this criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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, including the State definition of ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers. • 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. • 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. Provide specific clarity on the measures used to evaluate progress.

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 states it employs “professional development opportunities, webinars, grant funding, regional school climate support, and technical assistance” to “[support] local efforts to prevent and address violence, harassment, and bullying behavior” (P. 107).</p> <p>SEA describes that the Department of Ed and the Office for Safe Schools has a variety of resources available to LEAs to improve school conditions for student learning. These include strategies and resources such as Bullying toolkits, climate surveys, trainings, and technical assistance. SEA shares the ability to use data collected from schools to provide information regarding out-of-school suspensions, expulsions, other disciplinary actions to identify and address disproportionate and exclusionary discipline practices. P.103, 105, 107</p>

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

A.7: School Transitions (ESEA 1111(g)(1)(D))

- Does the SEA describe how it will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A in meeting the needs of students at all levels of schooling (particularly students in the middle grades and high school)?
- Does the SEA’s description include how it will work with LEAs to provide effective transitions of students to middle grades and high school to decrease the risk of students dropping out?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA describes how it will support LEAs in meeting the needs of students at all levels of schooling, including early childhood to elementary school (P. 96); pre-kindergarten to kindergarten (P. 96-97); elementary school to middle school (P. 98-99); middle school to high school (P. 99-101); and high school to postsecondary education and careers (P. 101-103).</p> <p>SEA describes transition strategies provided by the state to all levels of schooling including subgroups such as migrant and special education students. Examples include the 21st Learning Centers and the Diploma Project. P. 62, 78, 79, 94, 96. 116</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA included its work with its Early Learning partners to assist students in entering the K-12 system ready to learn.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

- Does the SEA describe how it will establish and implement, with timely and meaningful consultation with LEAs representing the geographic diversity of the State, standardized statewide entrance and exit procedures for English learners, including a description of how, if applicable, a State will ensure that local input included in the exit procedures, such as teacher input or a portfolio, will be applied statewide?
- Does the SEA’s description include an assurance that all students who may be English learners are assessed for such status within 30 days of enrollment in a school in the State?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The state has statewide procedures for identification and exiting that include teacher surveys/interviews. The state did not include the timeframe for identification in its identification process.</p> <p>The SEA states LEAs must use a “home language survey and parent interview to determine which newly enrolling students have a primary home language other than English” and that “for students whose primary home language is not English, an academic records review must be completed...” If no evidence of English language proficiency is found, “then the students are screened using one of the WIDA screening tools” (P 126). SEA discusses statewide entrance and exit procedures for English Learners including how stakeholder input was obtained. SEA shares teacher input is gathered through the use of a standardized inventory system.P.126 – 128</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA has a standard home language survey implemented by all districts to determine which students are potential English learners. From there an academic review is preformed prior to giving a state screening assessment to identify English learners. The SEA has an established entrance criteria based on the state identification screening assessment.</p> <p>The exit criteria includes two options for a student to be proficient in English plus two language use inventories to be provided by the EL teacher and other content level teacher (special considerations are included for ELs with waivers for service or classroom teachers providing both language and core instruction) pg. 127</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>It is unclear from the description how the parent interview results and review of academic progress review will be implemented consistently across all districts in the state. It is unclear how these inventories are implemented consistently across all districts in the state. The state does not include the statement that all ELs will be identified within 30 days of enrollment.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The following information is needed to meet this criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A description of how the EL identification - parent interview is standardized across the state, so that determinations made from this interview provide a consistent determination if a potential EL will proceed to the state’s identification screener assessment. • 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.

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 states it will “provide each LEA with calculations of interim progress and attainment of English proficiency as well as academic achievement for their English learners along with a detailed explanation of those calculations and how to interpret results. The Department will also will [sic] conduct, record, and archive professional development activities to assist LEAs and schools in understanding the calculations as well as how to evaluate the results and use them to make program enhancement determinations” (P. 128). SEA shares how it will assist districts in meeting their long term goals and the State’s academic standards. SEA explains it will provide each LEA with calculations of interim progress, attainment of English proficiency as well as academic achievement for their English Learners along with detailed explanations of those calculations and how to interpret the results. SEA will also be responsible for conducting, recording and archiving professional development activities to assist districts and schools in understanding the calculations as well as how to evaluate the results and use them to make program enhancement determinations. P. 128 – 129
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA includes technical assistance in the form of statewide PLCs to support all districts in supporting English Learners. Based on outcomes an LEA may be required to participate in a statewide professional learning or corrective action plan. pg. 129
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA has an established monitoring process and will change its focus from the AMAOs under NCLB to the ELP Indicator under ESSA.</p> <p>SEA describes the on-going Title III monitoring process and discusses the changes to take place beginning with 2017 – 2018. SEA addresses the districts’ outcomes based on state measures of interim progress towards long-term goals and English language proficiency attainment. SEA discusses the action strategies required to address improvement including assignment of a State monitor, professional learning community participation, corrective action plan and technical assistance. P.129</p> <p>P. 129 SEA says that it will monitor grantees on a rotating basis to determine those not identified as at risk. In 2017-18 a new monitoring element will be initiated related to interim progress in meeting LT goals State mentions a number of potential actions that could be taken.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA monitors the Title III sub grantees on a rotating basis and more frequently for LEAs that are consistently identified as being at-risk or as the result of a risk assessment. Pg. 129</p> <p>SEA monitors all Title III sub grantees on a rotating basis that are not at-risk.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	