

# STATE PLAN PEER REVIEW CRITERIA Peer Review Notes Template

---

STATE: South Carolina



**U.S. Department of Education**

## Background

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

### Role of the Peer Reviewers

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

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

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

### How to Use This Document

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

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

### **Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	N/A
<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>	

---

<sup>1</sup> In order for an SEA to exempt an 8<sup>th</sup> grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in 8<sup>th</sup> grade under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(aa), it must ensure that: a. the student instead takes the end-of-course mathematics assessment the State administers to high school students under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb); b. the student's performance on the high school assessment is used in the year in which the student takes the assessment for purposes of measuring academic achievement under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) and participation in assessments under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E); and c. in high school: (1) the student takes a State-administered end-of-course assessment or nationally recognized high school academic assessment as defined in 34 CFR § 200.3(d) in mathematics that is more advanced than the assessment the State administers for 8<sup>th</sup> graders under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb); (2) the State provides for appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR § 200.6(b) and (f); and (3) the student's performance on the more advanced mathematics assessment is used for purposes of measuring academic achievement under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) and participation in assessments under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E).

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

**A.3.i: Definition**

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	SCDE defines languages that are present to a significant extent as those languages that are equal to or greater than 1.5% of the overall percent of the English learner (EL) population statewide. Five languages are identified with Spanish comprising 82% and Russian, Vietnamese, Chinese, and Arabic, each comprising 1.5% or greater.
<i>Strengths</i>	By selecting a relatively low threshold for its definition, SCDE has included multiple languages to accommodate many EL learners.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	SCDE did not describe how it considered languages other than English that are spoken by distinct EL populations including ELs who are migratory, ELs who were not born in the United States, and ELs who are Native Americans. Further, SCDE did not 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>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>	SCDE must describe how it considered other languages spoken by distinct populations including ELs who are migratory, ELs who were not born in the United States, and ELs who are Native Americans.  SCDE must describe how it considered other languages spoken by distinct populations 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>	SCDE does not identify nor provide any assessments in languages other than English. SCDE maintains all assessments are aligned to the language of instruction – English.
<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>	SCDE asserts that assessments in languages other than English are not needed as assessments must be administered in the language of instruction, which is English, for the test scores to be valid.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	SCDE has not translated any assessments and declares that none are needed. This rationale is based on the fact that because students are instructed in English, they should only be assessed in English. There is no evidence provided for this conclusion.
<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>	SCDE must cite research to demonstrate their rationale that translated assessments are not needed, particularly in those subject areas where translations will not impact the construct being measured.

### 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>	SCDE has never intended nor does it now intend to develop any assessments in languages other than English. SCDE does not provide any description of gathering input on the need for such assessments and maintains that assessing students in a language for which they are not provided instruction would result in invalid scores. SCDE provides a reference to its Education Accountability Act to partially explain why such assessments will not be developed (“The standards are to promote the goals of providing every student with the competencies to (1) read, view, and listen to complex information in the English language; (2) write and speak effectively in the English language.”)
Strengths	
Weaknesses	There is no description of how this information was shared with stakeholders or how the act was reviewed with stakeholders.  SCDE has not indicated that it considered accessibility for all students when it made the decision not to translate assessments. SCDE may want to consider translating assessments into other languages where it will not affect the construct of what is being assessed.
<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>	SCDE must more comprehensively and clearly explain why assessments in other subject areas are not provided nor are being considered for development.  SCDE must describe its efforts regarding stakeholder input when making the decision not to provide any tests in languages other than English.

**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>	SCDE lists each subgroup it will include in its accountability system: Economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, English Learners, White, African American, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Native

	American.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>SCDE has not explained how the listed racial and ethnic subgroups were determined and why those included are considered “major” for purposes of this plan.</p> <p>SCDE should consider separating Asian and Pacific Islander depending on the variation and numbers within the group. SCDE may also want to consider adding a multi-racial/two or more races category.</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.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>	N/A
<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.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>	N/A
<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.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>	SCDE will use an n-size of 20 students for accountability purposes (which represents a reduction from its current n-size of 30). It is presumed that this n-size is being used for all students and for each subgroup of students for accountability purposes.
<i>Strengths</i>	By lowering its n-size, SCDE is able to include more schools in its accountability metrics which makes its reporting more reliable and comprehensive.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	A smaller n-size could include more students in small school districts.  SCDE may want to explicitly state that the minimum n-size of 20 also applies to the all student group.
<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?<sup>2</sup>

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	SCDE selected a minimum n-size of 20 to balance the need for transparency, the need for protection of personally identifiable information, and ensuring that accountability data are reflective of the school characteristics.
<i>Strengths</i>	SCDE uses information from the 2011 report published by NCES to defend its selection. The n-size of 20 seems appropriate for SCDE as they consider privacy issues, rural schools and data reliability.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Many students in smaller districts and even in larger districts will not be contributing to some metrics, which may lead to a less robust and valid overall picture.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	SCDE collected extensive feedback from various civil rights groups when determining its minimum n-size. SCDE has previously used n-sizes of 30 and 40. Feedback from these groups suggested that smaller n-sizes would allow more schools to be included in accountability measures. Some stakeholders preferred a smaller n-size in reporting; district personnel generally favored a

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

	larger n-size or a percentage model whereby a subgroup would be reported if it met a specific percentage threshold of the full population. The SCDE considered all the feedback and suggestions to come to a compromise of 20 as an n-size. SCDE is mindful of its significant achievement gaps and believe this smaller n-size will hold more schools accountable for all the students they serve.
<i>Strengths</i>	SCDE involved a wide array of stakeholders and reached a reasonable compromise to address transparency, privacy and accountability needs.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	One reviewer indicated that SCDE could have provided more information about exactly how it collaborated with different groups of stakeholders, in addition to including a long list of meetings it conducted prior to submitting its plan.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	SCDE works to keep all student information confidential as privacy is a priority identified by the plan. They will mask all data with results that could lead to identification of students (i.e., with subgroups of less than 20 and will mask calculations that result in 0 or 100 percent for a subgroup reported in a particular category).
<i>Strengths</i>	This strategy is consistent across reporting and accountability measures.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	SCDE may want to consider using a variety of strategies to mask confidentiality. SCDE should describe more thoroughly how this masking ensures privacy, as well as explicitly clarifying the difference between masking calculations and masking the data.  SCDE may be overly inclusive by masking data with subgroups of less than 20. ED standards indicate that masking data of less than 10 is sufficient for

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

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

A.4.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>	N/A
<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.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>
--	----------------------

<p><i>Peer Analysis</i></p>	<p>(p. 8-13 and Appendix D) The goals for improved academic achievement are ambitious yet attainable through rigorous attention to student academic performance. The long-term (2035) targeted measures for growth consist of 1) 90% of students scoring at Level 2 or higher in ELA and mathematics and 2) 70% of students scoring at Level 3 or higher in LEA and mathematics. Stakeholders, including the SC State Board and the Education Oversight Committee (EOC) agree this timeline represents a “generational approach” to transforming SC’s educational system.</p> <p>It is SCDE’s intent to make every student college- and career-ready; therefore, it will place emphasis on increasing the number of students reaching a Level 3 and reducing the number of students scoring in Level 1.</p> <p>These long-term goals will be measured with a 2017 baseline and a 2026 mid-term, with the expectation of a 50% reduction from the baseline in students scoring at level 1 or 2 for all students and all subgroups. Interim targets will be set for every 3 years in 2020, 2023, 2026, 2029, 2032, and 2035. Results will be reported annually along-side the next interim target. SCDE believes this will support a system of continuous improvement.</p> <p>SCDE explains that these goals are ambitious because based on 2015-16 data, between 2-6% of schools would have met either of these goals.</p> <p>SCDE is transitioning to new assessments and will be using a four-performance level rating system.</p>
<p><i>Strengths</i></p>	<p>SCDE is considering how to support generational education improvement through rigorous goals and outlines these goals using the state’s most current data.</p>
<p><i>Weaknesses</i></p>	<p>SCDE should clarify its plan for rolling out high stakes goals to school leaders to ensure districts are moving in the same direction.</p> <p>SCDE does not differentiate in its goals between the all students group and the individual subgroups.</p> <p>SCDE’s timeline of 18 years, while supportive of a “generational approach,” may be hard for the general public to accept the extended length of time. Reporting the scores along with the interim improvement targets will be helpful.</p>
<p><i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers)  <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)</p>
<p><i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i></p>	

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>	While SCDE provides measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for combined long-term goals across all student groups, grades and math and ELA, including highlighting the goals for the mid-point benchmarks. Measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for each subgroup of students have not been provided. Based on the chart provided on page 13, the calculation appears to be the goal minus baseline, divided by 18.
<i>Strengths</i>	Targets for Year 3, Year 6, and Midpoint goals for the all students group are clearly indicated and attainable.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for each subgroup of students have not been provided, nor have the measures been separated into subject areas.
<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>	SCDE must provide all measurements of interim progress for subgroups.

#### 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>	Using a “common target methodology,” SCDE will measure all students and each subgroup using the achievement baseline in 2017. All subgroups will seek to reduce the percentage of students below Level 2 and Level 3 by 50% by the 2026 midpoint, thus holding all subgroups to the same improvement percentage as it does for the all students group.
<i>Strengths</i>	Setting the same targets for underperforming groups as for all students is ambitious.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>While it is clear that, in order to meet goals, schools will have to raise the achievement levels of all subgroups, including those that are currently lower achieving, these goals do not take into account the dramatic increases that will be required for some of those subgroups. SCDE should consider differentiated goals for subgroups that are the furthest behind.</p> <p>SCDE could add transparency to its plan by producing a table for each of the subgroups that would display the necessary annual movement to have subgroups meet their targets.</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.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>SCDE will work towards a 90% graduation rate for the four-year adjusted cohort on an 18-year timeline (by 2035). While the 2017 benchmark is still being determined, the 2016 benchmark rate was 82.6%. Like the academic targets, the annual results and the 3-year interim targets will be reported side-by-side. Rates and benchmarks for subgroups are provided in Appendix D. The long-term goal and timeline for the all students group and each individual subgroup is the same.</p> <p>SCDE explains that this goal is ambitious because currently, only 25% of the schools in the state can meet this goal. However, given that the state rate is currently at 82.6%, an 18-year timeline seems protracted.</p> <p>Further, if/when schools and districts meet these goals, they will be required to set a new, higher goal (e.g., 95%). Because many of the subgroups benchmark rates are significantly lower than the all student group benchmark rate, SCDE believes it has set an appropriately ambitious goal for accountability.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>SCDE does not differentiate in its goals between the all students group and the individual subgroups. While on the one hand, this is good in that it prioritizes achievement of all students AND subgroups, it also does not make any adjustments for subgroups that are currently the furthest behind (e.g., students with disabilities, Native American, EL students).</p> <p>SCDE should consider a higher goal for subgroups already meeting the state prescribed goal (i.e., Asian/Pacific Islander) instead of having a goal that reduces the baseline.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers)

<i>all requirements?</i>	<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>	N/A
<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.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>	SCDE provides a chart on page 15 displaying the baseline rate, the 2035 goal (90%), the distance between the two, and the Y3 – 2020, Y6 – 2023, and Mid-

	point – 2026 targets. The table lacks the intervening year targets. Baseline data is presented in Appendix D for each subgroup, but no measurements of interim progress are provided.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Interim benchmarks for subgroups are not explicitly addressed.
<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>	SCDE must include measurements of interim progress for each of the subgroups.

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>	SCDE will measure all student subgroups with a common target methodology to promote consistency with each subgroup of students to meet the 90% target in 2035. Each subgroup will be required to reduce the gap between the benchmark and the mid-point goal by 50%. The calculation, per the chart offered on page 15, suggests that different subgroup targets will consider the movement necessary depending on the subgroup starting point. While this is an ambitious goal, it may be a less attainable one than if it required a similar rate of growth.
<i>Strengths</i>	Identifying 3-year interim targets as well as a mid-term is appropriate for keeping all subgroups on track toward the target goal.  By setting the long-term goals for the all students group and for each of the individual subgroups at the same levels, SCDE is requiring greater rates of improvement for subgroups of students that are lower achieving.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Subgroups that may be marginalized will be required to demonstrate more significant growth in the same period of time as other subgroups and all students.  All reviewers agree that the measurements of interim progress for each subgroup are not explicitly provided and 2 reviewers stated that this lack of information prevents the requirement from being met.  It will be helpful for SCDE to provide the table with the interim targets to increase transparency.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (2 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (2 peer reviewers)

<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	SCDE must explicitly state the measures of interim progress for each subgroup.
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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>SCDE measures English language proficiency based on the ACCESS assessment. By 2035, 70% of ELs will meet or exceed individual growth targets on ACCESS assessment. Beginning with the baseline score in 2016-2017, progress will be measured annually. The long-term goal timeline is 18 years with a 50% reduction in the distance between the baseline and the goal at the midpoint of 2026. The target scores of 4.4 on English proficiency with no sub-domain below 4.0 is projected within 5 years (the state-determined timeline for achieving proficiency).</p> <p>SCDE explains that this goal is ambitious because only 5% of schools have 70% of students meeting their proficiency goals and only 31% of students statewide are meeting annual progress to proficiency targets.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The anticipated growth is consistent with growth targets in other measured areas.</p> <p>SCDE establishes an ambitious target particularly when looking at current performance and a 5-year state determined timeline to reach proficiency.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Appendix D indicates there are two ELP goals, but the response in the plan only includes one goal. SCDE should explain this notation.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	SCDE provides a chart on page 16 which displays the 2016 baseline (actual TBD), the goal (70%), the distance between baseline and goal, and the Y3 – 2020, Y6 – 2026, and midpoint targets. Interim improvement targets are provided beginning with an approximate baseline of 31% and a targeted increase to 50.2% at the midpoint (2026).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	It would be more transparent for SCDE to provide a table of measurements of interim targets for each target year, and in particular, if those measurements were annual interim targets.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# 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>	SCDE indicates that the same indicator for all schools in all LEAs across the state will be used. SCDE uses SC READY for English language arts (ELA) and mathematics for grades 3-8, and end-of-course exams in English and

	<p>mathematics (Algebra I). SCDE uses statistically sound measurement theory and industry-standard item development and performance-level setting to ensure validity and reliability.</p> <p>SCDE uses a differentiated point system to increase student achievement across the performance levels, thereby measuring the continuum of student proficiency for all students and each subgroup of students. SCDE explains that all end-of-grade/course assessments are scored and each score aligns to a point structure, whereby students are awarded more points for higher performance levels. Scores are averaged for the school using a 50%/50% weighting for each assessment (SCDE does not indicate what the procedure will be if students only have one score) and adjusted depending on whether the school has an English language proficiency (ELP) indicator (e.g., n-size &gt;20) so that each school has a normed overall score. This calculation is completed for the all students group and each of the subgroups.</p> <p>SCDE includes a list of the qualifications students must meet to be included in the calculation (e.g., students who took alternative assessments, 0 points for students who should have taken a test but did not).</p> <p>Once the Achievement Indicator points are calculated, a summative rating is assigned (Excellent, Good, Average, Below Average, Unsatisfactory). SCDE has determined percentages for target ranges across all ratings (e.g., 10% unsatisfactory, 25% below average, etc.) based on scores from 2002-2006, which was a period of consistency in state test scores.</p> <p>If a school tests less than 95% of eligible students, its rating will be reduced by one rating level. If the school persistently tests less than 95% of eligible students, it must submit a plan to SCDE outlining how it will increase the percentage of students tested.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	SCDE provides extensive documentation regarding their academic achievement indicator. Technical information as well as narrative information describing the process and rationale are included.
<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.b: Other Academic Indicator for Elementary and Secondary Schools that are Not High Schools

*Note: If the SEA uses a different Other Academic indicator for each grade span, peer reviewers must separately review each indicator that an SEA submits. For example, if an SEA submits one Other Academic indicator for elementary schools and a different Other Academic indicator for middle schools, then peer reviewers will provide feedback, using the criteria below, separately for each indicator.*

- Does the SEA describe the Other Academic indicator used in its statewide accountability system for public elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools, including that the SEA uses the same indicator and calculates it in the same way for all elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools, in all LEAs, across the State, except that the indicator may vary by each grade span?
- Does the SEA describe, if applicable, how it averages data across years and/or grades (e.g., does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- If the SEA uses a different indicator for each grade span, does it describe each indicator, including the grade span to which it applies?
- If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, is the indicator another valid and reliable statewide academic indicator?
- If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, does the indicator allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance?
- Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>SCDE includes a measure of Academic Progress/Growth for grades 4–8 in ELA and mathematics. SCDE explains that this measure will be used annually to determine whether schools had more or less growth than the average school statewide by measuring the actual progress of students against their expected progress. Currently, the measure is received from the SAS Education Value-Added Assessment System (EVAAS); future value-added services will be the subject of a new procurement. Progress scores are measured similarly to the indicator above using both a 35 and 40-point scale depending on whether an ELP measure can be calculated.</p> <p>Half the growth points will be awarded for the all students group and the other half will be awarded based on growth of the bottom quintile (if the school has fewer than 6 students in the bottom quintile (for subject/grade/year), the school’s growth measure will only include the all student group calculation). Summative ratings are given to both sub-components of the measure, as well as to the overall indicator. Information will be reported by the all students group, as well as by each subgroup. In cases where a school or district does not have one or more subgroups, the weight of the missing subgroup is spread proportionally among the remaining groups.</p> <p>SCDE provides a well-articulated description of the calculation used to determine the school progress measure.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>By measuring student growth, and not just proficiency, SCDE is valuing movement along the learning continuum, especially in its focus on the bottom quintile of students in each school.</p> <p>SCDE used historical data to norm scores across schools with differing characteristics in a way that demonstrates that the summative ratings will be consistently measuring schools across the state.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>SCDE’s documentation appears to be missing some information or provides inconsistent information regarding n-size. For example on p. 31, it states that a minimum size of 6 students in a grade level with scores in current and previous years will be used to compute a growth index. SCDE should clarify how the varying n-sizes relate to the minimum n-size.</p>

	SCDE should clarify if the overall growth measure will be disaggregated by subgroups.
<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.c: Graduation Rate

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>SCDE annually reports a school’s graduation rate (including all students and each subgroup) and the long-term target is 90% of students graduating in four years. SCDE only uses the 4-year rate on which to base its indicator. SCDE will award points for the percentage of students graduating in four years. The rate is calculated based on students who earn a regular high school diploma divided by the number of the students in the cohort. SCDE uses the methodology defined by ED and applies the calculation to all schools in the state. SCDE’s ratings are described as excellent, good, average, below average and unsatisfactory.</p> <p>SCDE consistently utilizes the markers of 45th day of school to identify students who will be included in cohort groups, including in the graduation cohort.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	SCDE continues using the ED guidelines to determine the graduation cohort,

	<p>which has produced reliable results for reporting in the last 8 years.</p> <p>SCDE provides detailed information regarding its calculation and is very transparent with its methodology, including by presenting its data in a table.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>SCDE waits 45 days to define the 4-year cohort which does not count any students who drop out of school at the beginning of 9th grade. This may exclude students who should be included in order to get a full picture of the cohort.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.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>SCDE, as a member of WIDA, uses ACCESS as the State’s English language proficiency assessment. SCDE indicates that ACCESS has been confirmed to be a reliable measure, and evidence of validity is documented in the ACCESS Annual Technical Report.</p> <p>SCDE defines proficiency as any student receiving a total score of 4.4 with no sub-domain (reading, writing, speaking, and listening) score below a 4.0. SCDE cites research that indicates language proficiency typically takes five to seven years. Time in language instruction, grade level, and formal education among other issues can impact this timeline. SCDE has chosen a 5-year timeframe in which students are expected to reach English language proficiency.</p> <p>SCDE determines growth expectations for their ELs dependent upon the initial score on a student’s ELP assessment from which a linear trajectory is computed. The growth trajectories are displayed in Table 19 on page 41. Students are determined to have met growth if they meet or exceed the projected target. The indicator will aggregate the annual growth in ELs based</p>

	on the individual matched students' growth. From those calculations, a school may earn up to 10 points on this measure. Summative ratings are assigned in proportion to the percentage of students meeting ELP proficiency targets. Ratings correspond to excellent, good, average, below average, and unsatisfactory based on percent of students meeting their growth targets.
<i>Strengths</i>	SCDE provides detailed background on its EL progress indicator and makes use of multiple theories and recent research to set its goals and establish a monitoring system. SCDE has produced a system reflective of its deliberate and considered approach.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	All reviewers state that there is a lack of clarity around how the points are calculated for this measure, and 1 reviewer indicates that due to this lack of clarity, the requirements have not been met.
<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>	SCDE must provide additional detail to explain how the 10-point scale will be calculated.

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>	SCDE is including both school quality and student success indicators. These will be reported for all students and subgroups. Several elements have been proposed by the State Superintendent, which may necessitate amendments to the current plan. The student success indicator includes two different measures connected to corresponding grade spans: Preparing for Success and College and Career Readiness. The school quality indicator measures Positive & Effective Learning Environment for grades 3-12.  Preparing for Success Indicator

The Preparing for Success indicator for elementary and middle schools uses the Science and Social Studies exams on SCPASS; individual scores are converted into points with higher points awarded for higher levels of proficiency. The calculation used is essentially the same as the calculation used for its academic indicator. Summary results from the 2015-16 school year are provided with accompanying point distributions across both elementary and middle schools.

For high schools, the Preparing for Success indicator is based on the end-of-course exams students take in U.S. History and Biology. A similar calculation is employed and the percentage of points earned by students is converted to a 10-point scale.

College & Career Readiness Indicator

For elementary and middle schools, the College & Career Readiness indicator is based on SC READY in ELA and mathematics using a different metric. This is a reported metric only and not included in the accountability system. SCDE reports the percentage of students within Lexile and Quintile ranges to document that students are “on track” to college and career readiness. SCDE provides a sample student report.

The high school College & Career Readiness indicator includes a number of metrics. For demonstration of college readiness, students can earn points for scores on ACT, SAT, AP exams, IB exams, and dual credit coursework in specific subject areas. SCDE makes an argument that student selection and student-specific evidence is critical to the validity of the measure. SCDE describes the validity and reliability for these college-ready measures in the table on pages 50-52. SCDE or LEAs provide funding for student participation for all of these to ensure access. The Career Readiness indicators also has several ways students can demonstrate success: WorkKeys, ASVAB, completion of a Career and Technical Education program. SCDE describes the validity, reliability and comparability for each of these. Total points for these measures are 25 points and calculated in a similar way and roll up to a summative rating.

Positive & Effective Learning Environment

Lastly, SCDE describes a school quality indicator as measuring the Positive & Effective Learning Environment measured for grades 3-12. The tool, a student engagement survey, to gather this information is not yet developed or purchased. Once the tool is administered, the results will be provided by all students and for each subgroup. SCDE is still determining how points will be earned on the student engagement survey, but will be choosing between and comparison to a national benchmark vs a quintile/decile within state comparison.

<i>Strengths</i>	<p>SCDE provides extensive and comprehensive documentation regarding their student success indicators. They are explicit with their definitions and methodology. SCDE’s College &amp; Career Indicator for high school acknowledges the multiple pathways students can take to become prepared to enter the workforce and college.</p> <p>SCDE uses research to demonstrate why this measure is important and why it</p>
------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	has selected a student survey to measure positive learning environments as a measure of school quality.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	There is a lot of information for stakeholders to understand; SCDE's plan might benefit from some concrete examples to describe the indicators.  Because SCDE has not yet developed its survey, it should ensure that the survey appropriately measures school quality.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

##### A.4.v.a: State's System of Annual Meaningful Differentiation

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	A weighted point system for measuring annual meaningful differentiation is in place for all schools. Indicators from the State's accountability system are weighted with appropriate differences between elementary, middle, and high schools. SCDE describes the indicators and their point values for schools with an EL n-size of 20 or more and schools with an EL student population of less than 20. Three reviewers found adequate evidence to support that SCDE's system includes performance of all subgroups in the State on an annual basis.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Two reviewers determined that SCDE is not clear how the system of annual meaningful differentiation will include performance of each subgroup of students on each of the indicators in the state's accountability system. One reviewer indicated that SCDE did not meet the requirements due to this lack of clarity. The other reviewer found that the lack of clarity was not significant enough to find that SCDE failed to meet the requirement.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet</i>	SCDE must clarify how the system of annual meaningful differentiation will include performance of each subgroup of students on each of the indicators in its accountability system.

*this requirement*

**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>	SCDE clearly describes the weighting of their indicators, including a graphic to visually represent its response. Final summative ratings will result from aggregating points from all the indicators using a weighted point index. Final summative ratings are labeled as: Excellent (substantially exceeds standards for progress), Good (exceeds), Average (meets), Below Average (below standard), and Unsatisfactory (fails to meet). For the elementary/middle schools, academic indicators are weighted 80% with 20% weighted for school quality. For high schools, academic indicators are weighted 60% with school quality as 40%. For both grade spans, EL progress is 10% of the calculation which is equal to or greater than any one of the school quality/success indicators.
<i>Strengths</i>	The graphic display of weighting makes for an easily read point system.  SCDE consistently describes the weighing of each indicator in its system of annual meaningful differentiation throughout its plan.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	One reviewer stated that while SCDE explains how the system for annual meaningful differentiation is adjusted for the schools without the ELP indicator, it does not explain how to adjust the weight if a school does not have any of the other indicators.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

**A.4.v.c: If Applicable, Different Methodology for Annual Meaningful Differentiation**

- If the SEA uses a different methodology or methodologies for annual meaningful differentiation than the one described in 4.v.a of the State’s plan for schools for which an accountability determination cannot be made (e.g., P-2 schools), does it describe the different methodology or methodologies,

including how the methodology or methodologies will be used to identify schools for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement?

- Does the SEA’s description of a different methodology indicate the type(s) of schools to which it applies?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>SCDE provides a table on page 64 of how all traditional public schools are included in the accountability system. SCDE uses a system of grade configurations to determine with which model each school will be held accountable. If the school has one grade beyond the traditional grades, it will be treated as the main school type for accountability purposes. If it has two grades beyond the traditional grades, it will either receive two report cards or one report card and one report only card not used for accountability purposes.</p> <p>SCDE also refers to schools that differ from the traditional accountability schools and indicate metrics are currently being developed. Information about the suggested accountability metrics for alternative schools is included in Appendix F.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	Producing two report cards allows for a more specific determination of school success and differentiation. It also provides a means for potentially including all students in reporting.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>It is not clear why SCDE cannot apply the accountability framework to the schools listed in Appendix F.</p> <p>The methodologies for measuring accountability for other schools have not been finalized.</p> <p>SCDE has not clearly described how the alternatively measured schools will be identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.</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>SCDE must clearly articulate why the schools listed in Appendix F cannot be measured by the accountability framework described in 4.v.a. Additionally, SCDE must provide a plan with approved alternative methodologies.</p> <p>SCDE must clearly describe how the alternatively measured schools will be identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.</p>

**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>SCDE will use the weighted index to identify both Priority Schools and Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Priority Schools will include the bottom 10% of Title I and non-Title I schools, schools with &lt;70% graduation rate, and Title I schools with chronically low-performing subgroups. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools are a subset of the Priority Schools and include the bottom 5% of Title I schools and schools with &lt;70% graduation rate.</p> <p>SCDE includes the year in which it will first identify these schools on page 67 of the plan. Schools will first be identified in the 2017-18 school year.</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.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>SCDE will identify all schools (both Title I and non-Title I high schools) in need of comprehensive support and improvement if their 4-year graduation rate is less than 70%. This will capture more than the required one-third. SCDE includes the year in which it will first identify these schools on page 67 of the plan. Schools will first be identified in the 2017-18 school year.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	SCDE’s identification of no more than 30% failing to graduate is more rigorous than the required one third or more.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the</i>	

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

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>	Title I schools identified for additional targeted support and improvement due to low performing subgroups who do not meet exit criteria after 6 years ( <i>i.e.</i> , two cycles aligned to the state’s 3-year interim targets) will be considered CSI schools with chronically low performing subgroups, ( <i>i.e.</i> , schools with subgroups performing as low as ALL students in the highest performing CSI schools in the bottom 5% in graduation rate, college and career readiness, and student engagement for 6 years).  SCDE identifies these schools if they have not demonstrated improvement after 6 years or two cycles aligned to the state 3-year interim targets.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	SCDE should provide some detail about what constitutes improvement to be more transparent.
<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.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>	SCDE will identify Priority and CSI schools every three years. The baseline will be 2017 results, and identified schools will enter their planning year

	(2017-18). Beginning in 2020, the 3-year cycles will align with interim target dates.
<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>	SCDE defines consistently underperforming subgroups as those which are performing in the bottom 10 % across all accountability metrics. Three consecutive years of being identified as an underperforming subgroup will trigger a designation of Targeted Support and Improvement schools. SCDE will make its initial identification of schools in November of 2018. Schools with one or more historically underperforming subgroups performing at or below the bottom 10% of schools across all accountability measures for three consecutive years are defined as consistently underperforming. SCDE will identify these schools on an annual basis but will identify consistently underperforming groups every three years.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The methodology does not clearly state whether all indicators are included in the annual meaning differentiation model.  SCDE uses different terms with several, potentially confusing and/or conflicting definitions (e.g., consistently underperforming subgroups, underperforming subgroups, chronic low-performing subgroups, historically under-achieving groups). For example, it defines consistently underperforming subgroups differently: one on page 66 (bottom 5%) and one on page 67 (bottom 10%). SCDE should clarify its definition. SCDE also lists a focus school designation without any explanation. This section is quite confusing.
<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>	SCDE must differentiate and clearly and consistently define its terms, as well as its timeline for annual identification. SCDE must then apply that definition

<i>or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	to its methodology for annual identification of targeted support and improvement.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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>SCDE will identify schools for additional targeted support if one or more subgroups on its own would lead to identification using the state’s methodology for identifying low-performing subgroups. SCDE defines a school with low-performing subgroup(s) as a school with one or more subgroups performing at or below the performance of all students in the highest performing 5% of comprehensive support and improvement in achievement, growth, preparing for success, graduation rate, college career readiness and positive and effective learning environment.</p> <p>Schools will be identified from among all public schools in the state. First identification will occur in November of 2017 and the designation will apply for three years.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>SCDE does not base its criteria for identification for additional targeted support and intervention on all indicators.</p> <p>Based on the definition of low performing schools, it is not clear that all schools in which the performance of any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification of one of the lowest-performing 5% will be identified for additional targeted support and improvement.</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</i>	SCDE must include all indicators, such as ELP, in its criteria for identification for additional targeted support.

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	N/A
<i>Strengths</i>	
<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.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>	SCDE has identified factors to meet the 95% participation rates. Schools that do not have 95% of students participating in state testing for mathematics, reading/language arts, and federally required grades for science: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May not receive the highest rating in achievement or in the summative rating.</li> <li>• Must develop a plan monitored by the SCDE to test 95%.</li> <li>• Will have a zero (0) factored into the achievement rating for all students and subjects not tested.</li> <li>• May have Title I funds reduced if the problem persists for more than one year.</li> </ul>
<i>Strengths</i>	Punitive measures may serve as incentive for increased participation.
<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</i>	

*an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement*

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>Exit criteria for elementary or middle schools exiting CSI status is based on one of two accomplishments, related to summative score and growth indicators, and identified subgroup performance. It should be noted that some of these criteria are not criteria in which elementary and middle schools are assessed for accountability (e.g., graduation rate).</p> <p>High schools can exit CSI status with a final summative score above the bottom 5% of all school and a 3% increase in the number of points earned in the college and career readiness indicator; achieving a graduation rate that is 70% or higher and a 3% increase in the number of points earned in the college and career readiness indicator; the identified subgroup’s performance moves above the all student category in the highest performing CSI school in achievement, growth, preparing for success, graduation rate, college and career reading, and positive and effective learning environment and increases by 3% in number of points on the college and career readiness indicator. It is not clear whether these criteria are all required or whether high schools only need to meet one set of the listed criteria in order to exit from CSI status.</p> <p>2017 baseline results will determine planning year for CSI designated schools.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>These exit criteria emphasize priority areas for SCDE and demonstrate required performance to exit CSI status.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The criteria for exiting CSI status is unclear, including the fact that SCDE has not included the number of year within which schools are expected to meet such criteria.</p> <p>Additionally, it is unclear whether a school may still meet the criteria under which it was identified, despite the fact that it met a portion of the exit criteria.</p> <p>Elementary school/middle school (ES/MS) exit criteria includes indicators that are not used with those grade levels as part of the accountability plan.</p>

Did the SEA meet all requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	<p>SCDE must identify the number of years within which schools are expected to meet the criteria.</p> <p>SCDE must review and update the elements for exit criteria for both ES/MS and high school (HS) due to misalignment and lack of clarity.</p>

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>SCDE describes two sets of exit criteria both differentiated for ES/MS and HS in this section, for schools to exit Additional Targeted Support Status and for schools to exit Targeted Support and Improvement because of consistently underperforming subgroups. For example, for ES/MS, exit criteria from Additional Targeted Support status requires the identified subgroup performance to move above the ALL students’ performance in the bottom five percent of the highest performing schools identified for comprehensive support in Achievement and Growth. For high schools, performance must be above the bottom five percent of the highest performing CSI schools in Achievement and College and Career Readiness.</p> <p>For schools identified for TSI because of consistently underperforming subgroups in ES/MS to exit, the identified subgroup(s) three-year average performance must be above the three-year average performance of all students group in the highest performing school in the bottom 5% in Achievement and Growth. For high schools, performance must be above the 3-year average in Achievement and College and Career Readiness.</p> <p>SCDE does not provide the expected number of years that a school should exit the designation. SCDE also does not demonstrate alignment of exit criteria with long-term goals and measurements of interim progress.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	SCDE should consider describing the alignment of the exit criteria to the state’s long term goals.

	<p>The description does not include the number of years within which schools are expected to meet such criteria.</p> <p>It is unclear whether these criteria will ensure continued progress; SCDE may want to consider more rigorous criteria to ensure such progress.</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>SCDE must include the number of years within which schools are expected to meet such criteria.</p>

**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>SCDE will require schools that fail to meet the state’s exit criteria within 3 years to amend their School Renewal plans to include evidence-based interventions as described in ESSA and the SCDE Tiered Support and Intervention Metrics. Schools are assigned a tier depending on academic achievement, length of time identified as low performing, accreditation status and financial risk status. Schools can be assigned a Tier 1 to Tier 4 with Tier 4 being the most intense and directed intervention. The Tiers also correspond to the degree of evidence required although all schools are encouraged to choose practices that require the highest level of evidence. Transformation Coaches will monitor the fidelity of implementation.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>SCDE has a clear system for requiring additional support to schools through the tiered system, requiring more rigorous interventions for more intensive needs, as outlined in amended School Renewal Plans. This process grants schools autonomy to determine their community’s resources for supporting low-performing groups and for identifying their interventions.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>SCDE should provide some description of the transformation coaches.</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.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>	SCDE has identified the importance of monitoring and reviewing resource allocation and will conduct a needs assessment every three years aligned to the interim target periods. This will address resource inequity in each LEA serving a significant number of SCI or TSI schools. A comparison will be made with schools that do not have a significant percentage of schools identified for CSI or TSI. This assessment will include an examination of the allocation and use of resources; the equity of resource distribution to need; the ability of the LEA to ensure appropriate levels of funding and sustainability of resources; and evidence of long-range capital and resource planning effectiveness.
<i>Strengths</i>	SCDE has identified several key elements for examination when determining whether resource allocation supports school improvement in each LEA serving a significant number of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	SCDE does not specify how it will identify which districts serve a significant number of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.
<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>	The technical assistance that the SCDE will provide for those school districts with significant numbers of schools identified for support and improvement is evidence-based and varied. These include the following: a diagnostic system/LEA review, governance and leadership capacity review, revision of renewal plan, SEA and contracted services for PK, support to mitigate financial risk, an SEA appointed support liaison, evaluation of results to determine effectiveness of interventions, and SEA guidance on evidence-based practices. SCDE provides a number of research and best practice print

	<p>resources as well. CSI schools also will receive additional funds to assist with their improvement efforts, including specific funds allocated to the Office of School Transformation within SCDE to support statewide improvement initiatives tied to the needs assessments.</p> <p>SCDE provides information about how the funds for technical assistance will be allocated across the SEA, LEAs and schools statewide.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Evaluation will be done annually. All strategies are aligned to student outcomes and the guidelines provided through state-approved evidence.</p> <p>The technical assistance is likely to improve student outcomes by identifying state-approved evidence-based interventions; supporting LEAs in the development and implementation of support and improvement plans; and differentiating technical assistance.</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>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SCDE will evaluate the results of the district strategic and school renewal plan targets annually to determine the effectiveness of the interventions on achievement and growth. A review of interim targets for all students and subgroups will be conducted as well. LEAs may be eligible for special project funds to assist with their improvement efforts. Technical assistance may be provided by different offices with the SEA or professional development designed by different offices within the SEA.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	SCDE’s additional improvement support was described in broad strokes; more detail could be provided to clarify what specific strategies might be employed.
<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.5: Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators (ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B))**

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SCDE outlines its commitment to ensuring that all students are taught by effective, in-field, and experienced teachers. Each designation of teacher is described and defined. Data indicates that some disproportionality exists within Title I schools (baseline 16-17 year data is provided in Appendix E).</p> <p>Methods for ensuring these teachers are in the classroom include the establishment of a multi-agency State Human Capital Team to address the root causes of disproportionate rates. Beginning in fall 2018, an annual report called Access to Educators Report will be made public on the SCDE website. The report will contain yearly data aggregated across the three levels of reporting categories, progress compared to the prior year, evaluation of strategies, and plans for future strategies based on data analysis. The report will be available on the SEA website. The three levels of reporting categories will be indicated within schools Title I schools, between Title I and non-Title I school and across all schools.</p> <p>LEAs with Title I schools that show significant discrepancies will be required to address that data in their strategic plans, including by conducting a needs assessment and identifying specific targeted strategies to address the root causes of such disproportionality. Professional development and technical assistance may also be provided to schools to prevent within-school disproportionality. In addition, the SCDE is partnering with other state agencies to support initiatives to ensure that low-income and minority students</p>

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

	are not served by these categories of teachers at disproportionate rates.
<i>Strengths</i>	SCDE is being transparent with their data regarding these rates of disproportionality.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	While SCDE technically meets the criteria as defined in the statute, it should calculate a measure of disproportionality between Title I schools and non-Title I schools (and not among only Title I schools) to determine a rate that more appropriately reflects the rate of disproportionality.  Families who may be impacted by these categories of teachers may not have awareness of or access to the online report.
<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.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>SCDE demonstrates a commitment to improve school conditions by reducing bullying and harassment, reducing discipline practices that remove students from the classroom, and reducing the use of aversive behavioral interventions.</p> <p>As part of their Safe School Climate Act, and through collaboration with other entities, LEAs are required to adopt policies that promote anti-bullying. To provide districts representatives with information about various anti-bully strategies, the SCDE, in collaboration with the U.S. Attorney’s Office, has been sponsoring an Anti-Bullying Summit annually.</p> <p>To encourage students who have behavioral or academic challenges that prevent them from benefitting from regular school programs or may be interfering with the learning of others, alternative school programs are made available in all districts; this program has seen significant success in continued student enrollment and in the graduation rate. Additional support for LEAs includes providing information on Internet safety through the SCDE-created Cyber Security Task Force, and providing School Resource Officers with relevant training. SCDE also makes available up to \$4 million annually in</p>

	competitive grants to districts for the use to meet the requirements of SC’s Education and Economic Development Act of 2005 (EEDA), which requires schools to implement evidence-based strategies designed to mitigate at-risk academic or behavioral characteristics.
<i>Strengths</i>	SCDE has identified many supports to create safe school conditions for students.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	SCDE is vague about its support for classroom teachers that would enable educators to target students in need of support in a timely manner.  SCDE’s description of school climate work does not include how it will support LEAs to reduce the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety.
<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>	SCDE must specifically address how it will support LEAs to reduce the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety.

#### **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>	SCDE provides a tremendous amount of information related to supporting students and their families through additional initiatives in this section to demonstrate that it seeks to ensure student engagement and decrease the risk of students dropping out. The response includes assistance provided to schools and LEAs receiving Title I Part A funds, as well as those not receiving Title I.  Initiatives address: early learning, guidance and counseling, career and technical education (Programs of Study), migratory students, children and youth experiencing homelessness, ELs, children with disabilities, at-risk students, foster care students, virtual/online coursework, gifted and talented students, family and community engagement, and adult education. Within each of these categories, there are several different programs profiled.
<i>Strengths</i>	SCDE’s description of how it supports all schools, including Title I schools, in meeting the needs of students at all levels of schooling is thorough and addresses many different points of possible disengagement for students.
<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)

*If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement*

## 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>SCDE has standardized procedures for both entrance and exit criteria, which are supplemented through the required EL Accommodation Plans which LEAs are required to have in place for all qualifying EL students. These plans are student specific and ensure support for the student at each grade level K–12, until they meet “fully English proficient” status based on the state criteria.</p> <p>A Home Language Survey is administered to all students enrolling in grades K-12. If the student’s first language is not English, an LEA must administer, within the first 30 days of school, an initial language proficiency screener – WIDA-ACCESS. The results from the initial test determine if a student is placed into an EL program.</p> <p>Exit from an EL program is based on a standardized, common (across the state) score on ACCESS (i.e., score of 4.4 on English proficiency with no sub-domain below 4.0). In addition, the SCDE requires that LEAs monitor exited students to ensure support is maintained for those students who may still need assistance after exiting a formal EL program.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The SCDE requires that all ELs exited from the program continue to be monitored for a number of years to ensure success in the regular school program.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>SCDE does not include information about how it conducted timely and meaningful consultation with LEAs representing the geographic diversity of the state.</p> <p>While this response indicates that students shall be monitored for four years after exiting EL status, on p. 84, the plan indicates that this period lasts for two years. SCDE should clarify this inconsistency.</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>	SCDE must include information about how it conducted timely and meaningful consultation with LEAs representing the geographic diversity of the state in determining its entrance and exit procedures.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>SCDE supports ELs by monitoring LEAs to ensure that federal Office of Civil Rights (OCR) obligations are met for all EL students, which include that retention of EL students cannot be based on language proficiency. All LEAs must have supporting evidence of EL retentions to show that language was not a deciding factor in retention. In addition, students must be allowed to complete coursework to earn a high school diploma until their 21st birthday.</p> <p>The SC Title III program office in the SEA provides program monitoring, fiscal training and monitoring through professional development opportunities. The office conducts periodic desk audits and onsite monitoring visits. LEAs are monitored for compliance. On-site visits are conducted on a 3-year rotational basis. The Title III program office also coordinates services across offices within the SEA to ensure an integration of services for the LEAs. SCDE will be offering professional development to improve the skills of teachers and school leaders in identifying ELs and providing effective instruction to ELs. The professional development opportunities will be based on LEA feedback as well as data regarding EL progress.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SCDE coordinates its training with offices beyond the SEA.</p> <p>Continuous support can be provided to EL students who are permitted to stay in school until 21 years of age.</p> <p>SCDE provides a comprehensive answer to this question, focusing on professional development, compliance audits and ongoing support.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	SCDE could be more specific in describing their professional development opportunities.
<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</i>	

<i>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 Office of Federal and State Accountability Special Populations, Title III is responsible for the oversight of the language instruction of ELs and immigrant students. This program engages in the following strategies to ensure successful language instruction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administers grant programs that help children develop proficiency in English and achieve high content standards;</li> <li>• Recommends policies and promotes best practices for meeting the needs of EL;</li> <li>• Strengthens collaboration and coordination among federal, state, and local programs serving EL; and</li> <li>• Monitors funded programs and provides technical assistance that addresses outcomes and accountability.</li> </ul> <p>SCDE provides desk review and onsite monitoring visits. If, during the review, it is found that an LEA is not being effective based on performance, the SEA director of the Office of Federal and State Accountability will work with the Title III Coordinator to act to help the LEA improve. The actions will be tailored based on the school and the identified needs and may include mandatory attendance at SCDE sponsored professional development, individualized assistance in lesson planning, and professional development from the State EL coordinator.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	While SCDE meets the criteria, SCDE provides very little detail or specifics about monitoring and assisting LEAs.
<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>	