

# STATE PLAN PEER REVIEW CRITERIA Peer Review Notes Template

---

STATE: Utah



**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>	The State asserts that barriers to on-grade level and above-grade level courses have been eliminated for all students, including elimination of tracking in middle school, adoption of an integrated approach to mathematics in K-12, and all students having access to the state’s rigorous mathematics standards at or above grade level. In addition, there is an increased number of students taking AP and IB and concurrent enrollment coursework in eleventh and twelfth grades. (p 7)
<i>Strengths</i>	The state ensures that ALL students have grade level or above access to the state’s rigorous math standards.  Instruction is either on grade level or beyond, no limitations requiring grade level only and EoC assessments are allowed/provided for accountability purposes, which support this description.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	No evidence provided to support the statement “all students are prepared for

<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).

	<p>Secondary Math I by ninth grade.”</p> <p>Data regarding if this is already in place and whether or not they are actually seeing an increased number of students enrolled in AP or IB or “concurrent enrollment” is not provided. Also, they do not define “concurrent enrollment”.</p>
<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 specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

**A.3.i: Definition**

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>This state defines “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population” as any native language other than English spoken by five percent or more of the participating student population statewide (those in grades which take the statewide assessments). Spanish is noted as the only language that is spoken by five percent or more of the student statewide population with the greatest percentage of students (five percent or more) speaking Spanish at grades 3-5. Additionally, the State identified two LEAs in which students speak a language other than Spanish at 25% (Navaho) and 19% (Somali).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Utah provides data on 6 different native languages with Navajo, Vietnamese and Arabic accounting for less than .25% of the participating student population. In addition, data was analyzed at the LEA level with just 2 LEAs that have over 5% of their students speaking a language other than English or Spanish. Interestingly, the grade level data for which statewide assessment is administered revealed the highest percent of Spanish speaking students in</p>

	grades 3, 4, and 5 ranging from 7.9% to 9.5%.  The State provided data that supports their findings. These data should inform the State's efforts to provide appropriate supports to students proficient in these languages when taking the state's assessments.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	While the non-English percentages are low, Utah did not describe how it considered languages other than English that are spoken by distinct populations of English learners, including English learners who are migratory, English learners who were not born in the United States, and English learners who are Native Americans.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	This state should describe how the state 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 when making a determination regarding the language(s) spoken by five percent or more of the state-assessed student population.

### 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>	The State specifies that assessments are not administered in languages other than English. The plan states that an accommodation for Spanish speakers is provided through an on-demand Spanish glossary translation for each subject. Also, both American Sign Language and Braille assessments are available. (p 8)
<i>Strengths</i>	The state administers one assessment, Student Assessment of Growth and Excellence (SAGE), that has an on-demand Spanish glossary translation for every subject. In addition, the test is administered in Braille and American Sign Language, as needed.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Only an on-demand translation for Spanish is available, but nothing is stated regarding if translation dictionaries are provided for other languages.
<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 specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

### A.3.iii: Assessments not Available and Needed

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The state mentions that Spanish is the only language for which annual state-wide assessments are not available and may be needed, especially in grades 3-5, where at least five percent of the student population speaks Spanish. (pp 9)
<i>Strengths</i>	This state identified, based on their data, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	While the data this state provided made it clear that Spanish is the language most needed for the entire state, they also provided information showing both Navajo and Somali are significant at the LEA level. Even if tests are not provided for just these LEAs, the state should clarify what additional resources will be provided for these students.
<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 specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

### A.3.iv: Efforts to Develop Assessments

- Does the SEA describe how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, as defined by the SEA and identified under A.3.i of the consolidated State plan template?
- Does the SEA’s description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population include the State’s plan and timeline for developing such assessments?
- Does the SEA’s description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population include a description of the process the State used to:
  - 1) gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English;
  - 2) collect and respond to public comment; and
  - 3) consult with educators, parents and families of English learners, students, as appropriate, and other stakeholders?
- If applicable, does the SEA’s description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population include an explanation of the reasons (e.g., legal barriers) the State has not been able to complete the development of such assessments despite making every effort?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	While no effort has been made to develop State assessments in languages other than English, the State has devoted significant time and resources to the development of 27 adaptive state assessments since 2014. The state’s “Title

	<p>III ESSA Workgroup” administered a survey on the accountability of English Language Acquisition to a wide variety of stakeholders, including teachers, administrators, parents and members of community-based organizations, government and businesses from throughout the state. There were 994 responses received. 85 percent of the respondents indicated that developing state assessments in languages other than English is a priority. The state plans to continue to collect stakeholder feedback via the State Board of Ed’s Technical Advisory Committee and Assessment and Accountability Policy Advisory Committee. The state did not include a timeline for developing assessments in languages other than English. This state’s plan does address the need for the ACT to accommodate English learners when taking the test in Grade 11. This state does not present a plan to develop assessments for speakers of Navajo or Somali, the languages identified to be significant at the LEA level. Considerations and barriers include not only cost, but the ability to translate at the same level of cognitive complexity which requires further research and study. (pp 9-10)</p>
<p><i>Strengths</i></p>	<p>This state notes that Spanish assessments may be needed and is considering development of assessments in grades 3-5. The state also notes that ACT is administered to all students in grade 11 (a component of the state’s accountability model) and starting in fall of 2017 will include accommodations for qualified English learners including instructions in Spanish and bilingual glossary.</p> <p>The state sought extensive stakeholder feedback regarding the accountability of the English Language Acquisition.</p> <p>Responders to this state’s survey included representatives from key stakeholder groups. This state will continue to consult with its Technical Advisory Committee throughout the development of its state assessments</p> <p>Researching the inclusion of at least Spanish and working to ensure the same levels of cognitive complexity are maintained in the translated versions. The use of ACT and its inclusion of supports for more than just Spanish is a plus.</p>
<p><i>Weaknesses</i></p>	<p>The plan to consider developing Spanish assessments is vague. While it is noted that the SAGE assessment could involve both translation and adaptation, and the State Board is committed to engaging in a “thoughtful process to produce valid results,” there is no information regarding how or when such exploration will begin and proceed. In addition, because this state presents all content in grades K-12 in English, developing assessments in Spanish is a concern.</p> <p>Only Spanish is being considered and no mention of either Navajo or Somali are indicated.</p>
<p><i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s))</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))</p>
<p><i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet</i></p>	<p>This state should present a plan and timeline for creating assessments in languages that are present to a significant extent, including how it will overcome the identified barriers to developing assessments in other languages.</p>

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

**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>	This state lists each major racial and ethnic group as subgroups in its accountability system: American Indian, African American, White, Pacific Islander, Asian, Hispanic, and Multiracial students (p. 11).
<i>Strengths</i>	The state included all major subgroups of students as subgroups in its accountability system.
<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 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>	NA; This state includes no additional student subgroups beyond those required (p. 11).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<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 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>	[ NA ] This state selected exception option “ii” for recently arrived English learners. The State will exclude recently arrived English learners from proficiency and growth calculations in the accountability system in the first year of enrollment, include these students in the second year of enrollment, and include the third year and thereafter(p 11).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<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 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>	This state will continue to use an n-size of 10 which has been set by the State Board of Ed for use in accountability calculations for all student groups (p 12).
<i>Strengths</i>	The methodology is described in the State Board of Ed’s Accountability Technical Manual. This state’s decision to use a small n-size will ensure subgroups are identified for resources and not lost “in the shuffle”.

<i>Weaknesses</i>	One reviewer indicated a size this small could also cause resources to be stretched thin for schools that are already struggling financially.
<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 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>	This State references the National Center for Educational Statistics as the statistical soundness of using an n-size of 10 (p 12).
<i>Strengths</i>	The National Center for Educational Statistics, a respected authority, indicates that a n-size of 10 is acceptable. As of 2010, the most common n-size among states is a minimum n-size of 10 (pg. 12).  Student privacy will be maintained, and reliability will be ensured when 10 or more student's results are represented in each subgroup.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	One reviewer indicates a concern about using a value less than 30 since a minimum of 30 implies higher statistical soundness, thus a smaller margin of error.
<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 specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

---

<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.

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>	This state used various stakeholder groups to review the impact of n-sizes varying from 10 to 30 and then used data to inform and determine the decision to use 10 such that the maximum number of subgroups could be reported while maintaining privacy and statistical soundness (p 12).
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA involved stakeholders in the determination of the minimum N size and they appropriately compared N sizes of 30 and 10 to determine maximum reporting opportunities and reliability while maintaining student privacy.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	One reviewer indicated a concern about using a value less than 30 could also impact feasibility of providing services for even more schools when budgets are limited and an increased risk of protected student information being released exists.
<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 specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA adequately described how it will ensure that the minimum number of students will protect the privacy of individual students through the use of NCES practices. Both primary - and complementary - suppression controls will prevent the disclosure of pupil identifying information (pp 13-14).
<i>Strengths</i>	The model aligns with the National Center for Education Statistics methodology which is described in detail for groups of students from 300 or more students, 100 or more students, 41 or more students, 21 or more students, and groups of 11 to 20 (pgs. 13-14).
<i>Weaknesses</i>	

---

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA’s minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is equal to the minimum number of students for accountability purposes and it is consistent with the requirements in ESEA section 1111(i) with respect to privacy and statistical reliability ( p 14).
<i>Strengths</i>	Utah’s minimum number of students for reporting is consistent with ESEA requirements.
<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 specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.iii: Establishment of Long-Term Goals (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A))

A.4.iii.a: Academic Achievement (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(aa))

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

- Does the SEA identify (*i.e.*, by providing a numeric measure) and describe the long-term goals for all students for improved academic achievement, as measured by grade-level proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (which must apply the same academic achievement standards to all public school students in the State, except those with the most significant cognitive disabilities)?
- Does the SEA identify and describe long-term goals for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA’s description include baseline data for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA’s description include the timeline for meeting the long-term goals?
- Is the timeline the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Are the long-term goals ambitious?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	This state has set a 5 year goal of cutting each content area (Math and Ela) deficiency rate by 1/3 for Grades 3-8 as well as the composite ACT score for Grade 11 in HS. The goals for each subject are identified in charts to show the base line data as well as the expected change after 5 years for each subgroup. They use the percentile rank currently able to achieve the 5 year goal for Ela (92 percentile), math (89 percentile), and ACT (85 percentile) to indicate why this state believes the goal is ambitious and will be the focus of the State Board of Ed's Strategic Plan (pp 14-17).
<i>Strengths</i>	These long-term goals are measurable and result in differentiated increase in proficiency, reducing the academic proficiency gap across subgroups. This state includes ACT data in the accountability system. Baseline data and the timeline are included; goals appear to be ambitious given the number of schools currently able to attain such a level.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	One reviewer identified the concern that a generic decrease using the same process which leads to such a significant required change in only 5 years, without providing any data regarding current or past trends may potentially be too unrealistic to be achieve. Goals should be ambitious, but attainable, to gain the necessary support to succeed.
<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 specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	This state provided baseline data (2016) and state long term (2022) goals for both ELA and mathematics.  The long term goals and yearly goals/benchmarks set for each subject and subgroup are found in Appendix A (p 114).
<i>Strengths</i>	The interim progress measurements indicate that each student subgroup will attain the long term goals within the timeline.
<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 specific information or clarification that an SEA must</i>	

<i>provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	
---	--

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Utah’s long term goals and measurements of interim progress require greater rates of improvement for subgroups of students who demonstrate lower academic proficiency (p 18).
<i>Strengths</i>	Long term goals are differentiated, directly address decreasing proficiency gaps among groups of students, and require greater rates of improvements for lower performing subgroups.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	One reviewer indicated that while the reduction of the deficit of 1/3 may shrink the gaps among subgroups, there will continue to be an academic proficiency gap among student subgroups.  Information about the current trends of performance is not provided and thus the feasibility of setting such ambitious goals for such a short time frame is a concern.
<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 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>	This state plans to cut the graduation deficit by one-third over the next 6 years for all students as well as subgroups. Base line data as well as long term goals

	are provided for the 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and each subgroup, along with the long-term timeline of 2022. With the current grad rate being 85%, this means the state will hit the 90% threshold should they meet this goal. Some populations will be required to make big gains to decrease by 1/3 non-graduates. The goals are extremely ambitious and, if met, could put the state in the top fifth percentile in the country (pp 18-19).
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The state has a current graduation rate of 85.2 percent and is seeking 90.1 percent graduation rate over the next 6 years. Thus, the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate appear to be ambitious.</p> <p>The process is consistent with performance on Ela, math, and ACT and the goal may be possible if plans for implementation are currently in the works given that the first graduating class to have to meet this goal are currently in middle school, and thus, with proper guidance and supports, this is do-able.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	One reviewer indicated that although the graduation rate will increase across all subgroups and the reduction of the deficit of 1/3 may shrink the gaps, there will continue to be graduation rate disparities among subgroups.
<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 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>	[NA] This state did not include extended year graduation rates in the ESSA plan.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<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.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>	Yearly goals/benchmarks are identified in Appendix A for each subgroup showing the growth needed to attain the long term goal set for 2022. (p 114)
<i>Strengths</i>	Long term goals for graduation rates are differentiated, directly address decreasing gaps among groups of students, and require greater rates of improvement for subgroups with lower graduation rates.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	One reviewer indicated that although the long term goals could be met if the interim progress measurements are attained, there will continue to be gaps among student subgroups in the graduation rates.
<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 specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for the four-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, and require greater rates of improvement for subgroups of students that graduate from high school at lower rates. For example, while the goal of reducing the graduation

	deficit by one-third for all students and student groups is the same for all subgroups, the “All” student subgroup four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate must improve by 4.9 percentage points and the Students with Disabilities subgroup four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate must improve by 9.9 percentage points. By applying the same process of reducing the number of students not graduating by 1/3 for each subgroup the state is setting an ambitious goal such that the more struggling populations will need to work harder to meet this same rate of improvement. Concern if goal is too ambitious for some of the more struggling populations ( p 20) .
<i>Strengths</i>	Long term goals are differentiated, directly address decreasing graduation rate gaps among groups of students, and require greater rates of improvements for lower graduation rate subgroups. A similar process is being applied across the different subgroups and indicators allows for easier interpretation and tracking.
<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 specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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>	This state’s long term ELL proficiency goal is to increase the percentage of students making progress toward EL proficiency to the level of performance of a school currently performing at the 75th percentile in the next 6 years, which is different than how the long term goals will be determined for proficiency and graduation rate. The state notes baseline data shows 57% of grades 3-8 students making adequate progress and 31% of high school students making adequate progress. The state does not include a timeline for ELs to achieve proficiency (p 20).
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA recognizes that younger students learn a new language faster than older students. Thus, it makes sense that the long-term improvement goal for

	elementary/middle school students is to improve by 16% points over the baseline while the long-term improvement goal for high school students is to improve by nine percentage points over the baseline.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Although in high schools, where English language proficiency is lower, this state has lower expectations for increased English language proficiency. It is noted, however, that for English learners, a higher academic proficiency attainment in both reading language arts and mathematics was expected in all grades. Ultimately the concern is that a long term goal of 40 percent proficiency for the high school isn't ambitious enough.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Utah should set ambitious goals for English Language students to achieve English proficiency.(p 117).

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>	Interim progress for ELP is limited to two grade bands: 1) elementary/middle and 2) high school. See Appendix A (p 114).
<i>Strengths</i>	The State Board of Ed provides adequate measurements of interim progress that can be used to mark progress toward attaining this long-term goal.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The measurements of interim progress need slight adjustment to align with Utah's stated goals of 73% and 40% proficient. There is a concern regarding how ambitious this is, especially for high school students who only have to go from 30.7% English proficiency to 39.8%. While language acquisition at the high school level is much more rigorous than in the lower grades, this is still considerably lower than 50%.
<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 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>	This state currently administers SAGE in grades 3-10 and uses English language arts and mathematics grade level proficiency as the achievement indicator to measure a school’s students’ performance relative to an established standard of proficiency. Points are allocated based in proportion to the percentage (p.29) of students who score proficient or above on the statewide assessments, SAGE. Beginning this school year, Utah will continue to administer SAGE to students in grades 3-8, administer an assessment that is predictive of a student’s success on the ACT to students in grades 9-10, and administer the ACT to students in grade 11. Use of the SAGE in grades 3-8 is valid and reliable for this indicator. However, it is not clear if the ACT success-predictor assessments that will be administered in grades 9-10 are valid and reliable for the purpose of measuring this indicator. Utah’s long-term goals also pertain to student academic proficiency in English language arts and mathematics. The application of this indicator can be disaggregated for each subgroup of students, although this is not explicitly stated in Utah’s plan. Additionally, a measure of student growth is included for each public high school, measured by the annual statewide English language arts and mathematics assessments. However, based on the new assessments that will be administered in high school, it is not stated if the same process will be applied (p 21).
<i>Strengths</i>	Proficiency levels for the state assessments were established through a rigorous standards setting process involving a wide variety of stakeholder to ensure it is consistent with the state’s long-term goals.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The state indicates that it will factor the requirement for 95% student participation in statewide assessments into the accountability system by publishing the school’s participation rate on a school’s report card. However,

	the participation rate calculated for reporting purposes will include students who do not participate in an assessment due to parent opt out provisions prescribed in state law (page 41). Another concern is how a growth measure will be applied to the new assessments that will be administered in high school and if these new assessments are valid and reliable for this purpose. The description does not indicate that it measures the performance of at least 95 percent of all students and 95 percent of all students in each subgroup.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Ensure that the state complies with the federal requirement that says a school must annually measure the achievement of not less than 95% of all students and 95% of all students in each subgroup who are enrolled in public schools.  Provide a clear description of how the growth measure for the high school will be applied, that high school assessments are valid and reliable for this purpose, and that they will be administered in high school beginning this school year.  Clarify how student performance is calculated in a consistent manner for all schools including those schools classified as alternative schools or schools who primarily serve students with disabilities.

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>	This state will continue its practice of using student growth in the state accountability system for all schools that are not high schools by including it as the Other Academic indicator. SAGE will be used to calculate growth for students in grades 4-8. The state will calculate an Adequate Growth Percentile (AGP) for each student based on a three-year timeline and convert the AGP to a Student Growth Target (SGT). The SGT is equivalent to a scale score on statewide assessment. A Student Growth Percentile (SGP), a measure of the

	amount of growth students make on a statewide assessment compared to their academic peers, will be calculated for each student. The same indicator will be applied to all subgroups of students and will be calculated the same way (measured as growth between two points in time) (p 22).
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The Student Growth Percentile methodology is valid and reliable and understood by educators, parents, and students.</p> <p>The SEA’s plan to measure student growth includes a comparison to each student’s academic peers.</p> <p>SGPs are deemed to be valid and reliable ways of calculating growth on state assessments for students.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>It is unclear how the growth indicator is applied to alternative schools and schools for students with disabilities that serve students who are not in high school.</p> <p>It is unclear when the targets are set and information about the stability of the process used by this state would be helpful.</p>
<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 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>	This state clearly describes the graduation rate indicator and emphasizes that the calculation is consistent for all high schools as well as that the indicator acts as a lagged indicator in that the graduation rate assigned for any given year is determined by the graduation rate from the prior year. Reliability of the reported graduation rate is ensured due to annual calculations and use of the federal 4-year adjusted cohort guidelines; validity is attained due to BOE rules that outline minimum graduation standards. Points awarded to schools in proportion to the percentage of students who graduate within four years and up to 10 percent of the points may be allocated to a school for the five-year cohort graduation rate. The graduation rate is also calculated in a manner that aligns to the long term goals with the purpose of incentivizing schools to improve their graduation rates (p 23).
<i>Strengths</i>	This state recognizes and accounts for five-year cohort graduates.  This indicator is aligned to the state’s long-term graduation goals and can be disaggregated for each subgroup of students.  This state uses the long term goals as an incentive for the schools plus the inclusion of 5th year graduates.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Clarity could be improved by including exactly how the 4-year rate is combined with the 5-year rate (e.g., up to 10 percentage points allocated p 23).
<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 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>	Utah’s accountability system includes progress in achieving English language proficiency as an indicator across all schools in the state with at least 10 English learners. The state uses the WIDA ACCESS for EL assessment and

	administers the assessment annually to all English learners in the state. The WIDA ACCESS is a valid and reliable EL proficiency assessment. Adequate progress toward ELP is defined as either achieving a score that is .4 proficiency levels higher than the previous year’s score or achieving a proficiency level of 5 or greater. Since no timeline was noted in A. 4. iii.c.1, it cannot be determined whether or not the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator is aligned with the State-determined timeline described in A.4.iii.c.1. The inclusion of students making progress in achieving English Language Proficiency is consistent with how this state includes subgroups for accountability calculations, a minimum of 10 (p 24).
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>All EL students are tested for achieving English language proficiency annually.</p> <p>The indicator as described is a valid and reliable measure of progress in achieving ELP and is consistent with Utah’s definition of English language proficiency.</p> <p>Clearly outlines how ELP students will be included and the inclusion is aligned with state law.</p>
<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 specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>This state describes a well thought out and forward thinking model of School Quality and Student Success using three distinct indicators:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Equitable Educational Opportunity. The indicator measures growth of the lowest performing 25 percent of students in a school. This indicator applies to all schools using the SGP methodology and allows for meaningful differentiation as points range from 5 out of 25 to 25 out of 25.</li> <li>2) Science Achievement and Growth. The indicator measures both science achievement and growth. The indicator is applied to all schools (grades 4-10) and is weighted equally to performance on English/language arts and mathematics assessments in the Utah accountability system. This indicator applies to all schools with students in any of grades 4 to 10 and can be disaggregated.</li> <li>3) Postsecondary Readiness. The indicator measures readiness coursework completion where points are awarded based on student grades in AP, IB, concurrent enrollment (is this Dual Credit?), or taking a career/technical ed pathway. ACT performance, and graduation rates. The measure is applied to all high schools and allows for meaningful differentiation using a point system which ranges from 1.3 out of 25 to 25 out of 25 (pp 24-29).</li> </ol>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The Equitable Educational Opportunity indicator is impressive as it focuses on growth among the lowest-performing students as a separate and distinct measurement instead of just focusing on only those students not proficient, which will vary by percentages and populations across schools.. The Science Achievement and Growth indicator indicates this state’s emphasis in accountability for science instruction and student learning. The inclusion of science allows for the state to focus on the application of English language arts and mathematics skills necessary and make the learning of both more meaningful. The Postsecondary Readiness indicator promotes preparation for transition from high school to multiple pathways after graduation.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>It is unclear what “A ‘C’ grade or better in a concurrent enrollment course” means or how “a career and technical educational pathway” is awarded points for Postsecondary Readiness.</p> <p>The description does not include the year of testing for high school students.</p> <p>Schools are allowed to select other indicators valued by the community to highlight on the report card, but it is unclear as to whether these other indicators actually factor into the accountability grade/score.</p> <p>The Postsecondary Readiness indicator uses letter grades in AP, IB, concurrent enrollment (Dual Credit?), and simply taking a career/tech ed pathway instead of requiring a certain score on the standardized assessments in AP and IB, or the student actually receiving the credits in the concurrent enrollment course, or attaining an industry certification in the career/tech ed pathway. By only requiring students attain a particular letter grade the state is potentially putting teachers in an awkward position of being pressured to award more high grades (subjective), versus the focus on insuring students are prepared to perform well</p>

	on the standardized assessment (objective).
<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 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>	<p>Utah’s accountability system includes annual meaningful differentiation of all public schools in the state, including charter schools. Student performance on each of the state described indicators is aggregated at the school level to determine performance on each indicator. Each indicator is weighted then added together to determine a total. The state is moving to the 2017 formula defined in state law in 2017-18 and will assign letter grades (A-F) based on the school’s total score beginning with the 2018-19 school year. The description identifies how this state used a standard setting process for determining A-F letter grade assignments based on “school performance against specific criteria, as opposed to normative approaches” and also aligned to the policy goals for initial determination of how many schools should receive each letter grade. The policy makers supported a criterion approach which will then allow growth and improvement in school performance to be clearly identified in future years (pp 29-30).</p> <p>There is no mention that the State’s system of annual meaningful differentiation includes the performance of all students and each subgroup of students on each of the indicators in the State’s accountability system.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Utah has updated its accountability system through the legislative process and has engaged in criteria/standard setting processes with over 50 stakeholders to establish a system to assign schools letter grades.</p> <p>USBE will implement this rating system starting this school year, although not required until 2018-2019 school year. Applying criterion-based approach to identifying cut scores is more transparent than the normative approach.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA did not specifically mention that the performance of all student subgroups on each of the indicators will be included in the State’s</p>

	<p>accountability system.</p> <p>USBE did not provide performance data for high schools to illustrate this system.</p> <p>While it is a criterion approach, how the letter grades are actually assigned, or the scale that is being applied, was not provided, only a bell curve that makes it appear the starting place for the letter grades are normally distributed. While letter grades obviously need to be meaningfully distributed, it is till not clear how the grades are actually distributed.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The SEA should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Specifically mention that the performance of all student subgroups on each of the indicators will be included in the State’s accountability system.</li> <li>2. Provide the description for assigning letter grades and how the letter grades are distributed to ensure meaningful differentiation.</li> </ol>

A.4.v.b: Weighting of Indicators

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>This state describes the weighting of each indicator in its accountability system. Points are allocated for both academic achievement and growth in English/language arts, math and science in elementary, middle, and high school, for equitable opportunity and English language proficiency in all schools, and for postsecondary readiness in high school. All indicators receive substantial weight individually. 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.</p> <p>However, the weighting of the indicator of Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency is not as substantial as other indicators (pp 30 – 35).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The overall accountability system is well thought out and uses a diverse set of indicators. Utah models the weighting for schools with less than 10 EL students.</p> <p>Gr 3-8: Equally weighting both performance and growth</p>

<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Measures of EL progress are substantially less than other indicators. Because the indicators are grouped in the display, it is difficult to determine if the academic achievement, other academic, graduation rate and progress in achieving EL proficiency in the aggregate receive much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator in the aggregate. The postsecondary readiness indicator at 32.89% and school quality success indicator at 28.14 for high schools is weighted substantially more than combined Achievement and EL Progress at 38.97</p> <p>The Achieving ELP indicator receives less substantial weight than other indicators; elementary and middle – 8.6%, high school, 5.78% compared with indicators for school quality/student success (41.93% and 28.14%), academic achievement (27.06% and 33.19%) and growth (27.06%) or Postsecondary readiness (32.89%). It is unclear if the greater weight received of the required indicators is considered to be a “much greater weight.”</p> <p>Gr 3-8: The Equitable Educational Opportunity Indicator which identifies the growth of students in the lowest 25% will lead to counting the growth of these students in the system twice.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <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>This state should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide specific weights for each indicator so that it is clear that the academic achievement, other academic, graduation rate and progress in achieving EL proficiency in the aggregate receive much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator in the aggregate.</li> <li>2. Increase the weighting of the EL Progress indicator in schools with more than 10 EL students.</li> </ol>

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>This state uses different indicators and weightings for schools that serve special populations, or are classified as alternative schools or schools that primarily serve students with disabilities for determining accountability. The state is also currently reviewing whether to continue with this process thus how the different process currently works was not provided (p 36).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>This state did not provide any information regarding different indicators for alternative schools nor does the state address how alternative methodologies and indicators will be used to identify schools for comprehensive or targeted</p>

	support.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	This state should: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide a description of the methodology and indicators for schools that are classified as alternative schools or schools that primarily serve students with disabilities.</li> <li>2. Describe how the alternative methodology will be used to identify schools for comprehensive support or targeted support.</li> </ol>

**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>	State law requires the State Board of Ed to annually identify a school for improvement if the school “falls into the lowest performing 3 percent for two consecutive years, regardless of whether the school is a Title I school” (pg. 36). In an attempt to align accountability systems, the state will identify schools for improvement if they receive an ‘F’ for two consecutive years. The State Board of Ed indicates that if less than 5 percent of schools are identified using the criterion-based measure, it will use a relative measure to identify schools for improvement that are in the lowest performing 5 percent of schools for two consecutive years beginning with the 2018-2019 school year. However, to meet the ESEA requirement, the state must identify those schools receiving Title I funds to appropriately identify the lowest-performing five percent of Title I schools. This Title I identification must occur first, but does not prohibit Utah from identifying additional low performing schools (pp 36-37).
<i>Strengths</i>	Principles for determining identification and exit keep things grounded and from going off track of the initial intent. Use of modeling of prior performance data this method identifies 6% of the schools.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	While it is commendable that the SEA plans to identify the lowest performing five percent of ALL schools for comprehensive support and improvement, the state should disaggregate the schools based on Title I eligibility to ensure that at least the lowest five percent of the Title I schools are identified for comprehensive support and improvement. Note that the SEA mentioned this in the footnote on page 37.
<i>Did the SEA meet</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s))

<i>all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	This state must provide their methodology to identify not less than five percent of the lowest-performing schools of all schools receiving Title 1 funds.

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>	This state will identify all public high schools for comprehensive support and improvement by identifying schools with a four year adjusted cohort graduation rate of less than or equal to 67% for two consecutive years. This state does not address how it would use an averaging procedure to ensure all public high schools that failed to graduate one third or more of their students would be identified for comprehensive support by the beginning of the 2018/19 school year, nor does it include 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 or how the SEA averages data (p 38).
<i>Strengths</i>	The state’s methodology will identify the schools with a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate of less than or equal to 67 percent.  By requiring the two consecutive years of data before flagging a school for resources, the state is more likely to identify schools that are in need of resources versus an anomaly in a one year drop in graduation rate.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	This methodology does not align with annual identification of schools nor does the state address how it would use an averaging procedure to ensure all public high schools that failed to graduate one third or more of their students would be identified for comprehensive support.  By requiring two years below 67% schools who are bouncing around that important threshold will be left out for receiving resources. Also, it is unclear that this meets ESSA requirements. .  On page 38 both graduation rate and lowest performing schools are discussed separately, in the chart on page 39 these are also both broken out separately, yet in the timeline below only lowest performing schools is identified. It would be helpful to clarify that the timeline also includes identifying high schools with less than 67% graduates.

<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 this requirement</i>	This state must ensure that the graduation rate methodology aligns with the department’s guidance. This includes an annual identification of schools by the <u>beginning</u> of the 2018/19 school year (using 2017/18 data).

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA notes that Title I schools that have received additional targeted support under ESEA Section 1111(d)(2)(C) that have not satisfied the statewide exit criteria within four years will be identified for comprehensive support and improvement. USBE will identify such schools once every year beginning in school year 2022–2023 (p 38).
<i>Strengths</i>	By delaying until 2022-23 the state is providing the schools the time necessary to build towards implementing the new accountability system.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Delaying the start until 2022-23 may keep schools in need of resources from receiving them.
<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 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>	This state will identify the lowest performing schools in the state by the beginning of the 2018-19 school year and annually thereafter. The state will

	also identify high schools with graduation rates below 67% every two years beginning with school year 2018-19. Identification of additional targeted support schools with chronically low performing student subgroups will begin in 2022-23 and continue annually thereafter (pp 38-40).
<i>Strengths</i>	Annual identification of comprehensive support and improvement schools. Note: In Exhibit 14, the state includes identifying lowest performing schools as lowest rating for 2 consecutive years “or at least the lowest 5 percent of Title I schools.”  Very clear timeline for identifying comprehensive support and improvement schools.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Delaying until 2022-23 to identify chronically low performing schools ignores data from 2017-18 and further delays resources to students.
<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 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>	This state will annually identify a school as consistently underperforming if any of the student subgroups fall below the percentage of points associated with the lowest rating in the state’s accountability system for two consecutive years (currently less than 38% for high schools and less than 35.5 for elementary schools). This methodology will result in the identification of any school with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students. All required subgroups are identified and identification will occur annually beginning with school year 2018-19. However, the methodology may be compensatory where indicators may off set other indicators and not allow for meaningful differentiation (p 40).
<i>Strengths</i>	The definition of consistently underperforming schools includes all indicators in the state’s accountability system
<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 specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	
--	--

**A.4.vi.f: Targeted Support and Improvement Schools—Additional Targeted Support**

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify schools in which the performance of any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State’s methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D) (*i.e.*, the methodology described above in A.4.vi.a), including: 1) whether the methodology identifies these schools from among all public schools in the State or from among only the schools identified as schools with one or more consistently underperforming subgroups and 2) if applicable, how the SEA averages data (*e.g.*, does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in identification of such schools?
- Does the SEA include the year in which the State will first identify such schools (*i.e.*, does the timeline comply with the Department’s guidance)?
- Does the SEA include the frequency with which the State will identify such schools after the first year of identification?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	One peer reviewer indicates that this state’s methodology described in A.4.vi.e. permits the identification of schools with a student subgroup that meets this criteria.  This state only refers back to the prior section for identifying comprehensive support schools and does not distinguish how schools will be identified for additional targeted support, which is different (p 41).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The plan for identifying for <u>additional</u> targeted support was not clearly provided.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (1 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (3 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Clarify the distinction between Additional Targeted support schools and Targeted support schools to explain how the state is meeting the requirements of .4.vi.f: Targeted Support and Improvement Schools—Additional Targeted Support criteria.

**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 This state does not include additional statewide categories of schools (p 41).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<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 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>	This state will begin factoring in the requirement for 95 percent participation in statewide assessments by publishing the 2017-18 participation rate on the school report card. The methodology is described in USBE Accountability Technical Manual (p 41).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>No evidence of differentiation in approach such as the difference between 92% vs. 70%. No impact on rating.</p> <p>It is not clear how the students who opt out are included in the calculation of participation rate.</p> <p>95% participation isn't actually a factor in the accountability system, only something reported.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The state should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide information on how the accountability model differentiates school ratings in response to rates of participation below 95% and how it factors into the overall accountability model and by subgroup.</li> <li>2. Provide clarification that the inclusion of students who opt out does not inflate the participation rate.</li> </ol>

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>	This state uses a two-part methodology for schools to set goals for improvement and aligns exit criteria to identification criteria. Additionally, to exit improvement status a school must meet both targets for two consecutive years and within four years of initial identification. These exit criteria are consistent with the stakeholder group recommendations. Requiring a school to meet these criteria for two consecutive years helps ensure that a school no longer meets the criteria by which it was initially identified.
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The rationale is based on the importance of clear, achievable expectations as key to building trust, as a necessary condition for successful school improvement.</p> <p>This two-part methodology this state will employ provides clear and consistent targets for schools for schools to meet exit criteria and meeting these criteria for two consecutive years within a four year period likely indicates the school is focused on these targets for future student success.</p> <p>Criteria align to same criteria for identification, thus clear and transparent for how to exit. Requiring 2 consecutive years allows for some consistency that the improvement isn’t simply a “blip.”</p>
<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 specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.viii.b: Exit Criteria for Schools Receiving Additional Targeted Support (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(II))

- Does the SEA describe its statewide exit criteria for schools receiving additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C), which may include how the exit criteria align with the State’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress and the requirement that the goals and measurements of interim progress take into account the improvement necessary to close statewide proficiency and graduation rate gaps?
- Does the SEA’s description include the number of years within which schools are expected to meet such criteria?
- Do the exit criteria ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in the State (e.g., do the exit criteria improve student outcomes for the subgroup or subgroups that led to the school’s identification and ensure that a school that exits no longer meets the criteria under which the school was identified)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA notes that schools identified for additional targeted support and improvement will exit when, for two consecutive years, the school no longer has student groups performing below the cut score (percentage of points) associated with the lowest rating in the state’s accountability system. Schools will be given up to four years to make the necessary improvements to exit. Any Title I school that doesn’t exit Targeted Support will be identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement which will ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success (p 42).
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Target schools have plenty of time to exit status – thus time to plan and implement lasting changes. Schools must show two years of improvement status – thus sustainability. Any Title I school that does not meet the exit criteria will be identified for comprehensive support.</p> <p>The SEA is giving the schools four years to exit - two years to implement changes in practice and two years to demonstrate two consecutive years of improvement.</p> <p>Requiring schools to maintain student subgroup performance above the accountability system cut score for two consecutive years supports a school in implementation of strategies that will have long term positive effects on student performance.</p>
<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 specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.viii.c: More Rigorous Interventions (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(I))

- Does the SEA describe the more rigorous State-determined action required for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the SEA’s exit criteria within a State-determined number of years, which may include interventions that address school-level operations, such as changes in school staffing and budgeting or the school day and year?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA will implement rigorous state-determined actions for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the SEA’s exit criteria within four years. These include restructuring a district school, which may include contract management, conversion to a charter school, or state takeover; restructuring a charter school by terminating a school’s charter, closing the school, or transferring operation and control of the charter school; or other appropriate action as determined by the State Board of Ed. Also, the State Board of Ed is in the process of making rules to align state and federal requirements for more rigorous interventions for schools that do not meet the state’s exit criteria within four years and plans to complete this process by December 2017 (pp 42-43).
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The state is in the process of making rules to establish implications and more rigorous interventions for schools that do not meet the states exit criteria. This is expected to be complete by December 2017 and the state is developing a systematic approach to identifying the most effective and evidence-based strategies.</p> <p>The state will determine more rigorous interventions for schools that fail to meet the exit criteria in four years based on a root cause analysis of the school’s persistent underperformance to determine the strongest path to successful intervention in each context.</p> <p>The State Board of Ed is in the process of unifying their accountability and school improvement system and the current state interventions are already somewhat aligned with federal requirements, thus meeting December deadline for completion is reasonable.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Development of this unified system is in process.</p> <p>Work for aligning State and Federal interventions is not completed.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	This state must provide the results of the rules established by the State Board to establish implications and more rigorous interventions for schools that do not meet the states exit criteria for review by the Department upon completion (expected by December 2017).

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>	<p>USBE details their systematic resource allocation review to be applied to any LEA that serves significant numbers or percentages of schools identified for improvement. In addition, USBE is also developing an annual school level expenditures report that will be used to review resource allocation to support school improvement. A procedure is being developed to evaluate and address potential inequities identified through these reviews. It appears that the focus of this review is budget resources, not how the budgeted resources are expending their time to support student and school attainment of the indicators. USBE indicates that a comprehensive needs assessment to be conducted at the LEA level will address resource allocations other than financial support provided by the LEA.</p> <p>Although it will also examine the feasibility of assigning centralized and support service costs and other district-level supports, such as transportation and food services that cannot be practically or directly assigned to an individual school, it is not clear if such services should be factored into these resource allocations for the purpose of identifying resource allocations that support indicators of school improvement.</p> <p>It is a concern whether the correct schools will be identified, to ensure that resource allocations are appropriately applied to these schools (p. 43).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The state is developing tools and processes to review and analyze resource allocation in LEAs serving a significant number of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support.</p> <p>Not setting a strict “minimum percentage of schools falling into improvement”, but based on a more nuanced approach given the wide range in the number of schools that may be in each LEA.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>A description of how the SEA 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 is missing.</p> <p>The state is still in the process of developing a procedure to evaluate and address potential inequities identified through these reviews.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s))</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>Utah should set a timeline for developing and implementing the identified tools and procedures to 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. The state should provide assurances to the department that these criteria will be met within a reasonable timeframe.</p>

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>	This state will conduct a comprehensive needs assessment at the LEA level for LEAs serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support. The Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) will include a wide range of stakeholders. Technical assistance will be differentiated and provided based on the CNA results. The state will identify how and by whom the CNA will be provided to LEAs. The CNA focuses on distribution of effective teachers and leaders, removal of potential LEA level barriers, and leveraging available funds to support schools. Additionally, The State Board of Ed commits to providing a variety of supports to LEAs including vetting resources on evidence-based practices. Schools are required to develop school improvement plans (pp 43-45).
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The state will conduct an external CNA of all LEAs serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support. The State Board of Ed will differentiate support and technical assistance based on the results of the CNA. The State Board of Ed has also created a cross-department collaborative team to align school improvement efforts.</p> <p>By providing differentiated technical assistance to LEAs based on their identified needs instead of providing a one-size-fits-all PL approach, individual LEA needs will be specifically addressed thereby virtually ensuring student academic improvement.</p> <p>The needs assessment completed by stakeholders could provide data that will inform selection and implementation of appropriate practices in schools and LEAs.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The state has not yet decided how or by whom the LEA CNAs will be conducted. The additional supports provided to LEAs are vague.</p> <p>Detail regarding a timeline for implementation would make the plan stronger.</p> <p>Details about the technical assistance USBE will provide are vague.</p>
<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 specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	NA. This state does not describe additional operational action. (p 45)
<i>Strengths</i>	
<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 specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Utah displays and discusses the differences in the proportion of inexperienced

---

<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.

	<p>teachers (less than 3 years teaching) in Title I schools (26.7%) and non-Title I schools (18.8%) in 2015 – an eight percentage point difference. In addition, 41% of teachers in Charter schools had less than 3 years of teaching experience. There is no significant difference between teachers who are qualified in field in Title I schools as compared to Non Title I schools – both are just under 93% qualified (7% out of field). The state defines qualified in field as an educator who is fully licensed and endorsed to teach. USBE does not provide teacher qualification data disaggregated by student populations, neither does USBE provide data on teachers who are ineffective or how progress is reported to the public.</p> <p>USBE indicates it will support LEAs in disaggregating their data to evaluate and implement plans to ensure low-income and minority children are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers. USBE will make these data available to LEAs and within their annual stakeholder reports (pp 45-46).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>USBE is planning to gather LEAs together to facilitate discussion to study information, analyze findings, and implement plans to ensure that low income, or minority students are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers. The Legislature created a five year pilot program to provide funding for teacher recruitment, retention and professional development in high poverty schools serving High percentages of Native American students. HB 212 from the 2017 General Session will provide teachers deemed as effective with bonuses, which means the data on teacher effectiveness must be available.</p> <p>The state is taking significant measures to recruit and retain teachers in high-poverty schools that serve high percentages of American Indian and/or Alaskan Native students. In addition, teachers who are deemed highly effective will receive bonuses if they currently teach or move to teach in one of the state’s highest poverty schools.</p> <p>USBE provides data related to the extent that low-income students enrolled in Title I schools are served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers.</p> <p>Interesting and useful data that gets to school type and location in general and state supported pro-active initiatives described regarding teacher recruitment and retention efforts for high poverty schools (p 46).</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The state does not describe the extent, if any, by which minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers.</p> <p>Data only tangentially gets to disproportionality for minority students and the plan only states that this data will be collected and studied.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s))</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that</i>	<p>The state must describe the extent, if any, which minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers. Additionally, the state</p>

<i>an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	must describe the measures 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.
---	--

**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>	The SEA describes that it will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A to improve school conditions for student learning by providing technical assistance and implementing and monitoring Board rule, state laws and legislative initiatives. The state currently provides training and model policies to LEAs on reducing incidences of bullying, hazing and harassment, and supports LEAs to provide annual parent seminars and required trainings. The state is also working to improve the fidelity of statewide data collection on bullying incidences, and is collaborating with community partnerships to implement the SafeUT app, a statewide service that provide real-time crisis intervention to youth through text or phone call and a confidential tip program. Training is provided in the Least Restrictive Behavioral Interventions (LRBI) to create successful behavioral systems and supports within the state’s public schools. Evidence-based practices for establishing safe and successful schools, implementation of multi-tiered systems of support, positive behavior support and interventions, effective classroom management, and functional behavior assessment are all included in the LRBI policy as effective practices that prevent the overuse of discipline procedures that remove students from the classroom. The state training on the LRBI policy also includes guidance on the use of physical restraint and seclusionary time out. To protect the safety of students and staff, Board rule limits the use of physical restraint and seclusionary time out to those situations in which a student’s behavior poses an imminent danger to the student or others. In addition, USBE staff collaborate with other state agencies and community partners to provide supports to schools regarding trauma-informed practices (pp 47-49).
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The state provides an impressive set of State laws, policies, training, support, and programs to ensure safe conditions for student learning and to reduce the use of discipline or behavioral interventions that compromise health and safety.</p> <p>The Least Restrictive Behavioral Interventions (LRBI) policy provides clear guidance to schools in an effort to improve school conditions for learning.</p> <p>USBE provides comprehensive descriptions of its policies, state laws, training,</p>

	and programs to improve schools conditions for student learning, including reducing bullying and harassment, reducing practices that remove students from classrooms, and use enacting practices that reduce physical restraint and seclusion.  Required training for staff and the additional supports and seminars for parents and community members.
<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 specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>This state supports LEAs in providing effective transitions by implementing and monitoring Board rule, state laws, and legislative initiatives, and providing technical assistance. Board rule requires LEAs to conduct individualized education and career planning meetings with students and parents at least once in grade 7 or grade 8, once in grade 9 or 10, and once in grade 11 or 12. These meetings facilitate transitions and reduce the risk of students dropping out. State law requires LEAs to provide dropout prevention and recovery services to students who have dropped out or are at risk of dropping out. Partnerships for Student Success Act Grants have been awarded to partnerships that include feeder pattern schools and are aimed at improving educational outcomes for low income students. However, it is not stated if the state’s grants focus on LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A or to what entity these grants are awarded. The state monitors and assists LEAs in implementing the requirements to provide dropout prevention and recovery services to students. Although the state is now required to enhance its online data reporting tool to provide functionality as an early warning system, it is not clear when this program will be piloted in LEAs.</p> <p>The state will continue to train McKinney-Vento LEA liaisons to ensure homeless students in transition are supported. The state also makes use of Check &amp; Connect, an evidenced-based comprehensive intervention designed to enhance student engagement at school and with learning for marginalized, disengaged students in K–12, through relationship building and persistence. The state has undertaken the efforts to facilitate transitions for students in the</p>

	care of Juvenile Justice Services and the Division of Human Services. Led by state staff and supported by Juvenile Justice Services staff, short-term, market sensitive, easily-acquired, credential-creating classes are offered to students who are in the care of Juvenile Justice Services longer-term (pp 49-50).
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The state has a comprehensive approach and provides a variety of services, training, and programs to LEAs to address the needs of students in transition.</p> <p>It is obvious that state law and the state provide multiple supports to ensure the effective transition of students from one school level to another.</p> <p>Broad steps are identified for addressing the needs of students who are most at risk of dropping out.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Only requiring one career planning meeting with students and parents in either grade 7 or 8, one in either grade 9 or 10, and one in either grade 11 or 12 is likely not enough to meet the needs of all students. The efforts described are about meeting the needs of the “most at risk” students, however, those students who are just somewhere in the middle, not the high flyers, and not the most struggling, also need direction to make sure they suddenly don’t lose their way.
<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 specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA described extensive consultation for Utah’s Title III state plan and input into its development. Input was elicited from every LEA during meetings for Alternative Language Services (ALS) Directors held on September 1, 2016; October 12, 2016; November 9, 2016; and February 17, 2017. An ESSA Workgroup for Title III convened in September 2016 with representation from rural, urban and suburban regions along with teachers, university professors, and resettlement agencies (Catholic Community Services, International Rescue

	<p>Committee, and Asian Association of Utah). Biweekly webinars began in August 2016 to update all stakeholders on ESSA and the best practices implemented in LEAs that would affect the development of the state plan. All meetings and webinars were live-streamed and recorded with support materials on the media channel designated for Student Advocacy Services and Title III communications across the state. The Title III ESSA Workgroup developed a survey about the key features of ESSA, especially the accountability for Title III as included in Title I to which there were 994 responses. The vast majority of survey respondents agreed to standardized statewide entrance and exit procedures for English learners.</p> <p>Students are initially screened using the Home Language Survey, a standardized form to identify a student with a native language other than English, or who comes from an environment where a non-English language is either dominant or may have affected a student’s English language proficiency. Students who are identified as potential ELs are assessed in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing through the state-adopted ELP instrument – WIDA Screener. This assessment must be administered within 30 days of enrollment and determines if the student is an EL and in need of specialized language and academic support services Exit procedures are also standardized and are based on two elements: 1) student receives a composite score of 5 on the annual WIDA ACCESS for ELLS assessment, and 2) a teacher-student –parent conference is held to discuss the necessary support the student needs to make continuous progress. This conference is held within 30 days of receiving the WIDA ACCESS for ELLS scores. (pp 74-79).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>A comprehensive plan was developed to establish and implement a responsive English learner program and supports by a diverse group of stakeholders. An exit Rubric is being developed with stakeholder input.</p> <p>The plan was developed through several meetings with appropriate stakeholders. Monitoring each year for 4 years following being exited from the program.</p>
<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 specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

- Does the SEA describe how it will assist eligible entities in helping to ensure that English learners meet challenging State academic standards?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The state established measures of interim progress toward meeting the State-designed long-term goal for English Language proficiency. The measures of interim progress, annual growth targets have been set by the Data and Statistics department at State Dept of Ed and were developed with guidance from WIDA and agreed upon by the following State Dept of Ed departments: Assessment and Accountability, Data and Statistics, and Federal Programs. The State believes an ambitious goal would be attainment of ELP in 3 years and has based this decision on student performance on WIDA in 2015 and 2016.</p> <p>The State’s Title III and Data and Statistics departments, in consultation with and incorporating feedback from all LEAs, have developed annual progress reports and are provided to each LEA by school, grade, and teacher through the State Board of Ed’s Data Gateway. The recently developed LEA reports show whether each student, by school and grade, has met the annual growth goal by ELP level. Therefore, each LEA can identify schools and/or grades that have been successful with students at each ELP level. The report includes “Can Do Descriptors” under each domain to be used by teachers for planning instruction.</p> <p>Goals and measurements of interim progress are based on several factors that look not only at the WIDA scores, but factors such as length of time in the US, whether the student is a refugee or an immigrant, whether or not the student has had any formal education, or if the education has been interrupted, and the age and grade of the student. The expected growth is 0.4 per year and the goals set by grade span are based on the results of students currently at the 75 percentile. (pp 79-84).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Utah has developed both student level goals and progress reports along with annual progress reports for schools and LEAs. The state is developing a transition plan for recently arrived ELs who enter high school and are at risk of dropping out.</p> <p>The measures of interim progress in conjunction with the annual progress reports provided to each LEA and teacher provide helpful support to ensure that English learners meet the State’s challenging academic standards.</p> <p>Goals and plans for providing data in a transparent fashion in order to more quickly meet the needs of students.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Other than assessing students on state assessments and disaggregating the data by EL subgroup there is minimal description of how the state will assist LEAs in helping to ensure that ELs meet challenging state academic standards. No date is provided for the long term goal (see Exhibit 19, pg. 80) – 3 years is noted in the text.</p> <p>The SEA did not describe how it will assist and support LEAs in meeting the state-designed long term goals for English language proficiency.</p>

<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The state should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide a description of the supports available for LEAs and schools to provide academic content and instruction in English/language arts, mathematics, and science to ensure that English language learners meet challenging State academic standards. The state must provide a date for the long term goal (i.e., add the “Long-term Goal” year to Exhibit 19).</li> <li>2. Describe how it will assist LEAs in meeting the state-designed long term goals for English language proficiency.</li> </ol>

### 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>This state provides a detailed description of the comprehensive data review process it conducts with each LEA in September; the first component of the monitoring and continuous improvement cycle that includes scheduled onsite visits by the fiscal compliance officer and the Title III Specialist. Following this data review, each LEA revises and submits an Annual Improvement Plan. Ongoing technical assistance is provided by USBE through monthly interactive webinars that focus on policy and processes for LEAs to monitor the effectiveness of their language instruction educational program and ensuring Title III funds are used effectively.</p> <p>The state also describes the technical assistance it provides to LEAs when growth goals are not met. These include a letter informing the LEA of the growth targets required for the next year, quarterly meetings where model practices are shared which include policies, procedures and strategies to more effectively use resources to increase student growth, differentiated online professional learning modules/courses that focus on evidence-based practices, dissemination of online resources that showcase exceptional programs, and revision of the Annual Improvement Plan which is electronically monitored. Finally, the state monitors fiscal compliance related to allowable expenditures by conducting audits when reimbursement requests are submitted to identify discrepancies. (pp 84-87).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The state provides a well thought-through data-driven plan to monitor the progress of eligible entities. Based on feedback from LEAs, the state is revising the Self Assessment Tool to align with ESSA.</p> <p>USBE provides a comprehensive description of the strong strategies it will implement to monitor the progress of eligible entities as well as the technical support it will implement to modify these practices if they are not effective in</p>

	<p>specific LEAs.</p> <p>Providing details of what data to review and what should be included in the annual plans along with online professional development opportunities and support for fiscal compliance.</p>
<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 specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	