

# STATE PLAN PEER REVIEW CRITERIA Peer Review Notes Template

---

STATE: Virginia



**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 SEA allows all middle schools to offer an Algebra I course. The SEA’s plan discusses that all students have the opportunity to take high school math in middle school but does not provide specifics regarding how the students will be prepared other than receiving a minimum of 140 clock hours of required instruction. P. 7
<i>Strengths</i>	One peer reviewer identified the strength that the SEA has laws that require opportunities be offered for students to earn high school credits in middle school. P. 8
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA does not describe its strategies to provide all students in the State the opportunity to be prepared for advanced mathematics coursework in middle school. The SEA does not outline how this will take place in all districts and schools. P. 7-8
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (# 4 peer reviewer(s))

<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).

<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The following information is needed to fully meet this requirement: SEA’s description of its strategies to provide all students in the State the opportunity to be prepared for advanced mathematics coursework in middle school, such as a description of the strategies likely to provide all students in the State that opportunity.
--	---

**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>	The SEA provides a clear definition of languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the State’s participating student population. The SEA defines languages other than English that are present to a significant extent as languages spoken by more than 5% of the English learner population. The SEA identifies Spanish (Castilian) and Arabic as languages that meet the SEA’s definition. The SEA provides data that indicates Spanish is the most populous language spoken by 68.72% of ELs. The SEA explains that Spanish is spoken by 89% of migrant students and shares that four other languages are spoken but Spanish is more predominant. The SEA does not discuss the languages other than English spoken by English learners who may be immigrants or Native Americans. The SEA does not share information regarding languages spoken by a significant portion of the participating student population across grade levels or specifically spoken by a significant portion of the participating student population in one or more districts in the State. P. 7
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA’s definition does not include 5% of the total enrollment but 5% of the enrollment of the English learner population, which identifies the students that would most benefit from access to assessments in languages other than English. P. 7-8
<i>Weaknesses</i>	In determining which languages are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, the SEA does not describe how it considered languages other than English that are spoken by 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 populations, the SEA does not describe how it considered languages other than English that are spoken by a significant portion of the participating student population in one or more of the State’s LEAs or of the participating student population across grade levels. The SEA does not identify the other four languages spoken by migrant students or discuss specific languages spoken by immigrants or Native Americans. P. 7-8
<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 following information is needed to fully meet this requirement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SEA’s description of how it considered languages other than English that are spoken by distinct populations of English learners, including English learners who were not born in the United States, and English learners who are Native Americans. Additional data and clarity needed (e.g., Table (p.8)): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ including the total number of ELs by language,</li> <li>○ the students who do not speak Spanish or Arabic,</li> <li>○ students who are migratory who do not speak English.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The SEA’s description of how it considered languages other than English 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.</li> </ul>

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	SEA states there are no assessments available in languages other than English. The SEA provides bilingual dictionaries to support their English assessments. P. 7
<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.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 SEA shares that instruction within the state is provided in English with limited exception. During consultation it was determined that the SEA would continue to assess academic content in the language of instruction and provide bilingual dictionaries for students needing this accommodation option. The SEA described its stakeholder consultation process regarding the development of assessments in languages other than English and the reasons for opting not to develop these types of assessments. P. 7-8
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA applies its determination of available assessments based on language of instruction. The SEA provides a detailed description as to its stakeholder engagement on the development of assessments in languages other than English. P. 7-8
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA does not include data to reflect the impact of assessing only in English on students who would benefit from being assessed in their native language. The SEA does not plan to develop any assessments in a language other than English even if the presence of students with a language other than English is present to a significant extent in the state's enrollment. P. 7-8
<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>	The SEA does not make an effort to provide assessments in languages other than English due to the English only instruction model. The SEA shares the decision is endorsed by the stakeholders who had concerns that assessments in other languages was not aligned with the teaching model. The SEA described its consultation process regarding the development of assessments in languages other than English and the reasons for opting not to develop these types of assessments. The SEA does not address why the state does not plan to develop assessment languages other than English when the SEA has identified two languages present in the participating student population. (69,265 Spanish speakers and 5,486 Arabic speakers) P. 8
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<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 following information is needed to fully meet this requirement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SEA’s description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, Spanish and Arabic, as identified under A.3.i .</li> <li>• The SEA’s timeline for developing such assessments.</li> <li>• The SEA description of how it will consult with educators, parents and families of English learners, students, as appropriate and other stakeholders.</li> </ul>

**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>	The SEA identifies four major racial and ethnic groups “present in five percent or more of the population.” These groups include White (not of Hispanic origin), Black (not of Hispanic origin), Hispanic, and Asian. P. 9
<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</i>	

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

**A.4.i.b: Additional Subgroups at SEA Discretion**

- If applicable, does the SEA describe any additional subgroups of students other than the statutorily required subgroups (*i.e.*, economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners) included in its statewide accountability system?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA responds that it will not include additional subgroups of students other than the statutorily required subgroups in the statewide accountability system. P. 8
<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>	Not applicable, as the SEA is applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i). P. 9
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (#peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information</i>	

<i>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>	The SEA designates it will continue to use student n-size of 30 for accountability purposes. The SEA shares that the n-size 30 has been used for a number of years to identify low performing schools and it does not inappropriately identify successful schools. (See P. 11 for table.) P. 9-11
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA included all data to demonstrate the reason for its inclusion. All sub-groups have the same n-size. P. 9-11
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (# 4peer 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>

---

<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.

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Using a minimum n-size of 30 is recognized as statistically sound to be inclusive while protecting student privacy. The SEA provides documentation to show that the n-size of 30 is statistically sound by comparing the use of n-size of 10 with the actual results of n-size of 30. The SEA reviewed use of n-size of 30 for different subgroups as well as all students to verify the use of n-size of 30 is statistically sound for the state accountability system. P. 9-11
<i>Strengths</i>	SEA provided data to demonstrate the inclusion for all sub-groups. P. 9-11
<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.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>	The SEA states it discussed the minimum number of students with stakeholders “on several occasions, including at meetings of Virginia ESL Supervisors Association, the Committee of Practitioners, and the State Board of Education” (P. 10). Stakeholders list does not include or parents or principals. P. 10
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	It is unclear if the SEA collaborated with principals/school leaders and parents discussing the n-size minimum number included parents. P. 10
<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>	The following information is needed to fully meet this requirement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of how the SEA collaborated with principals and parents when determining its minimum n-size number.</li> </ul>

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 is continuing to use the n-size of 30 that it has used under NCLB. The SEA will have a more inclusive n-size for reporting. Data from past practices has shown that the SEAs use of n-size of 30 has been effective in protecting student personally identifiable information. SEA indicates n-size of 10 will be used for the minimum size for reporting purposes. P. 10
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA is opting to stay consistent with past practices; this will aid the SEA in date trend analysis. P. 10
<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.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 provides a different reporting n-size of 10 which is smaller than its accountability n-size of 30. P. 11-12
<i>Strengths</i>	The reporting minimum n-size of 10 is more inclusive and will provide additional information on the outcomes of subgroups. P. 11-12
<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>	

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA states its timeline “for meeting the long-term goals is seven years” and that this “provides the most reasonable and attainable interval for the attainment of the interim measures of progress for low-performing subgroups” (P. 11). In Attachment A, the SEA provides two tables—one for Reading/Languages Arts and one for Mathematics—that provide targets for accountability years 2018-19 through 2024-2025. The SEA states, (P. 11) “baseline data from the 2015-16 assessment year was used to confirm the rigor and relevance of the long-term goals.” However, data from 2015-16 or 2016-17 assessments are not included in the tables; as such, it is unclear where the SEA provides its baseline data. The SEA shares that it used “proficiency on the state assessment, growth, and EL progress toward gaining proficiency in English...to identify baseline data and to calculate interim measures of progress” (P. 12). P. 11-12
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA does not include baseline data for all students and each subgroup of students. The SEA’s long-term goals must be measured by grade-level proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts; not growth using the WIDA ACCESS 2.0. Baseline data is needed for all students and subgroups in order to determine if long-term goals are ambitious. The rate of annual performance does not appear ambitious for subgroups except students with disabilities and English Learners. P. 11-12
<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</i>	The following information is needed to fully meet this requirement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the SEA developed long-term goals for all students for improved academic achievement measured by grade-level proficiency</li> </ul>

<i>an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (i.e., excluding growth using the WIDA ACCESS 2.0).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Baseline data for all students and for each subgroup of students.</li> <li>• Demonstration that the long term goals are ambitious by providing baseline data for all students and each subgroup of students.</li> </ul>
---	---

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>	<p>Three peer reviewers determined the SEA meets the criteria for providing measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for all students and each subgroup of students.</p> <p>In Attachment A, the SEA provides two tables; one for Reading/Languages Arts and one for Mathematics, each providing targets for accountability years 2018-19 through 2024-2025. The SEA uses the table to reflect the measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals in accountability years 2018-19 through 2023-24. Asian and White subgroups measurements of interim progress are only reported in terms of “meet or exceed” long term goals. Appendix A, P. 75-76</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The measurements of interim progress for Asian and White subgroups are not represented numerically compared to other subgroups. It is difficult to determine, without baseline data, whether the measurements of interim progress represented for the Asian and White subgroups require continued improvement for these subgroups. (See Appendix A)</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (#3 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (# 1peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The following information is needed to fully meet this requirement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measurements of interim progress stated in percentages for all subgroups.</li> </ul>

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>	The SEA provides data to demonstrate the need for specific subgroups to have

	<p>more rigorous goals to address the gaps between the various subgroups. For subgroups already meeting the long-term goal they are required to maintain at that level. P. 13-14</p> <p>The SEA states its “accountability benchmarks...place the federal accountability focus on subgroups that have historically failed to meet growth targets. This gap-closing model is rigorous and attainable and emphasizes the importance of improved achievement of low-performing subgroups” (P. 11); targets in the Attachment A tables require greater rates of improvement for subgroups of students that are lower achieving. P. 75-76</p> <p>The SEA shares the methodology used to determine how improvement will be measured by using an index. The index will integrate performance on the state assessment, growth, and English Learner’s progress towards gaining proficiency in English and be used to identify baseline data and to calculate interim measures of progress. P. 12–13</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Including an EL on making progress on ELA when meeting growth on the ELP assessment could provide a school with meeting a target but at the same time not truly closing the achievement gap for ELs, if they are never required to meet on grade level ELA assessments. There is no growth requirement for students already meeting the target for ELA and Math. The targets in the Attachment A tables require greater rates of improvement for subgroups of students that are lower achieving; these rates represent a combined rate that “integrates proficiency on the state assessment, growth, and EL progress towards gaining proficiency” (P. 11). The criteria state the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for academic achievement must 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. Other than for white and Asian students, the calculation of measurements for interim progress is uniform increments between Year 1 and Year 7. While statistically understandable, the measurements of interim progress do not takes into account different starting points and size of the gap to be addressed. P. 13-14</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 following information is needed to fully meet this requirement: The SEA’s methodology for calculating improvement necessary to close statewide proficiency gaps based on grade level proficiency on the statewide assessment for ELA and math; not including growth or WIDA ACCESS 2.0. (see A. 4 iii.a.1)</p>

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>	The SEA charts the journey to achieve the four-year adjusted cohort graduation goals by establishing baseline data for all students. The SEA establishes the baseline data from the 2015–2016 accountability year and calculates the interim measures for each group using a seven-year timeline for each group to achieve their 84% graduation rate. P. 13-14, Appendix A, P. 78
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Some subgroups have already met the long-term graduation goal of 84%, these subgroups only have to maintain this level to meet the 7 year goal. This maintaining requirement is not ambitious for all populations.  The SEA states it used 2015-2016 data (which appears to represent 2014-2015 assessment year data), but does not include baseline data for each subgroup of students in the Attachment A tables (P. 13). Further, it is unclear why the SEA does not use more recent data (i.e. from 2016-2017) to establish the baseline. P. 13-14, Appendix A, P. 78
<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>	The following information is needed to fully meet this requirement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Baseline data for each subgroup of students.</li> <li>• Rationale that the graduation rate of 84% for all students is ambitious when the all student baseline from 2015–2016 is 84%.</li> </ul>

A.4.iii.b.2: If applicable, long-term goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate

- If applicable (i.e., if the SEA chooses, at its discretion, to establish long-term goals for one or more extended-year rates), does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students?
- If applicable (i.e., if the SEA chooses, at its discretion, to establish long-term goals for one or more extended-year rates), does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA’s description include baseline data for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA’s description include the timeline for meeting the long-term goals?
- Is the timeline the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Are the long-term goals ambitious?
- Are the long-term goals more rigorous than the long-term goals set for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA charts the journey to achieve the extended-year adjusted cohort

	<p>graduation goals by establishing baseline data for all students from the 2015–2016 accountability year. The timeline is included for the 5-year cohort to achieve their 85% graduation rate and the 6-year cohort target graduation rate of 86% respectively. The goals may be considered more rigorous than the long-term goals set for the four–year adjusted cohort graduation rate. Goals are not especially ambitious and no attention to differences in closing the gap. P. 14-15, Appendix A, P. 78-80</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>It appears that the white and Asian subgroups may have already met their respective long-term graduation goals, though it is not possible to confirm without baseline data; these subgroups would then only have to maintain this level to meet the 7-year goal. This maintaining requirement is not be ambitious for all populations. The SEA does not provide rationale for why the graduation rate goal of 85% for all students and subgroups in the 5-year extended cohort, and goal of 86% for all students and subgroups in the 6-year extended year cohort is ambitious when the all student baseline from 2015–2016 is 85% and 86% respectively.</p> <p>The SEA states it used 2015-2016 accountability year data (which appears to represent 2014-2015 assessment year data), but does not include this baseline data for each subgroup of students in the Appendix A tables (P. 78-80). Further, it is unclear why the SEA does not use more recent data (i.e. 2016-2017 accountability year data) to establish the baseline. P. 14-15</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (# 4peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The following information is needed to fully meet this requirement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Baseline data for each subgroup of students.</li> <li>• Rationale for why the graduation rate of 85% for all students and subgroups in the 5-year extended cohort, and 86% for all students and subgroups in the 6-year extended year cohort are ambitious when the all student baseline from 2015–2016 is 85% and 86% respectively.</li> </ul>

#### A.4.iii.b.3: Measurements of interim progress

- Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students?
- Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for each subgroup of students?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA provides measurements of interim progress towards the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate as well as the five- and six-year adjusted cohorts for all students and subgroups. Appendix A, P. 78-79
<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.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, five-year, and six-year adjusted cohort graduation rates take into account the improvement necessary for subgroups of students who are behind in reaching those goals to make significant progress in closing statewide gaps. The SEA’s long-term goals require greater rates of improvement for subgroups of students that graduate from high school at lower rates. Appendix A, P. 75-76
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA does not take into account the different starting points of subgroups. Appendix A, P. 75-76
<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>	The following information is needed to fully meet this requirement: Demonstrate with baseline data for each of the subgroups that the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress reflect the improvement necessary to make significant progress in closing statewide graduation rate gaps.

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA identifies the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress to achieve language proficiency and determines it will be measured by the statewide English language proficiency assessment. The SEA identifies its long-term goal (58%) and describes the long-term goal, including baseline data, for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency, as measured by the WIDA ACCESS assessment. P. 16</p> <p>The State indicates that the 75th percentile of school performance (currently 58%) is the SEA’s long-term goal. Therefore, the long-term goal of 58% is not ambitious for all English learners. P. 16</p> <p>The state-determined timeline for English learners to achieve English language proficiency is five years. P. 16</p> <p>The SEA shares it is using the WIDA ELP standards to determine proficiency. P. 15–16, Appendix A, P. 81</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>SEA needs to clarify if the specific baseline data is from the 2015–2016 or 2016–2017 assessment data.</p> <p>The State indicates that the 75th percentile of school performance (currently 58%) is the SEA’s long-term goal. The long-term goal of 58% is not ambitious for all English learners. P. 15–16, Appendix A, P. 81</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 following information is needed to fully meet this requirement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Long-term goals for English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency that are ambitious.</li> </ul>

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>	<p>The SEA provides measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goal for increase in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency. The measurements of interim progress are based on seven years versus the five years the state says should be the timeline for a student to meet proficiency. P. 18, 81</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The measurements of interim progress are based on the seven-year trajectory used for other indicators; however, the SEA has established a five year trajectory for proficiency. SEA should consider using a five-year timeline for</p>

	students to achieve English language proficiency. P. 18, 81
<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>	The SEA uses results from its Standards of Learning (SOL) assessment for the Academic Achievement indicator. The SOL assessments include English (reading), Mathematics, and Science and reflect “what students should know and be able to do at the end of each grade or course” (P. 18). The SEA does not state whether this is the same as grade level proficiency. The SEA does not discuss if there is a different weighting of reading/language arts relative to mathematics achievement. The SEA does state that the SOLs are used with all students (unless an alternative assessment for students with significant cognitive abilities). The SOLs are used with students with disabilities and ELs, who may need accommodations. The SEA does not describe a performance index or for high schools measures of student growth. The SEA does not indicate if the indicator is based on the State’s long-term goals or whether the indicator can be disaggregated for subgroups. The SEA does not state whether the indicator measures the performance of at least 95% of all students and 95% of all students in each subgroup. P. 17-18
<i>Strengths</i>	

<p><i>Weaknesses</i></p>	<p>The SEA states “all students in the test grade levels and courses described above are expected to participate in Virginia’s assessment program” (P. 17); however, it is unclear for which grade levels the English and Mathematics assessment(s) are administered for high schools. The SEA implies all students will participate, but does not include historical data. The SEA should not include Science in the Academic Achievement indicator. The SEA does not describe the weighting of English (reading) achievement relative to Mathematics achievement. It is unclear if/or how the indicator is based on the SEA’s long-term goals, as its long-term goals for Academic Achievement include “an index, expressed as a combined rate, which integrates proficiency on the state assessment, growth, and EL progress towards gaining proficiency in English” (p. 12). Clarification is needed regarding the two Geometry components since they are listed twice. P. 17</p> <p>The SEA does not provide discussion about whether the indicator is valid and reliable and does not indicate if the indicator is based on the State’s long-term goals or whether the indicator can be disaggregated for subgroups. The SEA does not state whether the indicator measures the performance of at least 95% of all students and 95% of all students in each subgroup. P. 17</p>
<p><i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s))  <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 this requirement</i></p>	<p>The following information is needed to fully meet this requirement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A description of only the required subject areas measured by the Academic Achievement indicator system not including Science;</li> <li>• Verification that the indicator is calculated consistently for all schools, in all LEAs, across the State;</li> <li>• A description of the weighting of reading/language arts achievement relative to mathematics achievement;</li> <li>• If the State averages data, a description of how it averages data across years and/or grades;</li> <li>• Verification the indicator is valid and reliable,</li> <li>• Justification that the indicator is based on the State’s long-term goals.</li> <li>• Verification whether the indicator can be disaggregated for subgroups.</li> <li>• State whether the indicator measures at least 95% of all students and 95% of all students in each subgroup.</li> <li>• Justification the academic achievement indicator is based on grade-level proficiency in reading/ language arts and mathematics only.</li> </ul>

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>	The SEA states it “established two measures to determine growth” for elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools which are “applied to all students and separately for each subgroup” (P. 18). The SEA states that students “who did not pass the state reading or mathematics assessment in the previous year are counted twice in the school’s combined rate if they pass the state assessment for the grade level in which they are enrolled in the subsequent year...this measure [is] referred to as recovery” (P. 18). For students that did not pass the reading and/or mathematics test the previous year, the SEA uses a value table to determine student growth, by which “a student has demonstrated sufficient student growth if the student who failed the test the previous year has grown by at least one sublevel.” P. 18–19
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA does not fully explain how the recovery process described and the value table will be measurements of growth. P. 19
<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>	The following information is needed to fully meet this requirement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate how the <u>Recovery Method and the Value Table allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance with data and/or examples.</u></li> </ul>

#### A.4.iv.c: Graduation Rate

- Does the SEA describe the Graduation Rate indicator used in its statewide accountability system for public high schools in the State, including that the SEA uses the same indicator across all LEAs in the State?
- Does the description include how the SEA calculates the indicator including: 1) that the calculation is consistent for all high schools, in all LEAs, across the State; 2), if applicable, whether the SEA chooses to lag adjusted cohort graduation rate data; and 3) if applicable, how the SEA averages data (*e.g.*, consistent with the provisions in ESEA section 8101(23) and (25), which permit averaging graduation rate data over three years for very small schools)?
- Is the indicator valid and reliable?
- Is the indicator based on the SEA’s long-term goals?
- Is the indicator based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate?

- If the State, at its discretion, also includes one or more extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates, does the description include how the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is combined with that rate or rates within the indicator?
- If applicable, does the SEA’s description include how the State includes in its four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates students with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed using an alternate assessment aligned to alternate academic achievement standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(D) and awarded a State-defined alternate diploma under ESEA section 8101(23) and (25)?
- Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA states it will use “the Federal Graduation Indicator (FGI) to calculate the graduation rate” and “extended graduation rates of five- and six-years are included in the graduation rate indicator” (P. 19). However, the SEA did not specify how the four-year and extended-year rates are combined to calculate the Graduation Rate indicator.</p> <p>The SEA discusses it will use the Federal Graduation Indicator (FGI) based on students earning the standard or advanced diploma as the Graduation Rate indicator. The SEA reports that calculations are based on a one-year lag used to establish the State’s long-term goals. The SEA also shares that the FGI uses prior year data and is based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. The SEA explains how the extended-year graduation rate goals for the cohorts for five- and six-years are more rigorous than for the four-year cohort. The SEA identifies a need for a diploma option for its students with significant cognitive disabilities.</p> <p>The Federal Cohort Graduation charts distinguish the disaggregation of subgroups. P. 19-20, Appendix A, P. 78-80</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA has used the federal graduation index to calculate its graduation rate in prior years and will continue to use this FGI under ESSA. This calculation is based on students obtaining a standard or advanced diploma. The calculation is used for each of the state’s proposed graduation rates (4, 5, and 6 year cohorts). The SEA is considering adding an Applied Sciences Diploma for its students participating in alternative assessments but at this time has not included this option. P. 19-20</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA does not describe how the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is combined with the five- and six-year adjusted graduation cohort rates within the indicator.</p> <p>SEA needs to qualify that the Federal Graduation Indicator is statistically sound, valid and reliable. P. 19-20</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</i>	<p>The following information is needed to fully meet this requirement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarification of how the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is combined with the five- and six-year adjusted graduation cohort rates within the indicator.</li> </ul>

A.4.iv.d: Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency Indicator

- Does the SEA describe the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator used in its statewide accountability system, including that the SEA uses the same indicator across all LEAs in the State?
- Is the indicator valid and reliable?
- Is the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator aligned with the State-determined timeline described in A.4.iii.c.1?
- Does the indicator consistently measure statewide the progress of all English learners in each of grades 3 through 8 and in the grade for which such English learners are otherwise assessed under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) during grades 9 through 12?
- Does the SEA’s description include the State’s definition of English language proficiency, based on the State English language proficiency assessment?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA describes how the ELP indicator is used in its accountability system and includes details on how students are included in the numerator for this calculation.</p> <p>The SEA states it “indicated three grade clusters...and three composite score groupings” to calculate average growth for the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator (P. 20). English learners in lower grades with lower proficiency levels are expected to make greater gains than those in higher grades with higher proficiency levels.</p> <p>English language proficiency is defined as those students with a composite score of 4.4 on the WIDA ACCESS.</p> <p>The SEA describes Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners (ACCESS) through the state’s use of the WIDA to track progress of ELs. SEA provides targets for each year to align with the statewide accountability system. P. 16–17, 20-21, Appendix A, P. 81</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The expected gains the SEA outlines for English learners in the table on P. 21 are not accompanied supporting data to reflect the expected gains.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes X (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>	The SEA states it will use chronic absenteeism—defined as “missing 10% or more of the school year”—as its school quality or student success indicator for grades K-12 (P. 21). The SEA has selected a measure of school success that is consistent across all schools in the state and has established the same timeline for the long-term goal as other indicators. The SEA charts percentages to achieve the long-term goal for all students and subgroups of students. P. 21, 25, Appendix A, P. 80
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA’s 10% absenteeism rate for the indicator seems to be a very high threshold. For example, one reviewer notes that within the calculation based on 10%, there is no difference between a school that has 1% chronic absenteeism rate and school that has a 9.9% chronic absenteeism rate. It is unclear if the indicator allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance.</p> <p>The SEA shares that a “10% rate of chronic absenteeism was established as the long-term goal for all students and for all subgroups.” This may need to be reviewed and/or adjusted as this implies it is for a select group of students already identified; and this is the same rate that defines the indicator. The SEA does not discuss the indicator’s validity or reliability or how it will be calculated across the grade spans. P. 21</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 following information is needed to fully meet this requirement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data demonstrating that the chronic absenteeism indicator will allow for meaningful differentiation for schools or subgroups.</li> </ul>

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA has established a system of annual meaningful differentiation that is applied to all schools based on the progress of each subgroup. However, the SEA did not base its system on all indicators in the system. For example, the SEA states, “in the event of a tie in ranking [based on the ranks for reading and mathematics based on the combined rate], use chronic absenteeism to resolve the tie.” P. 23</p> <p>The SEA describes the use of different indicators that will be used on an annual basis to determine meaningful differentiation throughout the state. P. 21–22</p> <p>In its combined rate for Academic Achievement, the SEA’s methodology for annual meaningful differentiation must be based on grade level proficiency on the statewide assessment for ELA and math; not student academic growth or student performance on the WIDA ACCESS 2.0. P. 21–22</p> <p>There is a list that starts with the number 3, with no reference to items 1 &amp; 2. P. 22</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA’s system of annual meaningful differentiation is not based on all indicators in the State’s accountability system, as chronic absenteeism may not factor into the identification of the lowest 5% of Title I schools for comprehensive support and improvement. P. 22</p> <p>The actual system of meaningful differentiation needs to be articulated to provide clarity for the combined use of all indicators. P. 21–22</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 following information is needed to fully meet this requirement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of how the SEA includes all indicators, including chronic absenteeism, in its system of annual meaningful differentiation and does not use that indicator <i>only</i> as a “tie-breaker” for identification of the lowest performing 5% of Title I schools.</li> </ul>

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>The SEA does not describe the weighting of each indicator in its system of annual meaningful differentiation or explain how weighting is adjusted for schools for which an indicator cannot be calculated due to the minimum number of students. Weighting is not discussed for Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicators. P. 22</p> <p>The SEA states it has “established a combined rate to integrate academic achievement, growth for elementary and middle schools, and progress for EL students towards gaining proficiency in reading” and that “graduation rate and chronic absenteeism are factored into the accountability system”, but the SEA has not shared it. Key details are lacking. P. 22</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Peer reviewers were unable to deduce whether 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 without a methodology.</p> <p>The SEA does not 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. P. 22</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 following information is needed to fully meet this requirement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of the weighting of each indicator in the SEA’s 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 (<i>e.g.</i>, for the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator).</li> <li>• Explanation of how each of the following indicators receive substantial weight: Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency.</li> <li>• Description of how the following indicators receive, in the aggregate, much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success</li> </ul>

	indicator(s), in the aggregate: Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency.
--	--

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>	The SEA discusses how schools without grade levels being tested will be paired with other feeder schools for accountability. In addition, the SEA shares that alternative measures of accountability will be used with special populations. P. 22
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA is linking non-tested grade level schools with tested schools in a feeder pattern thus creating an inclusive accountability for all schools. P. 22
<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: 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>	The SEA shares the methodology and process it will utilize to determine the Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. The campuses will be ranked and 5% of lowest performing schools will be identified as Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. In the event of a tie

	between campuses, the chronic absenteeism rate will be use to resolve. The SEA states the identification for Comprehensive Support and Improvement schools will begin with the 2018 -2019 school year. P. 22-24
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>It is unclear what the SEA means by “reducing the failure rate on the state assessments from the previous year by ten percent” regarding its methodology to identify the lowest-performing five percent of all Title I schools for Comprehensive Support and Improvement. Further, the SEA needs to provide clarification regarding step two of its methodology for identification.</p> <p>The SEA needs to review the use of chronic absenteeism to address a tie to determine the lowest performing 5% of all Title I campuses, as 5% is a minimum number required. P. 22-24</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 following information is needed to fully meet this requirement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of the SEA’s 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, specifically clarification of use of the combined rate comprised of reading and mathematics in either current or most recent year combined with current and previous two years of data; or by reducing the failure rate on assessments from the prior year by ten percent. (i.e. second step of process).</li> <li>• Description of the SEA’s process to explain how it averages data using a uniform averaging process across all schools.</li> <li>• Description of the inclusion of all indicators including chronic absenteeism to identify Comprehensive and Improvement Schools.</li> </ul>

A.4.vi.b: Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools—Low Graduation Rates

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify all public high schools in the State failing to graduate one-third or more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement, including: 1) a description of whether the SEA uses one or more extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates in addition to the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and 2) if applicable, how the SEA averages data (e.g., does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in the identification of all public high schools in the State failing to graduate one-third or more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement?
- Does the SEA include the year in which it will first identify these schools for comprehensive support and improvement (i.e., does the timeline comply with the Department’s guidance)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA discusses the 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. The SEA describes the timeline for the initial identification and review every 3 years. P. 25–26</p> <p>The SEA states it will “review graduation rate data . . . to determine which schools fail to meet the federal, four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate of 67%...beginning with the 2018-2019 school year” (P. 23). While the State</p>

	<p>mentions the federal four-year adjusted cohort rate, there is no mention of their extended-year or clarity on their “graduation rate data”. P. 25–26</p> <p>The SEA states the process will be used to identify all schools, not only Title I campuses that fail to graduate one-third or more of their students. P. 23</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA should provide clarity whether the extended year cohorts are being used to determine identification of schools with low graduation rates.
<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 following information is needed to fully meet this requirement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarification to indicate whether the extended-year cohort graduation rates are used to determine identification of schools with low graduation rates.</li> </ul>

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 provides details on how it will identify schools for additional targeted support for any one subgroup beginning in 2018–2019. The methodology is the same across all schools in the state. The SEA will identify any schools not meeting the exit criteria for comprehensive support and improvement. It will begin identification of these schools with the 2021-2022 school year. Schools not exiting after 3 years will be required to enter into a school-level MOU with SBE and/or develop a corrective action plan. Detailed requirements of such a plan are included. P. 23-24
<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</i>	

<i>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>	The SEA included the specific timeline for identifying schools for Comprehensive Support and Improvement consistent with the three year timeline. The SEA states these schools will be “identified once every three years.” P. 24
<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.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>	<p>The SEA describes its methodology to determine schools with consistently underperforming subgroups, including consistently underperforming - for all indicators except FGI (for schools that do not reduce the failure rate by 10 percent from the prior year or subgroups for which the school was identified) as well as consistently underperforming – FGI (for additional targeted support and improvement schools not meeting FGI in the four-year, five-year or six-year rate in the subgroup or subgroups for which the school was identified).</p> <p>The SEA identifies schools with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups from schools previously identified for additional targeted support and improvement. The SEA states it will “identify schools annually for targeted support and improvement beginning with the 2019-2020 school year”. P. 24</p>

<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA’s criteria are not based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation (i.e. chronic absenteeism is excluded from the methodology). P. 24
<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>	The following information is needed to fully meet this requirement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SEA’s methodology to identify schools with consistently underperforming subgroups which includes all indicators. Describe how the SEA’s methodology includes all indicators included in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation.</li> </ul>

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA provides a detailed outline on how the state will determine which schools are identified as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement Schools within an established timeline. The SEA states “using the combined rate, identify all schools that did not meet the interim measure of progress in any subgroup in reading and mathematics for either the current/most recent year, by using a three-year averaged rate comprised of the current and two previous years’ data, or by reducing the failure rate on the state assessments from the previous year by ten percent” and “any school that is identified for additional targeted support and improvement that failed to meet interim targets for chronic absenteeism will address chronic absenteeism during the school improvement process. P. 25</p> <p>The SEA states it will “identify all schools that did not meet the interim measure of progress in one or more subgroups for the federal four-year, five-year, and six-year adjusted cohort graduation rates, and that did not increase the graduation rate by 2.5 percent from the previous year. The SEA will identify any school with a reporting group that has a four-year federal graduation rate below 67%.” P. 25</p> <p>The SEA will identify schools for additional targeted support “every three</p>

	years beginning with the 2018-19 school year.” P. 25
<i>Strengths</i>	Graduation rate improvement is focused on subgroups, helping schools be aware and improve graduation rates over time. Additional Targeted/ Federal Graduation Indicator support success of subgroups. P. 25
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA’s criteria are not based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation. For example, chronic absenteeism is excluded from the methodology. It is unclear whether or not the SEA’s criteria currently include other indicators such as ELP and Growth. P. 25
<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 following information is needed to fully meet this requirement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of how the SEA includes all indicators in its methodology to identify schools with consistently underperforming subgroups.</li> </ul>

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>	NA. P. 26
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# 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>	The SEA describes the requirement to develop a plan that will occur if the 95% participation in the statewide assessment system is not adhered to. In addition, schools that continue not to meet the 95% participation threshold or demonstrate progress for meeting the 95% participation rate will be required to implement additional actions and interventions. P. 25
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA will require school plans of improvement for not meeting the 95% participation rate. If a school does not improve in three years additional measures will be required. P. 28
<i>Weaknesses</i>	It is unclear when schools will be required to develop a plan and/or implement additional actions and interventions (i.e. “three or more years” is not specific). It is unclear how “progress towards meeting the 95% participation rate” is determined. P. 25
<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: 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>	The SEA describes exit criteria for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that a school should meet in no more than four years. The SEA explains the improvement period for initial interventions to improve student performance in reading and math will be over a two-year period. The SEA describes a sustainability plan that requires state monitoring to ensure implementation of the interventions to support student progress. The

	SEA also presents additional criteria for schools identified for comprehensive support due to graduation rate, which allows a school to exit comprehensive support and improvement status once a school has made improvement necessary to be above the threshold. P. 25-27
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA provided a clear detailed description of how an identified school can exit from CSI. At the end of year two, these schools will be evaluated. If the school meets the established exit criteria, the school can exit early or continue for a third year if the school needs additional time. P. 27</p> <p>For schools that exit at the end of the two-year period following identification, the SEA requires schools to prepare a sustainability plan that requires state monitoring to ensure comprehensive support and improvement schools continue maintaining exit criteria. P. 26</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>	

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 has established clear goals and expectations for exiting from Additional Targeted Support schools status. The SEA states schools not identified for graduation rates must “meet the interim measures of progress or reduce the failure rate by ten percent;” schools identified because of their graduation rates “must either meet the interim measure of progress or must increase the FGI by 2.5 percent for two consecutive years” (P. 27). The SEA discusses exit criteria for schools receiving additional Targeted Support. The SEA requires meeting the required measures within two consecutive years or additional measures will be required. P. 27
<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.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 describes the more rigorous State determined actions required for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to exit in three years. The SEA requires both state and district interventions to support the improvement status of each school. The district will be required to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Virginia Board of Education to develop a corrective action plan. The SEA will provide technical assistance and support for the plan with other designated District team members. Reporting and progress reviews will be required. P. 27-28
<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.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>	The SEA states its “Office of School Improvement will periodically review resource allocation and school improvement expenditures for LEAs with a significant number of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support

	and improvement” by “detailing the requirements and timelines around timely efficient expenditure of funds; and [requiring] LEAs to indicate ... how funding requests are aligned to identified needs [and] how other resources are coordinated with the SIG 1003(a) funds to meet the academic improvement needs of the school” (P. 29). These actions also include technical assistance. P. 29
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA has detailed how it will confirm adequate resources for schools in improvement status. The SEA staff will provide ongoing technical assistance. Step by step process was very detailed.
<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.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>	<p>Plan seems sound and thorough with several good options available. Office of School Improvement is required to monitor, but it is not clear what staff and resources they have. The SEA states it will provide a self-selected and Office of School Improvement menu of sessions; required whole and small group sessions; individual LEA sessions and one-to-one customized assistance. P. 29</p> <p>The SEA provides sample session topics (e.g. alignment of written, taught and tested curriculum). The SEA outlines the technical assistance and support to be given to each district serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement. The technical assistance will include a menu for required trainings as well as those that may be selected to meet identified needs for a district. The SEA provides examples that include the required improvement plan, leadership training, alignment of curriculum and implementation, and research based interventions. P. 29</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	Clear list of opportunities for technical assistance based on the needs of each identified school. The SEA outlines specific training sessions that will address school system needs to improve student outcomes. P. 29
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA shares that it will have the staff and resources, but one reviewer is

	concerned with the ambitiousness of the plan and expressed concern about whether the SEA will have the resources available to assist schools and districts. P. 29
<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.f: If Applicable, Additional Optional Action**

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	NA. P. 29
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# 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>	<p>The SEA presents its findings from its 2015 Teacher Equity Plan, which includes comparisons to 2006 data. This report includes “data analysis from 2013-2014 data files related to distribution of teachers according to qualifications, experience, and assignment to their content area endorsements”, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Qualified teachers according to poverty quartiles</li> <li>• Qualified teachers according to minority quartiles</li> <li>• Teacher experience</li> <li>• Out-of-field teaching</li> <li>• English learners</li> <li>• Special Education</li> </ul> <p>The SEA will continue to have districts report information with their application for ESSA funding and will publically report the information. The SEA also discusses the data system needed to collect the information as well as concentration on providing support to recruit, retain and provide professional development to the State’s teachers. P. 29-32</p>
<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.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?

---

<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.

- Does the SEA’s description include how it will support LEAs to reduce the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA describes an extensive plan to improve school conditions for student learning, reduce incidents of bullying and harassment, reduce the overuse of discipline practices that remove the students from the classroom as well as reduce the use of aversive behavioral intervention that compromise student health and safety.</p> <p>The SEA explains that it will provide professional development, technical assistance and coaching through the Virginia Tiered Systems of Supports Research and Implementation Center. In addition, school nurses are on every campus and the Department of Criminal Justice Services Center for School and Campus Security operates through an MOU with the Virginia Department of Education to provide professional development, technical assistance and on-going building security to assist LEAs. P. 32-34</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA will be providing professional development and technical assistance from its multi-tiers support system to improve school conditions. P. 33</p> <p>The SEA highlights its success with Virginia Tiered Systems of Supports, e.g., “19% decrease (general education students ) and 15% decrease (special education students) in the average number of Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs) from EOY 2015 to EOY 2016” (P. 33). The SEA is tracking recovered instructional time based on the interventions to improve school conditions.</p> <p>The SEA does not specify whether support given to schools to improve conditions for student learning is specific to LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A or whether it is a statewide initiative. It would be a great support to all schools.</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.7: School Transitions (ESEA 1111(g)(1)(D))**

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA states its “VTSS framework is intended to address the needs of students at all level of schooling, particularly those in middle and high school to decrease the risk of students dropping out, as well as other vulnerable and mobile groups of students ... This includes not only those transitioning from one grade to the next grade but also those students transitioning into the district and/or a new school.” P. 34</p> <p>The SEA shares support is based on school transition data analyzed to develop and monitor transition plans, creation of positive school climate that promotes academic and social engagement and school connectedness, as well as support for students identified as homeless, foster or kinship care and military families. P. 32-35</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA is working to support wrap around services with counselors, nurses, homeless liaisons, academic intervention strategies, including support for military and foster students. The SEA has designated personnel to assist with transitions for students in areas where high populations of military are assigned. P. 34
<i>Ly 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>	

## **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 has established a set of questions to be asked in all districts to determine potential English learners and established a clear identification screener score to determine which students are English learners. The SEA has established a clear exit criteria based on the student’s score on the annual ELP assessment. The SEA has four optional screeners available that are aligned to the state ELP standards. The SEA states it “conducted meaningful

	consultation with LEA leaders, teachers...community stakeholders through roundtable sessions...face-to-face-meetings ... [and] through Virginia Department of Education presentations at conferences and during webinars, as well as requires for input to the state ESSA mailbox” (P. 52). The SEA describes a standardized process for entrance and exit procedures for English learners that was determined based on stakeholder input that represented the geographic diversity of the state. The identifying process includes parent input through the registration process or a home language survey and standardized assessments within 30 days. Exit criteria were established by assessment scores that correlate with student success with state assessment standards. P. 52-53
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA did not describe its geographic diversity during consultation. The SEA could improve its response by describing who was involved and where.
<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>	The SEA includes state level training, support for smaller EL population districts as well as university support for all districts with ELs. The SEA charts and describes the array of state supports in place to support meeting long-term goals for English proficiency and how it will help districts and schools including private nonprofits meet State standards. These supports include providing specific instructional supports, technical assistance to schools and districts, information sharing and university partnerships. Embedded in each support system is professional development and communication methods to ensure ongoing assistance. P. 53-56
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA provides annual training for schools and has a statewide consortium to support districts with smaller EL populations. Additional partnerships with universities and a web page with lots of information. The SEA staff includes 8 regional Title III staff to support districts based on geographic region. P. 55
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s))

<i>all requirements?</i>	<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.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>	The SEA will use eight regional support hubs with its Title III staff to consistently support and monitor the progress of ELs at the regional level. This support and ongoing technical assistance is critical to the success of ELs in the state. The SEA outlines the use of continued help of Title III specialists assigned to each of the State superintendent’s regions designated to provide technical support and program implementation, and program specialists to review districts’ programs/activities, budgets/reimbursement requests. In addition, the SEA established a three year monitoring cycle based on a risk analysis that reviews all aspects of the Title III program and expectations. P. 55-56
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA provides for ongoing monitoring and technical assistance based on the geographic regions. Monitoring is established on a criteria based three year monitoring cycle. This frequency allows the SEA to address continual progress in its EL program as well as address improvements. P. 56
<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>	