STATE PLAN
PEER REVIEW CRITERIA
Peer Review Panel Notes Template

STATE: Washington

U.S. Department of Education

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

A.1: Challenging State Academic Standards and Assessments

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

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

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

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

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

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Not Applicable
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers) ☒ N/A (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

---

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

➢ 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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State identifies 12 languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the student population. The State defines the most populous languages other than English as having a student/language combination that exceeds 1,000 in total across the State.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State identifies assessments in languages other than English (Spanish, Russian, Korean, Vietnamese, Chinese, Somali and Arabic) along with the grades and content areas for which those assessments are available.
Strengths	The State offers its State-developed science (grades 5, 8, and End-of Course Biology) assessments in languages other than English in addition to language options provided as part of its membership in the Smarter Balanced consortium.
Weaknesses	The State does not indicate if existing information is available to parents and families in their native language.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must	

provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State meets the criteria in its identification of additional languages needed for its statewide assessments (p. 14). The State specifies that assessments in Somali, Marshallese, and Tagalog are not provided, although these languages meet the definition of being present to a significant extent.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	The State does not mention if information is available to families in their native home language.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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:
    o   1) gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English;
    o   2) collect and respond to public comment; and
    o   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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State meets the criteria in its effort to develop assessments in languages

	other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population (p.14-15).
Strengths	The State's ongoing process includes discussions with peer agencies, experts and other stakeholders allowing for broader public engagement. As part of the Smarter Balance consortium, the State proposes to advance this work.
Weaknesses	The State does not indicate if existing information is available to parents and families in their native language. The descriptions of its efforts to develop assessments in this area are minimal.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State identifies the major racial/ethnic groups used in federal reporting: American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino, White, and Two or More Races (p. 15).
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	No additional subgroups of students are included in State's accountability system. The State identifies the following subgroups, in addition to the ones listed immediately above, for reporting: migrant, homeless, foster children, and military children (p. 16).
Strengths	Disaggregation of ethnic categories allows for better transparency and focused evaluation of the State's goals for all students.
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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.din 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)?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Not Applicable
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers) ☒ N/A (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State proposes using a minimum n-size of 20 over three years of data, which will be applied consistently across all schools and subgroups (p.17-18).
Strengths	Combining up to three years of data allows for the inclusion of small subgroups and schools which would otherwise be excluded from accountability ratings.
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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

➢ Is the selected minimum number of students statistically sound?[2]

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State's minimum n-size of 20 is statistically sound based on research and best practices.
Strengths	The State considered the impact of different n-sizes on reliability and variability. AYP and AMO results from the 2004-2005 through 2014-2015 school years were reviewed to determine the mean and standard deviation for different sized groups.

[2] Consistent with ESEA section1111(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.

Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State describes how it analyzed the impact of different n-sizes on stability, reliability, and inclusiveness (p. 19-20). The two primary considerations for the determination of minimum n-size were statistically sound results and the inclusion of small schools and historically underserved populations. The State consulted with several workgroups in establishing its minimum n-size.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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

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

---

[3] See footnote 5 above for further guidance.

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State's statute prescribes a minimum number of ten students for reporting. Additionally, combining up to three years of data to obtain the minimum number of 20 for accountability purposes guards against the ability to surmise information for small groups of students.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The minimum number of students for reporting purposes is ten. Following a careful analysis, the peer reviewers concluded that its minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is consistent with the requirements in ESEA section 1111(i), including with respect to privacy and statistical reliability.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State's targets were created by calculating annual achievement increments needed to reach 90 percent proficiency for each subgroup within ten years. Schools and subgroups currently achieving this goal are also required to demonstrate continuous progress.
Strengths	Determining annual improvement targets for all schools and student subgroups allows for differentiation in goal setting. Also, requiring schools and subgroups currently exceeding 90 percent proficiency to demonstrate continuous progress creates the expectation that all schools should strive toward higher levels of proficiency.
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State meets the criteria for providing measurements of interim progress for all students including subgroups (p.24).
Strengths	
Weaknesses	Easy to read numerical interim measures should be provided going forward.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State takes into account the improvement necessary for subgroups of students who are behind in reaching long-term goals to make significant progress in closing the statewide proficiency gap (p. 24-25).
Strengths	The State's plan includes the family and community engagement required to address the needs of the whole child. Implementation of evidence based practices and monitoring student progress is also included in the State's systems of supports. The State includes the Response To Intervention system of supports.
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

A.4.iii.b: Graduation Rate (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(bb))

A.4.iii.b.1: Long-term goals for four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate

➤ Does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students?
➤ Does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for each subgroup of students?
➤ Does the SEA's description include baseline data for all students and for each subgroup of students?
➤ Does the SEA's description include the timeline for meeting the long-term goals?
➤ Is the timeline the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students?
➤ Are the long-term goals ambitious?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State proposes a long-term goal for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate at 90 percent in 10 years for all students and subgroups. Baseline data from 2016-2017 are provided, and the timeline for reaching the end goal is the same for all students and subgroups (p. 26-27).
Strengths	
Weaknesses	Targets are based on projected graduation rates and will need to be re-evaluated.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the	

specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Not Applicable
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers) ☒ N/A (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State provides measurements of interim progress toward long-term goals for its four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students including subgroups (p. 28 and Appendix A). Annual targets for students and subgroups are calculated by dividing the

	graduation gap by ten (because the State's long-term goal for improving graduation rates extends over ten years through 2027).
Strengths	As with the long-term goals for academic performance, determining annual graduation rate targets for each schools and student subgroup allows for differentiation in goalsetting. Also, requiring schools and subgroups to demonstrate continuous progress once the 90 percent target is reached creates the expectation that all schools should strive to graduate all students.
Weaknesses	Easy to read numerical interim measures should be provided going forward.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State meets the criteria in its description to make the necessary improvements to close statewide graduate rate gaps for all students and subgroups (p. 28). The goals and measurements of interim progress take into account that some subgroups will need to improve at a greater rate.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State utilizes ELPA21 as its English language proficiency assessment and currently has two years of data to establish a baseline. It establishes a six-year period as the expected timeline for the achievement of English language proficiency and exiting status. The State identifies a one percent annual improvement in the percentage of students making progress. Table 9 indicates that more than one percent of students made progress from 2016 to 2017 (p. 29-34). However, some peer reviewers did not consider the long-term goals as ambitious because the timeline was through 2030.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	The State does not mention its processes for newly-arrived English learners at the high school level. A peer reviewer is concerned that these students will not be assessed on the ELP and their progress will not be factored into the system. The State cites "historical trends" for the transition rate to English language proficiency on page 29 but provides no empirical evidence. The information provided is too minimal to evaluate the appropriateness of these goals.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (2 peer reviewers) ☒ No (2 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	According to two peer reviewers, the State must provide additional information that supports the establishment of its long-term goals as ambitious.

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State provides information about measurements of interim progress for English learners to achieve English language proficiency (p. 29 and Appendix A).
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers)

all requirements?	☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State describes its Academic Achievement indicator as the measures of proficiency on the Smarter Balanced math and ELA assessments. The State also administers an alternate assessment, the Washington Access to Instruction & Measurement (WA-AIM), to students with significant cognitive disabilities. This assessment also measures proficiency for ELA and math. For accountability purposes, math and ELA proficiency are calculated separately for each school and for student subgroups within schools (p. 29-31).
Strengths	
Weaknesses	This indicator combines three years of data which may mask positive or negative trends. Also, schools which improve towards the State's long-term goals for academic proficiency will continue to be negatively impacted by prior year's performance.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the	

specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State uses student growth percentiles (SGPs) as the Other Academic indicator for elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools. Median SGPs are calculated, separately for ELA and math, for each school and subgroups within schools. Due to the transition to Smarter Balanced assessments, the first year of SGPs to be included for accountability will be from the 2015-2016 school year (p. 31-32).
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State uses the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. The State does not have an alternate diploma for students with significant cognitive disabilities. The accountability framework includes adjustments for schools that graduate high percentages of students in the extended timeframe (p. 32). The State's plan indicates that an upward adjustment will be made for schools that graduate relatively high percentages of students in an extended timeframe, but provides no detail.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The State must provide additional information to explain how the extended timeframe adjustments proposed are included in this indicator.

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State defines progress toward achieving English language proficiency as the percentage of students who are making adequate progress to exit the program within six years. The State compares the student's first-year performance on ELPA21 to their Year 2 level to determine if the student is progressing. To be considered on track for transition, students must achieve one level of gain per year (p. 33-34).
Strengths	
Weaknesses	ELPA21 is in its first year of roll out. The definition of progress should be re-evaluated once several years of data are available.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (1 peer reviewer) ☒ No (3 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The State must provide scientific evidence that ELPA 21 and the growth calculation are valid and reliable.

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State includes three measures of school quality or student success (SQSS): regular attendance, ninth graders on track, and dual-credit participation. Regular Attendance – students are identified as chronically absent if they miss 10 percent or more of school days. This indicator includes students enrolled

	for at least 90 days and the calculation of absenteeism is adjusted based on length of enrollment. All grades and student groups are included in the indicator, with the exception of students enrolled fewer than 90 days. Ninth graders on track –this indicator identifies ninth grade students to be "on track" for graduation if they attain full credit on courses they attempt in ninth grade. The indicator is calculated for all students, and student subgroups, for those enrolled in the 9th grade. Dual Credit Participation – this measure is calculated based on the percent of students in grades 9 – 12 that complete a dual credit course, including Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, College in the High School, Tech Prep, and Cambridge programs (p.35-38).
Strengths	
Weaknesses	K-8 schools currently only qualify for one of the three School Quality or Student Success indicators. Two peer reviewers caution that the ninth grade on-track sub-indicator may lead to some students receiving less rigorous coursework in order to obtain full credit.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Schools within the State are assigned a score of 1 – 10 for each indicator based on a decile system. The scores for each school are then aggregated using a weighting system. Subgroups also receive scores for each measure as well as a multiple measures score based on the same system and weighting. Each measure within the system is assigned a decile rank, and ranks are combined to produce a multiple measure score (p. 39-40).
Strengths	
Weaknesses	This differentiation system may not be transparent for parents and other community stakeholders.

Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

A.4.v.b: Weighting of Indicators

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

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State's weighting scheme is clearly defined. When an indicator cannot be calculated due to the minimum number of students, the weighting of other select indicators increases. The three SQSS measures are averaged for high schools to obtain an overall score which is then weighted (p. 41-42).
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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.aof 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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State describes different methodologies to identify schools for

	comprehensive or targeted support and improvement. The State identifies the following types of schools where a different methodology for annual meaningful differentiation applies: Schools in Which No Grade Level is Assessed; Variant Grade Configurations; Small School; Schools Designed to Serve Special Populations; Charter Schools; and Newly Opened Schools (p. 42).
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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)?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State identifies Title I schools using the combined multiple measures approach utilized for annual meaningful differentiation. Based on three years of combined data, the lowest performing five percent of Title I schools are identified for comprehensive support and improvement. Schools are identified for comprehensive support once every three years at the beginning of the 2018-2019 school year based on data from the 2017-2018 school year (p. 44).
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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)?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State establishes an acceptable methodology and timelines to identify all public high schools in the State failing to graduate one-third of more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement. The State uses three years of combined data for school identification, which will first take place at the beginning of the 2018-2019 school year based on data from the previous school year.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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)?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State identifies additional targeted support schools for comprehensive support and improvement if, after three years, the school do not improve performance of lower achieving student subgroups. The State will first identify these schools in the 2022 school year (p. 45).
Strengths	
Weaknesses	

Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State includes the frequency by which it will identify each type of school for comprehensive support and improvement after the first year of identification and every three years thereafter (p. 45).
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Consistently underperforming subgroups are defined as those whose multiple measures score falls below the threshold set for all students. Each measure within the State's system of meaningful differentiation is assigned a decile rank, and ranks are combined to produce a multiple measure score (p. 39-40). If a school has a single subgroup whose multiple measure score falls below the threshold, the school is identified for Targeted Support and Improvement.

	Identification of these schools will begin in the 2018-19 school year and be conducted annually. Identified schools have up to three years to implement targeted supports and improvements (p.46-47).
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Schools are identified for Additional Targeted Support if they have two or more subgroups whose summative score on the annual system of meaningful differentiation falls below the threshold. These schools will first be identified in the 2018-19 school year and annually thereafter (p.47-48).
Strengths	ESSA requires schools to be identified for Additional Targeted Support if any subgroup performs similarly to the lowest performing schools in the State. Washington's methodology includes all schools, which therefore sets a higher bar for identifying subgroups in need of improvement.
Weaknesses	Schools with only one low performing subgroup would not be identified for additional targeted support.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The State's methodology to identify additional targeted support schools must be based on the performance of any one subgroup of students, rather than the two or more subgroups specified in the State's plan.

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State identifies an additional category of targeted support schools for consistently low-performing English learners. These schools will first be identified in the 2018-19 school year. Only one year of data will be utilized for the first identification of the schools because the ELPA21 was first administered in 2016. As more years of data become available, identification of schools within this category will be based on three years of data (p.48-49).
Strengths	The State's accountability and school support system provides additional recognition for English learners and the schools which serve them.
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

A.4.vii: Annual Measure of Achievement (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(iii))

➢ Does the SEA describe how it factors the requirement for 95 percent participation of all students and 95 percent of all students in each subgroup of students in statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments into the statewide accountability system?
➢ If applicable, does the SEA describe how the SEA differentiates its approach based on such factors as the number of subgroups in the school missing the participation rate requirement, the length of time over which the school has missed the requirement, or the degree to which the school missed the requirement (*e.g.*, 92 percent participation rate vs. 70 percent participation)?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Three peer reviewers concluded that there is insufficient data to determine if the State calculates mathematics and language arts participation rates separately (p.49).
Strengths	Two peer reviewers noted that schools not meeting 95 percent participation cannot receive state or national awards based on elements of the accountability plan.
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (1 peer reviewers) ☒ No (3 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet	The State must clarify if the participation rate is calculated separately by subject, to be later applied to the academic achievement indicator, for mathematics and reading/language arts.

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)?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State's exit criteria for comprehensive support and improvement schools are clearly defined and meet the requirements. The State describes its statewide exit criteria for comprehensive support schools and the number of years within which schools are expected to meet criteria, which is three. The exit criteria ensure continued progress for both students and the schools (p. 50).
Strengths	Schools may petition after the second year of supports for an accelerated exit. The State plans to re-evaluate the identification process after three years.
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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

➢ Does the SEA describe its statewide exit criteria for schools receiving additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C), which may include how the exit criteria align with the State's long-term goals and measurements of interim progress and the requirement that the goals and measurements of interim progress take into account the improvement necessary to close statewide proficiency and graduation rate gaps?
➢ Does the SEA's description include the number of years within which schools are expected to meet such criteria?
➢ Do the exit criteria ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in the State (*e.g.*, do the exit criteria improve student outcomes for the subgroup or subgroups

that led to the school's identification and ensure that a school that exits no longer meets the criteria under which the school was identified)?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State's exit criteria for schools receiving additional targeted support to close statewide achievement and graduation rate gaps are clearly defined to meet its long-term goals. The State describes its statewide exit criteria for additional targeted support schools and the number of years within which schools are expected to meet criteria, which is three. The exit criteria ensure continued progress for both students and the schools (p. 50-51).
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State provides a clear description of its framework for providing more rigorous interventions for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvements that fail to meet the states exit criteria within the State's determined number of years (p.51-55).
Strengths	Considering interventions on a school-by-school basis allows for differentiation of support efforts. The State offers inclusive wraparound supports for students, families and schools.
Weaknesses	Two peer reviewers noted that the State does not mention if additional information was gathered from teachers, staff, or parents in its identification, determination, intervention or strategies.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must	

provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State's description of its periodic review of resource allocation to support improvement for schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement meets the requirement. The State uses an internet based allocation of resources portal and is working to enhance the portal (p. 55-56).
Strengths	
Weaknesses	Two peer reviewers note that the State does not mention if parents or community members were included in the process of periodic review of its resource allocations.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State meets the requirements to describe its technical assistance for schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement (p. 57-66).
Strengths	Technical assistance provided by the State focuses on partnerships with various stakeholders including school personnel, family members and community partners. Additionally, support efforts include evidence-based interventions that are data driven.
Weaknesses	The State does not indicate if it conducted outreach to the community at-large to ensure the technical assistance supports are appropriate and meet the needs of all stakeholders. One peer reviewer noted that the State's Resource and Advisory Committee

	does not include teachers, school staff, parent, family, and student representation.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State clearly describes its action to initiate additional improvement in LEAs with a significant number of schools consistently identified for comprehensive support and improvement. The SEA follows the process outlined in Washington state law to support schools in need of improvement and increased levels of state oversight for persistently lowest achieving schools (p. 66-70).
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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

➢ Does the SEA describe the extent, if any, that low-income children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, which may include the State definition of ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers?

➢ Does the SEA describe the extent, if any, that minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, which may include the State definition of ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers?

➢ Does the SEA describe the measures (*e.g.*, data used to calculate the disproportionate rates) that it will use to evaluate and publicly report its progress with respect to how low-income and minority children are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers?[4]

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State analyzed student access rates to out-of-field, ineffective, and inexperienced teachers. The State sufficiently describes the extent that minority and low-income children are taught at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out of field, or inexperienced teachers. In the 2018-19 school year, it proposes to calculate the access rates of students to teachers rated ineffective through the Teacher and Principal Evaluation Program. The State will report equity gaps in its Equity Plan p.70-77).
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

A.6: School Conditions (ESEA Section 1111(g)(1)(C))

➢ Does the SEA describe how it will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A to improve school conditions for student learning?
➢ Does the SEA's description include how it will support LEAs to reduce incidences of bullying and harassment?
➢ Does the SEA's description include how it will support LEAs to reduce the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom?
➢ Does the SEA's description include how it will support LEAs to reduce the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State meets the criteria in its description of how it supports LEAs to reduce the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety (p.77-81).
Strengths	A wide range of issues are addressed including bullying, harassment, mental health, suicide, discipline, restraint of students, and multi-tiered systems of

---

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

	support.
Weaknesses	The State plan lacks information about training and resources for parents and families, including parents of children with special needs, as determined by an Individualized Education Program or 504 plan.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State describes how it will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A in meeting the needs of students at all levels of schooling (p. 81-100).
Strengths	A wide range of issues are addressed including bullying, harassment, mental health, suicide, discipline, restraint of students, and multi-tiered systems of support. The State offers Career Technical Education (CTE) programs to prepare students for careers in industry, manufacturing and other high skilled industrial sectors available to students with High School and Beyond Plans (p. 92-93 and 96-97).
Weaknesses	Two reviewers note that the State provides CTE programs to prepare some students (those with High School and Beyond Plans) for careers in industry, manufacturing and other high skilled industrial sectors, however, these programs should be available and accessible to all students.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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

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

➢ Does the SEA describe how it will establish and implement, with timely and meaningful consultation with LEAs representing the geographic diversity of the State, standardized statewide entrance and exit procedures for English learners, including a description of how, if applicable, a State will ensure that local input included in the exit procedures, such as teacher input or a portfolio, will be applied statewide?

➢ Does the SEA's description include an assurance that all students who may be English learners are assessed for such status within 30 days of enrollment in a school in the State?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Students are identified based on a home language survey and their score on the State-approved English language proficiency screener. Districts are required to administer the State's English language proficiency assessment within ten days of enrollment. English learners are tested annually using ELPA21. Students exit English language development services upon obtaining proficiency on the ELPA21 (p. 126-127).
Strengths	
Weaknesses	Two peer reviewers note that the State does not mention if parents and families are specifically included during entrance and exit processes.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State establishes student growth and proficiency goals based on age and English language proficiency upon entering the program. The State also provides technical assistance (direct and virtual) to LEAs, and provides required academic assessments in native languages (p. 127-128).
Strengths	The State establishes a comprehensive system of support for English learner progress, including mechanisms to assist eligible entities in helping to ensure that English learners meet challenging State academic standards.
Weaknesses	Two peer reviewers note that the State does not mention if information is provided to parents and families.
Did the SEA meet	☒Yes (4 peer reviewers)

all requirements?	☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	LEAs are required to conduct an annual data-driven program evaluation prior to receiving Title III funds. The evaluation includes analysis of student outcome data and descriptions of how funds are used. Beginning in the 2018-19 school year, LEAs will provide evidence of effective instructional strategies, professional learning and family engagement (p. 128-129).
Strengths	The State includes families in its process.
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	