STATE PLAN
PEER REVIEW CRITERIA
Peer Review Notes Template

STATE: Wisconsin

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:

- <u>Peer Analysis</u>: Describe the peer reviewer's justification for why an SEA did or did not meet the requirement;
- <u>Strengths</u>: Summarize the strengths of an SEA's response to the State plan requirement;
- <u>Weaknesses</u>: 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
- <u>Assessment</u>: Determine if the SEA met the State plan requirement (indicated by Yes/No)
    - o 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,[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	N/A
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	N/A
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	

---

[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 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 8th graders under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb); (2) the State provides for appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR § 200.6(b) and (f); and (3) the student's performance on the more advanced mathematics assessment is used for purposes of measuring academic achievement under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) and participation in assessments under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E).

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

A.3.i: Definition

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

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The SEA defined "a language other than English that is present to a significant extent in the participating student population" as a language that has a written form and is the first language of students who represent at least 20% of the pupils enrolled in grades K-12 who are current or former English learners. As specified in the plan, Spanish is the only language that meets this definition.
Strengths	The SEA described that they set the threshold at 20% to ensure an adequate size group of English learner students, and provides a list of the 10 languages that are spoken by 90% of English learners in K-12.
Weaknesses	The SEA did not provide their consideration of languages spoken by the state population including English learners who are migratory, English learners who were not born in the United States, and English learners who are Native Americans. Additionally, the SEA did not provide information about the consideration for languages by LEA and grade level.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (3 peer reviewers) ☒ No (1 peer reviewer)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	One peer reviewer noted that the SEA should describe how it considered languages other than English that are spoken by distinct populations of English learners, including English learners who are migratory, English learners who were not born in the United States, and English learners who are Native Americans. The SEA should 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.

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 SEA complies with the requirements of this section by stating that it provides Spanish assessments in math and science for grades 3-8.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	One Peer Reviewer noted the SEA does not discuss the method of producing the stacked translation; is the translation a word by word translation or a transliteration where the meaning is translated?
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 SEA provides data that Spanish is a significant language present in the student population. WDPI indicates that there is no need for the state assessment to be available in any other languages than Spanish.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	One Peer Reviewer noted that Spanish is such a significant language spoken in Wisconsin; it is a weakness for the state not to have Spanish assessments in language arts, mathematics or science at the high school.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (3 peer reviewers) ☐ No (1 peer reviewer)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	One Peer Reviewer noted WDPI should reconsider its position on Spanish assessments in Language Arts, grades 3-8 and for Language Arts and mathematics in High School.

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The SEA explained that they have addressed all requirements in developing assessments in languages that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population.
Strengths	The SEA discusses its efforts to hold discussions with appropriate stakeholders on the development of testing in additional languages and names a number of appropriate groups.
Weaknesses	One Peer Reviewer recommends the SEA reconsider its position on Spanish assessments on Language Arts for grades 3-8 and for Language Arts and mathematics in high school.

The SEA did not describe the process for re-evaluating the need for providing translations for state assessments in other languages if/when there are significant demographic changes in the state and if another language is represented by 20% or more of the English learner student population. |
| *Did the SEA meet all requirements?* | ☒ Yes (3 peer reviewers)
☐ No (1 peer reviewer) |
| *If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement* | One Peer Reviewer noted the SEA should provide information on the main points of discussion with its stakeholder groups, and how it arrived at its decision not to provide Spanish Language Arts to students. |

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 SEA lists each of the major racial and ethnic groups in its accountability system.
Strengths	N/A

Weaknesses	Providing ethnic distribution would have strengthened the response.
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	N/A
Strengths	N/A
	N/A
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.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)?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The SEA selected the first option so no explanation is needed.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	N/A
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 SEA clearly indicates the minimum n-size of 20 for federal accountability purposes and indicates the same n-size will be used as the State determined number for all students and subgroups.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	N/A
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 SEA described factors considered to determine n-size and the extensive involvement of the accountability design team (i.e. number of subgroups excluded, statistical impact, and ability to maintain privacy). It should be noted that the SEA's decision was justified based upon their intent to utilize the n-size to identify schools for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement in alignment with the SEA's accountability system under ESSA.
Strengths	The discussion of how the minimum n-size was set lays out stakeholder engagement. The SEA states that it raised the question of n-size in the recent engagement for ESSA implementation and the stakeholders have reaffirmed the desire to keep the n-size at 20.
Weaknesses	N/A
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 SEA states that it held many listening sessions and discussions with multiple stakeholders to determine the n-size of 20, both in 2011 when they changed the n-size from 40 to 20 for the ESEA Flexibility Request and again recently for the ESSA implementation.
Strengths	The SEA describes its discussions with several groups of stakeholders when it

---

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

	lowered n-size from 40 to 20, coming as a result of stakeholder interest in broadening student subgroups included in testing results. This change was based on extensive stakeholder engagement with groups and individuals representing students with disabilities, English learners, Native American students, the Governor, the chairs of the Senate and Assembly education committees, school and district leadership, school boards, teachers, and parents.
Weaknesses	N/A
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]

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The SEA states that it will not identify any n-sizes below 20 and will indicate these subgroups as "<20" for reporting to ensure the privacy of individual students.
Strengths	The SEA describes that student privacy is also supported by the Federal law, state statutes, and WDPI policy.
Weaknesses	N/A
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	

---

[3] See footnote 5 above for further guidance.

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 SEA indicates that for accountability reporting, the n-size is set at 20, and for non-accountability reporting, the n-size of 6 which is greater than National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) guidelines of five (5). The state does not display any number below the minimum n-size of 6 to protect the privacy of the students.
Strengths	The SEA will use the WISEdash public portal to disseminate its results, and these data sets will also use an asterisk instead of data for small groups of students.
Weaknesses	The SEA requested flexibility for collecting data for students whose parents are in the Armed Forces and the per-pupil expenditures of federal, state, and local funds because they do not collect these data points currently. It is unclear to the Peer Reviewers why this request is included in this response. The SEA does not mention masking in percentages only N-counts. Masking based on percentages in addition to N-counts would better protect student privacy.
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 SEA explains that its long-term goal is to cut the achievement gap in half for each subgroup within six years. For all students, this means a 1.0 percentage point annual increase in both ELA and mathematics. The tables include the baseline data from SY15-16, 6-year targets, and the required annual increase in percentage points for each subgroup; subgroups with low proficiency rates have higher percentages to increase over the six-year period.
Strengths	The SEA provides justification for why it chose the six-year timeline and states that at the end of the six-year period it will reevaluate and potentially reset the targets. The SEA also states that the proficiency cut scores are aligned to the NAEP to ensure alignment with the national and international benchmarks.
Weaknesses	The state has ambitious long-term goals; however, the overall goals do not match the subgroup goals, Page 19. It is difficult to understand the chart on page 21, which shows the baseline data and expected growth for each group of students. For example, in the case of Black students, the achievement gap (between Black students and all students) will be halved from 28 points in 2015-16 to 14 points in 6 years. However, for Hispanic students, the baseline is 25.1% proficient, a gap of about 17 points. In 6 years, the expected rate is 43.1%, with a gap of 5 points, not half of 17 = 8.5 points. Charts should be recalculated for accuracy. It is unclear how the interim and long term goals for Asian and White subgroups, already above the all-student baseline, were set. Increasing many subgroup's performance by 2 or 3 percentage points per year and increasing White student performance by 1 percentage point should not lead to a 1 percentage point overall increase in proficiency. It would lead to a greater than 1 percentage point per year.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (3 peer reviewers) ☒ No (1 peer reviewer)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	One Peer Reviewer noted the state should reconsider its long-term goals such that the goals require more than a 1 percentage point increase per year.

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 SEA provides the measurements of interim progress for all students and each subgroup in Appendix A for academic achievement (ELA and math proficiency), graduation rate, and EL proficiency. The SEA provides a table with annual interim targets aligned to the long-term goals for all students and each subgroup.

Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	N/A
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	Based upon the information provided it is difficult to determine whether or not the SEA's long-term goals require greater rates of improvement for lower achieving subgroups of students. The SEA's long-term goal for all students is 6 percentage points improvement while the long-term goal for many subgroups is much higher. The SEA does not provide N counts for subgroups in the baseline therefore, it is difficult to ascertain if the annual increase in proficiency will close the gaps as planned, Page 23.
Strengths	The goal of decreasing achievement gaps in 6-years is laudable. Each subgroup is treated individually, based on its own numeric gap, with its own interim targets and long-term expectations for growth, (page 23).
Weaknesses	The SEA should demonstrate that subgroup trajectories for progress are at or above historical trajectories. The SEA should also review long-term goal calculations for accuracy and clarify its comparison subgroups (which subgroup is the comparison subgroup for racial and ethnic subgroups).
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 SEA explains that its long-term graduation goal is to halve the graduation gap within six years. The table includes the 2015, 4-yr Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (ACGR) as the baseline, the six-year targets, and the required annual increase in percentage points for all students and each subgroup. Subgroups with lower ACGR have higher percentage increases to make in the six-year period.
Strengths	Cutting gaps in half is an ambitious and worthy long-term goal. The timeline is the same for all groups

The SEA's examples of identified stakeholder support were beneficial in understanding the process. |
| Weaknesses | The long-term goals for White and Asian students appear to be quite modest, with only a two-point percentage rate increase over six years. The calculations of halving the baseline gap do not appear to be accurate in all cases.
The all students long term goal does not appear to take into account the increase in the graduation rate of traditionally low graduation rate subgroups. |
| 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	The SEA states that it will set the extended-year graduation rate goals using the 7-yr graduation rate. SEA utilized an extended-year adjusted graduation rate to be consistent with the provisions of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) for students with disabilities. By focusing on the provision of Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE), implementing a seven-year adjusted graduation rate and ensuring ambitious expectations, this subgroup of students is now provided equitable opportunities. The table on page 28 includes the 2013 6-yr ACGR as the baseline, the six-year targets, and the required annual increase in percentage points for all students and each subgroup. Subgroups with lower extended-year graduation rates have higher percentage increases to make in the six-year period.
Strengths	The SEA provides a justification for using the 7-yr graduation rate, to be consistent with the provisions of FAPE for students with disabilities that allow these students to receive services until the age of 21.
Weaknesses	The long-term goals for White and Asian students appear to be quite modest; less than a two-point percentage rate increase over six years. The calculations of halving the baseline gap do not appear to be accurate in all cases. The SEA does not currently calculate the 7-yr graduation rate, so they set their 7-yr graduation rate targets using the 6-yr graduation rates. While there may not be a significant difference between the 6-yr and 7-yr graduation rates, the targets that were set using the 6-yr rates may not be ambitious enough for the 7-yr graduation rates.
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 SEA should provide a baseline 7-year graduation rate using actual data and set ambitious long term goals that require at least as much improvement per year as the 4-year graduation rate.

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	WDPI provides the requested information on interim progress for all groups of students for both the four-year and extended rate; Appendix A.
Strengths	N/A

Weaknesses	The SEA long-term goals do not identify the racial and ethnic subgroup comparison group. The lack of clarity makes it difficult to determine if the long-term goals align with the SEA's goal of decreasing graduation rate gaps by half; Appendix A, page 114.
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 SEA's long-term goal is to cut the achievement gap in half in six years. They include the percentage increases that all students and each subgroup will have to make for the 4-yr and 7-yr Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate in previous two sections.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	The SEA should demonstrate that subgroup trajectories for progress are at or above historical trajectories. The SEA should also review long-term goal calculations for accuracy and clarify its comparison subgroups (which subgroup is the comparison subgroup for racial and ethnic subgroups).
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 SEA explains that the long-term goal for EL students is to achieve an 18-point increase in the percentage of students' on-track to proficiency by the end of six years. They state that this goal is in alignment with the 2- to 4-percentage point annual improvement required to reach the ELA and math achievement goals for subgroups falling behind. They use the SY14-15 ACCESS median to set the baseline at 61%.
Strengths	The SEA's goal of achieving proficiency ranges from one to eight years, depending upon grade at entry, prior schooling, and English level at entry. The state trajectory factors in these data in determining on-track to proficiency. The 3 percentage point annual increase demonstrates a more ambitious rate of improvement than the state's earlier goal of 2 percentage point annual increase. The chart in Appendix A provides information on the differentiated goals using 2014-15 district median of percent ELs on track, which is 61%.
Weaknesses	N/A
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.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 SEA describes its methodology to calculate appropriate growth expectations annually based on grade, ELP level, and year of entry. Documents provided in 'Appendix A' provide sound support on measurements of interim progress.
Strengths	In Appendix A, the state provides a table showing the breakdown of time-to-proficiency by starting grade and starting English Language Proficiency level, which is used to determine on-track to proficiency calculations. Scale score growth, deemed fastest at earlier levels, is also part of the calculation. The SEA's measurements of interim progress for English learners are in alignment with the States' plan for all students.

Weaknesses	N/A
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: 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 SEA states that the academic achievement indicator will be based on combined ELA and mathematics performance on the Wisconsin Student Assessment System (WSAS) for all students groups and each subgroup with 20 or more students. ELA and mathematics will be equally weighted. The state proposes using a performance index rather than percent proficient.
Strengths	The SEA consistently links documentation back to the State's accountability system. Up to three sequential years of testing data will be used to calculate the proficiency index (greater weight will be given to more recent years' data) to increase the reliability of the data thus reducing the effect of year-to-year enrollment variability on aggregated test data.
Weaknesses	The SEA's response does not clearly state its adherence to the 95%

	participation rate, but it does use the state's system for assessing all students (except for those who take an alternate test). The SEA proposes using a weighted score approach averaged over as many as three years, but does not specify how the SEA will weight recent years more in the average. The SEA's index system for performance levels awards 1.5 points for students performing at the advanced level. The approach has the capacity to mask differences in subgroup performance in that high performing students can swap out lower performing students, Page 34.
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 SEA should propose less weighting in their performance index for advanced students. Additionally, the SEA should provide more detail as to the proposed multi-year weighting. The SEA should reference the 95% participation rate in this section.

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 SEA indicates that it will use the Student Growth Percentile (SGP) modeling for ELA and mathematics to measure the academic growth for elementary and middle schools for all students and each subgroup with 20 or more students. They will use up to three years of student-level data to calculate the SGPs for ELA and mathematics.
Strengths	The SEA plans to use a growth measure for elementary and middle schools, the Student Growth Percentile (SGP), generated from the state test in language arts and mathematics.

	SGPs are used in Wisconsin school report cards, and are therefore already familiar to parents and school personnel.
Weaknesses	The SEA identifies a well-established growth measure to be included in their accountability system but does not provide sufficient detailed information for the Peer Reviewers to determine how the State will calculate this indicator.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (3 peer reviewers) ☒ No (1 peer reviewer)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	One Peer Reviewer noted that the State should provide additional detailed information for the Peer Reviewer to determine how the State will calculate this measure, assurances that the measure will be calculated the same for all schools, affirmation of the State's averaging techniques or lack thereof.

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 SEA's graduation rate indicator is in alignment with noted minimum n-size and calculated for all students and subgroups across all LEAs. The State stated that year-to-year improvement on the indicator would signify progress toward long-term goals. The indicator will include both four-year and seven-year adjusted cohort graduation rates, (pg. 36). Additionally, the State determined the state-defined alternate diploma would not be included in the calculation at this time.
Strengths	The state provided a concise, thorough description of the graduation rate indicator calculation.
Weaknesses	The states averaging of the four-year and seven-year graduation rates equally appear to overvalue the seven year rate.

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.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 SEA indicates that they will use a school-level mean SGP for the EL proficiency indicator and will include up to two prior years of assessment data. They state that they will include students in grades 1-12 for this indicator, and indicate that once an EL student has achieved a 5.0 composite score on the ACCESS assessment, the student is considered proficient for accountability purposes.
Strengths	The SEA is using its existing ELP exam as the basis for calculating the SGP, and is going beyond grades 3-8 and one year of high school to include 1-12 in its calculations.
Weaknesses	The SEA identifies a well-established growth measure to be included in their accountability system but does not provide sufficient detailed information for the Peer Reviewers to determine how the State will calculate this indicator.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (3 peer reviewers) ☒ No (1 peer reviewer)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	One Peer Reviewer noted that the state should provide additional detailed information so that it is possible to determine how the State will calculate this indicator, assurances that the indicator will be calculated the same for all schools, and assert that the indicator is 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 SEA indicates that they will use chronic absenteeism as the school quality indicator for all schools and include students in all grades. This measure will be calculated for all students and each subgroup with 20 or more students and up to three years of data will be used for the calculation.
Strengths	The SEA provides a supportive chart which assisted in substantiating the information provided. The SEA provides data to justify that this measure will contribute to differentiation of schools and explains that it is an indicator that the state has been using since SY11-12.
Weaknesses	The SEA does not discuss how this measure provides meaningful differentiation of school performance. In particular, an explanation of how this measure indicates school efforts and not merely other factors outside of the schools control. The SEA enumerates the indicator without describing how this indicator leads to meaningful differentiation. The SEA does not include any additional student success indicator for high schools, which means high schools will have no student growth measure.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (3 peer reviewers) ☒ No (1 peer reviewer)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	One Peer Reviewer noted the SEA should provide a theory of action describing how this indicator will provide meaningful differentiation across schools, along with multiple years of data demonstrating that the differentiation across schools is meaningful (aligns with schools efforts).

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	The system is explained and establishes the intent of producing an overall score that differentiates school and subgroup performance. Indicator scores will be produced for all students and subgroups. SEA states that the primary purpose of this system is to appropriately identify schools for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement. The SEA states that they will use the indicators described in previous sections to calculate scores for all students and each subgroup with 20 or more students. A school could receive up to 11 possible scores, the scores will then be standardized to produce an overall score from 0 to 100 points. They will use this overall score to identify schools for comprehensive support, targeted support, and " not identified". The SEA states the weighting of indicators will be described in A.4.v.b.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	N/A
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 SEA's accountability calculation is based on a 0-100 scale in order to provide a meaningful differentiated school performance. A combination of

	data elements will be calculated based upon school availability (academic achievement, student growth, graduation, chronic absenteeism, and EL progress). The SEA describes the weighting of each indicator—chronic absenteeism (school quality measure) is set at 15% for all schools, EL progress, when there are 20 or more students, is set at 10 if the EL student population makes up 10% or more of the school population and 5 if the EL student population makes up less than 10%. The remaining indicators (academic achievement, student growth, and graduation) are then weighted equally when applicable.
Strengths	The SEA provides a table on page 41 which demonstrates how the weighting is provided at different school levels with different EL populations and/or graduation data information.
Weaknesses	The SEA does not provide an explanation as to how academic achievement, student growth, graduation rate and chronic absenteeism are combined to a single indicator when individual subgroups are missing one or more of the indicators due to minimum n-size.
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 SEA should provide additional information on how they will incorporate the subgroup performance data into their System of Annual Meaningful Differentiation, especially when a subgroup is missing a single indicator due to minimum n-size.

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The SEA notes the alternate accountability process applies to schools having no tested grades, schools with fewer than 20 full academic year students enrolled in tested grades, new schools, and schools exclusively serving at-risk students.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	No description of current performance indicators for alternate accountability was provided. While the SEA indicates that they will use this alternate accountability process to meet the requirements of ESSA, it does not describe how it will use the alternate rating to identify schools for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.
Did the SEA meet	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers)

all requirements?	☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The SEA should provide a description of the current performance indicators for the alternate accountability and self-assessment mentioned in the response, page 42. The SEA should describe how it will use the alternate rating to identify schools for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.

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 SEA will begin identifying schools for 2018-19. State will identify schools based upon overall outcomes of the federal accountability system. Additionally, the SEA will identify the lowest 5% of schools receiving Title I, Part A.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	N/A
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 SEA uses both a four-year and seven-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and has determined rates will be averaged for all schools. Schools with an average graduation rate below 67% will be identified. Schools will be identified for the 2018-19 school year.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	N/A
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 SEA provided a description of the methodology for identifying schools in need of additional targeted support after six years under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C).
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	The SEA's response allows schools to remain in the targeted status for 6 years after identification. The Peer Reviewers noted this timeline is excessively long and not educationally sound for children. Additionally, the first identification of the schools would not occur until the 2024-25 school year, which is the last year of the 6 year long-term goals.
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 SEA should shorten its timeline for the identification of additional targeted support not exiting status.

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 SEA will identify the lowest 5% and graduation rate below 67% comprehensive support schools every 3 years, and targeted support schools not exiting status as comprehensive support schools every 6 years.
Strengths	A chart is provided on page 44 showing the initial identification year for the lowest 5% and graduation rate below 67% schools. They are to be identified in 2018-19 and identified every three years.
Weaknesses	The SEA's response allows schools to remain in the targeted status for 6 years after identification. The Peer Reviewers noted this timeline is excessively long, not educationally sound for children and does not meet statutory requirements. Additionally, the first identification of the schools would not occur until the 2024-25 school year, which is the last year of the 6 year long-term goals.
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 SEA should adjust their timeline of the identification of conversion from additional targeted support status after the initial identification to comply with Section 1111(c)(4)(D) of ESEA, once every 3 years.

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	The SEA defines "consistently underperforming" as any subgroup in the bottom 10% of statewide performance for all students and bottom 10% of statewide subgroup performance across all indicators. The SEA will base its identification of schools for targeted support upon outcomes of the annual federal accountability system prior to 2018-19 school year and annually thereafter.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	The SEA does not specify how it will handle schools that meet the identification criteria for both CSI low performing and TSI under-performing status.

	The SEA's method of identifying chronically under-performing subgroups allows a school to be held harmless as long as a low performing subgroup is not in the lowest 10% of that subgroup across the state. The SEA should consider clarifying the language in this response (i.e. schools with the greatest achievement gap).
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	The SEA's will identify schools for additional targeted support from among those identified for targeted support in which any student subgroup performance, on its own would place it in the bottom 5% of performance of all schools that receive Title I funds, page 45.. The identification will begin prior to 2018-19, and will be done every three years.
Strengths	The indicators are based on multiple years of data to ensure the identified underperformance is of a chronic and systemic nature.
Weaknesses	The response would have benefitted by providing more detail in regard to the calculation.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewer) ☐ 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.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 SEA will continue to identify "Schools of Recognition" for schools that make better than expected achievement with high poverty populations, have overall high achievement, and are closing achievement gaps, as they have for over 10 years.
Strengths	The SEA has been recognizing Schools of Recognition for over 10 years and will continue to do so under this new federal accountability system.
Weaknesses	The response would have benefitted by providing more detail in regard to the measures used to determine school status.
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	The SEA states that the achievement calculations will be conducted for all students and each subgroup with 20 or more students based on 95% participation in the statewide annual assessment or the number of students tested in excess of 95%, whichever is higher.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	The SEA does not clarify how they will calculate the indicators if the 95% participation requirement is not met, and how they factor the requirement of 95% participation into the state accountability system.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that	The SEA should clarify how they will calculate the indicators if the 95% participation requirement is not met, and how they factor the requirement of 95% participation into the state accountability system.

an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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

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

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

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The SEA's exit criteria for comprehensive support and improvement schools has three components—the school does not meet the initial identification criteria, demonstrates sustained progress, and demonstrates evidence of systems/structures/processes for high quality improvement planning and practices. The timeline for meeting the exit criteria is within 4 years.
Strengths	The three proposed criteria are comprehensive and should be sufficient to ensure exiting schools are on the right path.
Weaknesses	The SEA's response does not elaborate on the specific details that will be used to determine that a school has met the third criteria.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (3 peer reviewers) ☒ No (1 peer reviewer)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	One Peer Reviewer noted the SEA should elaborate on the specific details that will be used to determine that a school has met the third criteria.

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 SEA's exit criterion for additional targeted support and improvement schools is similar to the exit criteria for the comprehensive support and improvement schools, but for the subgroup(s) that is being identified. Schools that do not exit within 6 years will be identified as comprehensive support and improvement schools.
Strengths	The three proposed criteria are comprehensive and should be sufficient to ensure an exiting school is on the right path.
Weaknesses	The SEA's response does not elaborate on the specific details that will be used to determine that a school has met the third criteria. The SEA's response allows 6 years after identification for schools to exit. The Peer Reviewers noted this timeline is excessively long and not educationally sound for children.
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 SEA should shorten its timeline for exiting targeted support status. One Peer Reviewer noted the SEA should elaborate on the specific details that will be used to determine that a school has met the third criteria.

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 SEA stresses that before requiring more rigorous interventions, it will provide the LEAs with significant support and technical assistance around coordinated support with the IDEA support, leveraging families and communities, and implementation fidelity. It also indicates that the SEA will monitor the progress regularly and conduct a comprehensive review after year 2 to ensure that schools are on track to exit status. The SEA describes the state-directed, more rigorous interventions and supports as enhanced supports, requirements, and resources around implementation, external evaluation of improvement plan, expanded academic improvement efforts, and additional requirements and supports (family and community engagement, PD, mental health/SEL, and educational design). The SEA notes that they will align these supports based on the stages of implementation.

Strengths	The SEA's school improvement efforts emphasize research regarding science of implementation to ensure plans and interventions designed by local committees are implemented with fidelity. The SEA is working with the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) to help design a system of effective improvement efforts across the state. The SEA included a list of possible actions, changing administrative and personnel structures.
Weaknesses	N/A
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (# peer reviewer(s))
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 SEA has a solid plan in place to periodically review resources. While there is a request of flexibility to transition to the infrastructure required, the SEA has developed a comprehensive federal grant portal, WISE grants, to facilitate the required resource allocation review.
Strengths	This will be a comprehensive review across federal programs. The inclusion of district expenditures in reporting is notable.
Weaknesses	The response would be stronger if the state provided an indication of its definition of significant percentage or number of schools identified for support and improvement.
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 SEA indicates that the technical assistance and support will be coordinated with LEAs identified under the IDEA and will emphasize successful implementation of evidence-based practices. WDPI will also coordinate with Title I, III, and Special Education teams, as appropriate, and continue to build on the current system of support networks and WISE suite of tools.
Strengths	The SEAs technical assistance and support will emphasize successful implementation of evidence-based practices according to the tenets of implementation science and with a focus on equity. This process will draw on existing WDPI supports and expertise, including the WISExplore process, which helps schools and districts utilize data to identify root causes and then develop improvement plans based on best practices regarding improvement cycles. The SEA notes that the technical assistance will include coordination of compliance requirements (data collection and evidence submission), which prevents undue burden on the LEAs.
Weaknesses	N/A
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	Section 118.42, Wisconsin Statutes, allows WDPI to direct specific additional improvement interventions (i.e. using student achievement data to differentiate instruction, providing additional learning time, implementing or modifying a new instructional design, implementing changes in administration and personnel structure).
Strengths	The state is to be commended for legislation that provides the ability to direct change that is in the best interest of students.
Weaknesses	N/A

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 SEA provided an explanation to address the Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators (ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B)) indicator. The SEA indicates that the data analysis they conducted identified nine school districts contributing to the state's equity gap, the results of the analysis are not included in the response. The state developed a theory of action based upon their data analysis and root causes which ultimately resulted in four strategies: 1) resources for school districts and schools, 2) school climate, 3) ongoing professional learning and 4) teacher preparation. Delineated activities are identified for each of those strategies.
Strengths	The SEA has engaged the stakeholders and developed a theory of action to come up with the 4 strategies.
Weaknesses	The SEA does not provide the data to show the extent to which low income and minority children are currently being served by ineffective, out-of-field, and unqualified teachers. The SEA does not clearly state what measures of disproportionality will be evaluated and publicly reported. The SEA states they will supply the data to

---

[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.

	the districts, but the district must analyze the data themselves to determine the extent to which they have ineffective, out of field, and inexperienced teachers serving students.
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 SEA should respond to each of the following: The SEA should 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 should include the State definition of ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers. The SEA should 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 should include the State definition of ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers. The SEA should 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.

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 SEA describes how it will support LEAs receiving assistance to improve school conditions for student learning. The description clearly addresses bullying and harassment, reduction of classroom removal and reduction in the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety. Additionally, State Statutes are referenced, links to websites are included, and processes, procedures and programs such as Response to Intervention (RTI) and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (PBIS) are detailed.
Strengths	The SEA provides information highlighting that an anti-bullying curriculum for use with students in grades 9 through 12 is available. Other supports include an anti-gay bullying and harassment webcast and an informational pamphlet for families of students who have been bullied. Tools have been designed to assist districts in examining current approaches to determine needs and gaps, map present resources, and connect bullying prevention to a multi-tiered system of support.

	The SEA has created and disseminated a case studies document to schools related to alternatives to suspension and expulsion.
Weaknesses	N/A
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 SEA indicates that it supports all LEAs in effective transitions of students at all levels through PD, technical assistance, and guidance documents. For early childhood to elementary school, the SEA works with other state agencies that oversee birth to three programming and child care; for elementary to middle school, the SEA requires students to start their Academic and Career Plans starting in grade 6, and the work with the CASEL to promote social emotional learning competencies; for middle school to high school, they use the Dropout Early Warning System to track students who are at risk starting in the middle grades; for high school to post-secondary, it uses the Career and College Ready Early Warning System. The SEA uses its data dashboard and resources to share relevant student-level data across LEAs.
Strengths	WDPI indicates that it has ongoing professional development opportunities in the forms of trainings and workshops, as well as technical assistance and guidance documents for the three levels of school transitions, and describes specific resources for each: early childhood to elementary school, elementary to middle school, and middle school to high school. The SEA level student data dashboard makes the transfer of student information easier for the LEAs.
Weaknesses	N/A
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	

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	The SEA has described a comprehensive multi-tiered approach to identifying (within 30 calendar days) and serving English Learners. Stakeholder groups are determined and engaged in identified key decision points such as exit procedures, measurement, family engagement and proficiency screeners. In addition to the statewide definition of 5.0, the SEA states that districts weigh student performance on the ACCESS for ELLs with other indicators of English Proficiency and academic success to determine if the student is fully English proficient, page 86.
Strengths	The SEA provides local educational agencies with an implementation guide, State of Wisconsin EL Policy Handbook, which addresses standard practices statewide for identification and reclassification. The SEA describes the stakeholders and process used for designing statewide entry and exit procedures. The SEA is to be commended for having WIDA conduct standards setting in the Fall of 2016, thus resetting proficiency cut scores to better align proficiency expectations in English with current college and career readiness standards.
Weaknesses	The response does not specifically indicate a classroom measure or input by the student's teacher as part of the exit process.
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 SEA has developed a system of support aimed at assisting LEAs to meet the language development and academic content challenges of English learners. The SEA provides a multi-faceted support system that offers a two-pronged service delivery approach: optional services and direct services. To capture a more robust understanding of EL performance and their learning environments. The SEA is reviewing both qualitative and quantitative elements as a part of their continuous improvement reviews (i.e. direct surveys, district needs assessments, review of data elements, etc.)
Strengths	The SEA lists optional services it is making available to the LEAs—cafeteria-style services, targeted trainings, and direct consultation services at the request of an LEA. They will also provide intentional support services for comprehensive and targeted support schools, transition schools, and monitor schools.

The SEA has also set up stakeholder groups and networks to maintain focus on the achievement of ELs. The State's leadership within the WIDA consortium is to be commended. |
| Weaknesses | N/A |
| 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.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	The SEA sets clear requirements and guidelines for the LEAs in using the Title III funds for effective approaches and methodologies for teaching ELs, and increasing the EL proficiency. It has identified 10 focus areas with high impact on ELs based on research-based principles and practices for ELs, and

	they will examine both the progress towards meeting long-term and interim goals and the Title III application for monitoring the LEAs. They will collect and analyze the data using the statewide data tools and dashboards, and they describe the support and technical assistance they will provide to LEAs in the previous section.
Strengths	The SEA uses its suite of WISE tools and data structures to maintain current information on the progress of districts.
Weaknesses	N/A
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	