

STATE PLAN PEER REVIEW CRITERIA Peer Review Notes Template

STATE: Wyoming



U.S. Department of Education

Background

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

Role of the Peer Reviewers

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

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

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

How to Use This Document

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

in item A.4.iii.b.2 below). For these particular questions, if the circumstances addressed in the question do not apply to the SEA, the SEA is not required to answer the question in order to fully address the statutory and regulatory requirements.

Instructions

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

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

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

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

A.1: Challenging State Academic Standards and Assessments

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

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

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

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

- If applicable,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)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	NA
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE has determined based on their EL assessment, that the state does not have a high number of non-English students beyond their Spanish-speaking population. WDE defines “languages other than English present to a significant extent” as those languages that represent greater than or equal to 1% of the total student population taking the assessment (ACCESS for ELLs). Based on this definition, one language other than English is identified – Spanish. All other languages assessed to fall below the 1% threshold. WDE describes its methodology in determining which languages are present. In its research, WDE found that 39 of the 45 non-English languages identified, had an n-size of fewer than 10. Additionally, WDE found that Spanish was the most frequently noted language on the Home language survey among Native America English Learners. WDE meets the requirement based on their definition of language other than English present to a significant extent.
<i>Strengths</i>	WDE has identified the top two native language learners from population as well as 45 other spoken languages. The other languages were less than .02% of all students in Wyoming. WDE used a measure that was available to all its students (ACCESS for ELLs). WDE carefully considered the ACCESS data as well as the Home Language survey data to make decisions about what student population would meet the significance standard and considered all their languages spoken.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	While the State clearly indicates the criteria of the indicator, a clear explanation addressing the participating student populations across grade levels would strengthen the definition.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	In grades 3-10, WDE offers both its statewide summative assessments in math and science with a Spanish audio version. Grade 11 students have access to audio versions of math and science as well as general test directions. WDE does not offer translated versions of their English language arts assessment as they indicate doing so would alter the construct. WDE will be administering a new assessment in 2017-18. WDE indicates linguistic accommodations such as side-by-side translations and pop-up glossaries are being explored. WDE has met the requirements through the provision of these additional assessments.
<i>Strengths</i>	WDE has broken down which grades and content areas have Spanish assessments and has also specified which assessments are available in audio as well as text. The provision of texts and audio in grades 9 through 11 provides more access to the assessments for EL students.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	WDE is using a new assessment for the current school year (2017-2018). While linguistic accommodations are being explored, it is unclear in which grade levels and content areas these assessments will be administered and if they have been translated to Spanish.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.3.iii: Assessments not Available and Needed

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE has provided accommodations for the Spanish speaking populations through audio assessment translations in grades 3-10 math and science, and in grade 9-10 text and audio translations, and are currently exploring other text accommodations. The State is encouraged to continue investigating appropriate accommodations in all content areas, including ELA, to provide a truer picture of students' academic skills by reducing language obstacles.
<i>Strengths</i>	No other languages have been identified, so WDE only needs to examine the

	Spanish assessment offerings. WDE has conducted a thorough and thoughtful study of the necessity to offer assessments in languages other than English.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	WDE did not explore any further possible need for the Spanish assessments beyond what they have currently done. WDE is encouraged to explore needs and continue to monitor the needs of non-English students to determine if other assessments might be needed.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.3.iv: Efforts to Develop Assessments

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	With only one identified language other than English – Spanish - present to a significant extent, WDE has made efforts to provide translations in the content areas they have determined relevant for translating. WDE offers a Spanish audio version for math and science for Spanish speaking students. As no other language groups are identified as meeting the criteria, the state is not developing any additional non-English assessments. WDE indicates that stakeholder input was gathered from K-12 educators, community members, parents, advocacy group, and business members.
<i>Strengths</i>	WDE does not have languages other than Spanish that appear to a significant extent. WDE has a clear rationale for the non-English testing they offer.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	While WDE briefly indicates stakeholder input was gathered, it is not clear if or how that input influenced the decisions to assess in Spanish only.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s))

	<input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4: Statewide Accountability Systems & School Support and Improvement (ESEA section 1111(c) and (d))

A.4.i: Subgroups (ESEA section 1111(b)(3), 1111(c)(2))

A.4.i.a: Major Racial and Ethnic Subgroups of Students (ESEA section 1111(c)(2)(B))

- Does the SEA list each major racial and ethnic group that the SEA includes as a subgroup of students in its accountability system?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WY lists each major racial and ethnic subgroup as required by the ESEA.
<i>Strengths</i>	WDE includes a “two or more races” category to be inclusive of students who may fall into multiple identified groups.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	NA
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must</i>	

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

A.4.i.c: Previously Identified English Learners

Note: State Plan template item A.4.i.c requires a binary yes/no response from SEAs, and thus has no applicable peer review criteria.

A.4.i.d: If Applicable, Exception for Recently Arrived English Learners

Note: This peer review criterion applies only if a State selects the third option in item A.4.i.d in the consolidated State plan template for recently arrived English learners under which the State applies the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i) or the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii) to a recently arrived English learner.

- Does the SEA describe how it will choose which exception applies to a recently arrived English learner (e.g., a statewide procedure that considers English language proficiency level in determining which, if any, exception applies)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	NA
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

A.4.ii.a: Minimum N-Size for Accountability (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)(i))

- Does the SEA provide the minimum number of students that the State determines is necessary to meet the requirements of any provisions under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that require disaggregation of information by each subgroup of students for accountability purposes, including annual meaningful differentiation and identification of schools?
- Is the minimum number of students the same State-determined number for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State (i.e., economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners) for accountability purposes?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE has determined that a minimum n-size of 10 students for all indicators is appropriate for Wyoming schools. WDE indicates that this n-size has been vetted and accepted in WDE for accountability purposes. WDE recognizes the potential for instability, but suggests that an n-size greater than 10 would exclude too many schools in the state. The minimum n-size is the same for all subgroups, thus is reasonable for maintaining stability and equitable

	representation of all populations.
<i>Strengths</i>	Due to WDE’s small number of schools and large number of small schools, it is appropriate for WDE to identify a relatively small n-size. WDE provided data around how many schools/percent of schools do not meet the minimum n-size on at least one indicator. It was helpful that WDE provided a detailed chart demonstrating the number and percent of schools not meeting n-size requirements with four different n-sizes.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	WDE states that it vetted this approach and it has been accepted, but does not specify what this means. WDE also does not explore an n-size smaller than 10 in its response. Additional information would bolster the argument for such a small minimum n-size.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

➤ Is the selected minimum number of students statistically sound?²

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Reviewers were not in agreement that argument for statistical soundness has been articulated regarding the determination of 10 as the n-size. Two reviewers felt that the lookback approach is an appropriate methodology for determining statistical soundness that also maximizes the inclusion of all schools and students. If the minimum n–size for an indicator cannot be assessed using two years of data, the school will not have a score for that indicator.
<i>Strengths</i>	Two peer reviewers found that WDE attempts to include as many schools as possible given its n-size selection by looking back to prior years for this metric.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Two peer reviewers indicated that WDE does not provide sufficient evidence for why a minimum n-size of 10 is statistically sound.

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.

<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (2 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (2 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Wyoming must provide evidence that the selection of 10 as a minimum n-size will meet statistical soundness. While WDE is committed to maximizing the number of schools and students included in its accountability system, an n-size of 10 may not be appropriate.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE utilizes an n-size of 10 throughout most of its recent past and uses this historical trend to explain why it selected this number for ESEA accountability. WDE indicates that the minimum n-size was revisited during public hearings with stakeholders yet does not articulate the process that was taken to make this determination.
<i>Strengths</i>	Selecting an n-size of 10, WDE seeks to include as many schools as possible in its accountability measurements. The n size has been a place for a number of years so this is a consistent process for WDE.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	WDE does not provide an adequate description of the public vetting of the minimum n-size. No description or rationale is provided, except to indicate that it's been in place for many years. WDE does not explain how it collaborated with stakeholders.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The rationale does not give details on how the n-size was chosen by the group. WDE must provide a more detailed description of how they collaborated with stakeholders and the process that was undertaken to achieve the determination of 10 as the n-size to reach a decision.

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

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

³ See footnote 5 above for further guidance.

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE describes a process for protecting the privacy of their students. Using both processes of recoding and suppression appears to provide adequate protection of privacy of their individual students. For each of the recoding and suppression techniques, examples are provided to illustrate the process. WDE uses strategies outlined in “Statistical Methods for Protecting Personally Identifiable Information in Aggregate Reporting” to ensure their privacy techniques are adequate. Reviewers were not in full agreement that a protective strategy would fully protect confidentiality.
<i>Strengths</i>	WDE uses multiple strategies for masking data while still providing useful metrics, to the extent possible. It does cite the Department of Education guidance about protecting privacy in reporting was used as a guideline for the procedure.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	One reviewer indicated that WDE’s response does not explain when each strategy will be used and what the process will be for “cascading through the multi-level subgroup and category results hierarchy.”
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	WDE must explain how it will determine which protective strategy to employ and the process it will take to identify data sets.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	N/A
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE describes its long-term goals for all students and for each subgroup of students. The timeline of 15 years is the same for each student group. The baseline data is based on the 2015-16 assessment results. WDE is implementing a new assessment for grades 3-10 this year and will revisit its long-term goals once the new performance standards are set for the test. WDE makes an argument that their long-term goals are ambitious yet attainable because every Wyoming school and subgroup will have to perform as well or better than the baseline year at the 65 th or 80 th percentile. Wyoming sets different long-term goals for each of its subgroups depending on the starting point for each group. As a result of the methodology, subgroups, specifically Asian, 2 or more, and White, are left without long-term goals for improvement, thereby not meeting the requirement.
<i>Strengths</i>	By using a higher than average percentile to establish the long-term goal for all students and an even higher goal for subgroups, WDE is prioritizing raising achievement for the lowest performing subgroups, which may be harder to move along that continuum (e.g., those with a lower starting point have a longer road to improvement). WDE breaks down each subgroup, each goal and compares that information with baseline state averages in Appendix A.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	WDE does not explain its selection of a 15-year timeline or reason for selecting specific percentile benchmarks. It explained generally the process for establishing long term goals, but did not drill down into the specifics behind the final numbers selected (e.g., select a goal that is considerably above the median and considerably below the top-ranked school). Though it states that these goals will have to be reexamined when new cut scores are determined, it does not explain how it will do so. WY’s explanation for ambitiousness is subjective; one reviewer indicated that regardless of current performance, having long-term goals that call for less than 50% of the student population to be proficient is hard to defend. Goals do not reflect appropriate rigor for demonstrating true academic performance growth.
<i>Did the SEA meet</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s))

<i>all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Methodology must be adjusted to provide a goal of growth or maintenance for every subgroup, including those already performing at or above the target.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE provides examples of interim targets for the all student group and some subgroups. Because the targets will vary from school to school based on a school's baseline percentile ranking, not all interim targets were displayed. An example of a school at the 15 th percentile was used to illustrate WDE's methodology. Some of the already high-performing sub-groups do not have interim targets (e.g., Asian and white subgroups). As a result, WDE does not meet the requirement.
<i>Strengths</i>	WDE differentiates the goal and interim target structure, taking into account different starting points for schools and subgroups, thus breaking down a large goal into progressive targets.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	WDE's methodology results in not all subgroups having long-term and interim targets.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	WDE must provide measures of interim progress for all subgroups including those that are performing at or above the goal.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE recognizes that different subgroups of students will need different measurements of interim progress to meet differentiated long-term goals. Appendix A outlines an example of the proposed adjusted goals based on a school performing at the 15 th percentile during the baseline year. For those subgroups where the gap is reduced by at least 30%, a more appropriate goal

	will be set. Again, the baseline is set based on the percentile rank during the 2015-16 school year, so subgroups will have different interim targets to meet the long-term goal. WDE sets different long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for each of its subgroups depending on the starting point for each group, which recognizes the need to consider greater rates of improvement for some groups.
<i>Strengths</i>	WDE defines a process by which each school has a differentiated goal based on the overall goal and the gap between subgroup and the All Students group. This is commendable and prioritizes closing proficiency gaps as required by the law while also honoring different baselines and different expectations based on those baselines.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	WDE should consider a maintenance or adjustment goal for those subgroups that would be more aligned with continuous improvement.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE describes its long-term goals for all students (88%) and for each subgroup of students (ranging from 69 to 88). For all student group, 100% of WDE schools will perform as well as or better than the schools performing in the top 35% of schools. For each subgroup, 100% of WDE schools will perform as well as or better than the schools in the top 20% of schools. The timeline of 15 years is the same for the all student group and each student subgroup. The baseline data is based on the 2015-16 on-time graduation rate. WDE sets different long-term goals for each of its subgroups depending on the starting point for each group. As a result of the methodology, three subgroups are left without a long-term goal for improvement. WDE makes an argument that their long-term goals are ambitious, yet attainable because every subgroup will have to perform as well or better than the top 20% of schools in the 2015-16 baseline year. This would eliminate the lowest rung of performing high schools such that all schools’ graduation rates would be 88% or higher, with

	increased rates for all subgroups currently performing below target.
<i>Strengths</i>	WDE uses a relatively high goal to motivate change on a macro level as well as by subgroups. It has broken down interim progress to illustrate that incremental positive improvement will steadily progress schools to the goal and the long timeline of 15 years increases the likelihood of the goals being met.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	No goal was provided for those subgroups already performing at or above the target of 88%. While a general statement about subgroups was given, a more detailed response would provide a clearer picture of what the expectations and measurements will be for all subgroups.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	WDE must identify and describe the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for each subgroup of students, including those that are currently performing at or above the target rate.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	NA
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE provides examples of interim targets for the all student group and subgroups currently performing below target. Because the targets will vary from school to school based on a school’s baseline scores (Appendix A), not all interim targets are provided. An example of a school at the 15 th percentile was used to illustrate WDE’s methodology. Due to the baseline percentile component, three of the subgroups do not have interim targets: Black, Asian and White subgroups.
<i>Strengths</i>	WDE differentiates the goal and measures of interim progress, considering different starting points for schools and subgroups.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	WDE’s methodology eliminates some subgroups from having measurements of interim progress and long-term goals.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	WDE must identify measurements of interim progress for each subgroup of students, including those that are currently performing at or above the long-term goal.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE recognizes that different subgroups of students will need different measurements of interim progress to meet differentiated long-term goals. Goals must narrow the gap by at least 30 percentage points. For those subgroups where the gap is not reduced by at least 30%, a more appropriate goal will be set. Again, the baseline is set based on the percentile rank during the 2015-16 school year, so subgroups will have different interim targets to meet the long-term goal. As a result of this methodology, some subgroups are left without long-term or accompanying measures of interim progress for the graduation rate; however, this does currently impact gap closing since those subgroups are performing above the goal.
<i>Strengths</i>	WDE attempts to define a process by which each school has a differentiated

	goal based on the overall goal and the gap between subgroups and the all students group. This is commendable and prioritizes closing graduation rate gaps as required by the law.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	WDE should consider a maintenance or adjustment goal for those subgroups that would be more aligned with continuous improvement.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (#peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE sets the long-term goal according to the same framework as the above goals – in 15 years, all schools will be performing at or above the school that is performing at the 65 th percentile for making “acceptable progress” toward ELP in the baseline year, which is 44%. The baseline average for the state is 19%, so WDE must raise this number significantly to meet the goal, which is still below 50% of students making acceptable progress. WDE utilizes the WIDA ACCESS for ELL’s approach for determining acceptable progress and will monitor state trends to make adjustments to the process as necessary depending on any applicable variations in Wyoming data from the other states in the WIDA consortium.
<i>Strengths</i>	The statistical model that allows for collaboration with other states that have small EL populations is beneficial for determining student placement and expectations.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	While WDE uses the same methodology for setting its ELP long-term goal, that methodology results in a goal of 44%. It can be inferred that 56% of students not making progress is acceptable. It is difficult to make a determination of ambitiousness based on this description.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE indicates a school’s interim target will be based on the percentage of ELs making “acceptable progress” toward English language proficiency based on WIDA ACCESS. The definition of acceptable progress considers the students’ starting points. A table is provided for both expected student progress as well as school interim targets. All schools will vary in their interim target as WDE bases the target on a school’s baseline performance and calculating the distance from goal and dispersing that over 15 years.
<i>Strengths</i>	WDE considers students’ current performance to determine their measurements of interim progress.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	While interim goals are given, a more detailed plan for how this approach will be assessed and modified through the 15-year cycle would be beneficial.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.iv: Indicators (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B), 1111(c)(4)(E)(ii))

Note: A single indicator may consist of multiple components or measures. Peers must review each such component or measure for compliance with all of the required elements.

A.4.iv.a: Academic Achievement

- Does the SEA describe the Academic Achievement indicator used in its statewide accountability system, including that the SEA uses the same indicator for all schools in all LEAs across the State?
- Does the description include how the SEA calculates the indicator, including: 1) that the calculation is consistent for all schools, in all LEAs, across the State; 2) a description of the weighting of reading/language arts achievement relative to mathematics achievement; 3) if the State uses one, a description of the performance index; 4) if, at the high school level, the indicator includes a measure of student growth, a description of the growth measure (e.g., a growth model); and 5) if the State averages data, a description of how it averages data across years and/or grades (e.g., does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- Is the indicator valid and reliable?
- Is the indicator based on the SEA’s long-term goals?
- Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?

- Is the indicator measured by grade-level proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments?
- Does the indicator measure the performance of at least 95 percent of all students and 95 percent of all students in each subgroup?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>WDE includes an Academic Achievement indicator and a Growth indicator for mathematics and reading in grades 10 and 11. Presumably the Growth indicator is the same for all schools in all LEAs across the state, though this is not stated explicitly. For Academic Achievement, each school has one score representing the percent of students who are proficient on the designated assessment (statewide assessment for 3-8 grades and college entrance exam for grade 11). Scores are reported for the all student group and for each subgroup.</p> <p>Growth will be measured by comparing 10th and 11th grade student growth to the growth of other students with the same test scores. Students must have had two consecutive years of subject matter scores to be measured. 10th grade Student Growth Percentiles will be made by comparing 9th grade results to 10th grade results and growth in 11th grade will be made by comparing 9th to 10th to 11th grade growth. All Student Growth Percentiles will be aggregated into a Median Growth Percentile for each school in each subject area. Beginning in 2017-18, growth will also be measured in 9th grade. All indicators can be disaggregated for each subgroup. The test is provided to all students in the designated grade levels.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The indicators are aligned in reading and math. The system is comprehensive and based on long-term goals.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Since WDE states that the same number of students take the math and reading assessments in all grades, and therefore the assessments are weighted the same, a small number of students unable to take one of the assessments (due to absence, suspension, serious illness, etc.) could have an impact on data for a small school. Clarification regarding weighting could be helpful to ensure consistency.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.iv.b: Other Academic Indicator for Elementary and Secondary Schools that are Not High Schools

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE describes its other academic indicator for non-high schools as a growth measure for schools serving grades 4-8. Growth is computed separately for math and reading and will be disaggregated for each subgroup. Like the high school measure, growth is measured as an SGP, with a school's growth measured by the median growth percentile (MGP). Once each student's Student Growth Percentile is established, as compared to other students with similar test scores, those will be aggregated and the mean determined to identify a Mean Growth Percentile for each school.
<i>Strengths</i>	Growth is measured as SGPs, which indicates how an individual student's growth compares with that of all Wyoming public school students from that particular year in the same grade who had similar math/reading scores from the previous years.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	WDE does not indicate how it will incorporate the other academic indicator into schools that do not serve grade 4-8 students – i.e., K-2.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.iv.c: Graduation Rate

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE uses a 4-year, on-time, adjusted cohort graduation rate beginning with students who entered grade 9 and students are included in the cohort of the last school for which they had an enrollment record. The indicator is based on WDE’s long-term goal. Appendix A includes the long-term goals for each subgroup where possible. The graduation rate long-term goal is consistent throughout the plan.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	There is currently no state defined diploma for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who take an alternate assessment aligned to alternate academic standards, resulting in some subgroups of students not having a stated long-term goal because of their starting points.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE uses the results of WIDA ACCESS 2.0 (WDE’s ELP exam) as the progress in achieving ELP indicator. The goal established is applicable to all

	EL students in grades 3-8 and high school. WDE defines proficiency as a composite score on ACCESS at 4.6. Presumably, the timeline is aligned with the state-determined timeline described in A.4.iii.c.1, though this is not stated in the response. Since the indicator is based on data aggregated from many states, it is likely a reliable measure.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The plan does not describe the timeline in the SEA's response to this requirement.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE describes two School Quality indicators: one for grades 3-8 and one for high school. WDE describes an Equity indicator for grades 3-8. Equity is described as the measure of academic growth for any student who scores in the bottom quartile in reading or math. Students who score in this area during the baseline year are placed in a consolidated subgroup, and the equity score is then based on the median growth for that group. The consolidated group can be disaggregated. For high schools, WDE describes the indicator as a Post-Secondary Readiness which uses the percentage of grade 12 students who meet the state definition of post-secondary ready, one of three options.
<i>Strengths</i>	WDE provides a clear description of its School Quality Indicators. There are options for the post-secondary readiness indicator to give students meaningful differentiated approaches to achieve post-secondary goals, whether they relate to college, industry, or military.

<i>Weaknesses</i>	There is not a clear description of access to the options described – if all schools provide equitable access to all their students to meet one of the options, then this would appear comparable.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE schools are assigned a performance category annually on the indicators: below target, meets target, and exceeds target. Schools receive a score on each indicator to develop the summative rating. WDE specifies that charter schools are included in this calculation, but does not say anything further; this is the first mention of the charter sector in the state’s application overall. It is not clear whether the system of meaningful differentiation includes the performance of all students and each subgroup of students for each indicator.
<i>Strengths</i>	The three performance levels are simple and a clear description of School Quality Indicators is provided.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	WDE’s description is brief and unclear on how the subgroup performance is indicated in the performance category; a more comprehensive explanation is needed for clarity. Additionally, an explanation of how this system provides <i>meaningful</i> differentiation is needed.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	WDE must provide more information to clarify how the system for annual meaningful differentiation will work and how the three performance categories will work with the combined scores for the All Students group, as well as each subgroup. Clarification for how the system of meaningful differentiation includes performance of All Students and each subgroup for each indicator is required.

A.4.v.b: Weighting of Indicators

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE applies weighting principles to grades 3-8 using four indicators and high schools using five indicators. For grades 3-8, each indicator is weighted equally (25%). In the aggregate, all the other indicators receive much greater weight (75%) than the school quality indicator. For high schools, each indicator is weighted equally (20%). In the aggregate, achievement, growth, graduation rate, and progress in achieving ELP receive much greater weight (80%) than the school quality indicator. Since growth requires a minimum of two years' data to determine, students who take the state test in third grade will be assessed for growth beginning with the administration of the fourth grade test and continue through eighth grade, thus allowing for aggregation and disaggregation of test scores by school, by subgroup, and by individual.
<i>Strengths</i>	This is a very clear and understandable method for weighing each indicator. The Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate and Progress in Achieving ELP indicators in the aggregate receive much greater weight (for 3-8, 75%, and for HS, 80%) than the School Quality/School Success indicators (for 3-8, 25%, and for HS, 20%). This weighting schema is easily understood by and transparent to the public.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	This system's weights do not prioritize one indicator over another. WDE determines that they should all have the same significance in terms of statewide accountability. WDE does not provide any justification for this determination.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

- If the SEA uses a different methodology or methodologies for annual meaningful differentiation than the one described in 4.v.a of the State's plan for schools for which an accountability determination cannot be made (e.g., P-2 schools), does it describe the different methodology or methodologies, including how the methodology or methodologies will be used to identify schools for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement?

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE describes its various methodologies for annual meaningful differentiation for schools in which a determination cannot be made. WDE indicates that schools that do not have grade levels that are included in the accountability system will be paired with other schools for accountability purposes. However, it does not explain how those pairings might be determined. WDE provides examples for different grade level configurations (e.g., K-2), as well as for small schools, institutional schools, and new schools. Although the methodology is provided, for determining schools that will be identified as in need of comprehensive and targeted support, the description is limited. WDE may want to consider providing additional info about how these schools can be meaningfully differentiated.
<i>Strengths</i>	WDE attempts to provide alternative methods for measuring accountability in cases for which all of the criterion are not met by schools. The schools are paired with partner schools with the same grade level demographics, allowing for more students to be included in the accountability measure than would be counted if the small schools were unpaired.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Insufficient description of methodologies for identifying schools that qualify for comprehensive or targeted support is provided. Also, the process involved in pairing small schools for accountability is unclear.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	WDE must provide an explanation for how the pairing of schools will be accomplished for accountability. Additionally, WDE must include methodologies to identify alternative schools for comprehensive and targeted support.

A.4.vi: Identification of Schools (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D), 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D))

A.4.vi.a Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools—Lowest Performing

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement including, if applicable, how it averages data (e.g., does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in the identification of not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement?
- Does the SEA include the year in which it will first identify these schools for comprehensive support and improvement (i.e., does the timeline comply with the Department’s guidance)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE identifies schools that need support based on the performance index; this applies to all Wyoming schools. Schools identified for comprehensive support are strictly Title I schools. Schools in need of comprehensive support will first

	be identified in the 2018-19 school year based on the 2017-18 school year data, and then will be re-identified every third year thereafter. WDE will use a combined score based on a weighted index and rank all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds to determine the lowest performing 5%.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	It is unclear how the weighted index is different from the performance indices or if the weighted index uses a different weighting schema than described in the methodology for determining Annual Meaningful Differentiation.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	In the year of 2018-2019, Wyoming high schools graduating less than two thirds of their students based on a four-year adjusted cohort will be identified for comprehensive support. This process will begin in the 2018-19 school year and will take place every three years thereafter.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE indicates that Title I schools identified for additional targeted support and improvement that do not meet the exit criteria will be identified for comprehensive support and improvement. However, WDE’s description does not take into account the state’s determined timeline for meeting exit criteria. While WDE states that the identification process will begin in the 2018-19 school year, this will not allow for any school to demonstrate success in meeting the exit criteria.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	It is not clear how WDE will identify schools during the 2018-19 school year with only one year of data as stated in its plan (e.g., schools not reaching exit criteria which is based on two years of performance after being identified as a school in need of additional targeted support). Reviewers noted that WDE should restate the way it refers to schools in the bottom 5%, (e.g. among the bottom 5%).
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	WDE must explain how the identification of schools in the 2018-19 school year will be sufficient time for schools to exit based on the state determined exit criteria.

A.4.vi.d: Frequency of Identification

- Does the SEA include the frequency with which the State will identify each type of school for comprehensive support and improvement after the first year of identification?
- Does the SEA’s timeline result in identification of these schools at least once every three years?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Schools will be first identified for comprehensive support and improvement in the 2018-19 school year, based on performance data from the prior school year. Identification will be made every three years.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))

<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	
--	--

A.4.vi.e: Targeted Support and Improvement Schools—“Consistently Underperforming” Subgroups

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify schools with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students, including its definition of “consistently underperforming”?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in the identification of any school with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students?
- Is the methodology based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation?
- Does the SEA identify these schools annually?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Beginning in 2019-20, WDE will identify these schools using a combined score of the indicators for each subgroup. WDE defines consistently underperforming as schools that have subgroup performing among the bottom 10% in the state.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The weighted index is used to rank schools every three years instead of annually, which is required.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	WDE must annually identify schools for Targeted Support and Improvement.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Beginning in 2018-19, and then every three years thereafter, WDE schools will be ranked on the combined score on the indicators for each subgroup. If the subgroup combined scores results in that subgroup being below the bottom 5% for the all student group, that school is identified for additional targeted support.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	NA
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE describes a participation requirement (95%) and a participation

	threshold (90%). If a school meets the threshold but not the requirement, the school is docked one school performance category. If a school does not meet the threshold, the school is assigned the lowest category (Not Meeting Expectations). Participation is calculated based on all student enrolled during the testing window.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA has considered how to recognize schools that have a slightly lower participation rate of 90-94%, while still holding the other schools accountable for lower rates like 89% or below.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Key terms such as “active enrollment” and “test window” are not clearly defined.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Exit criteria for schools identified for Comprehensive support and improvement includes 2 consecutive years of combined indicator scores for the All Students group greater than the bottom 10% of state Title I schools. This criterion ensures that a school that exits no longer meets the criteria under which the school was identified (except if the statewide percentages decrease over the years being measured). Schools that remain in the comprehensive support and improvement designation for 4 consecutive years will be required to implement more rigorous interventions as defined by WDE.
<i>Strengths</i>	A two-year timeline for exiting this designation is appropriate and ensures continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in Wyoming. WDE also provides for progressively more rigorous interventions if a school does not exit this status within a four-year period.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The exit criteria are not explicitly aligned with the state’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress. This relationship should be made clear to

	ensure understanding on the part of schools and stakeholders.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Exit criteria for schools identified for additional targeted support and improvement includes 2 consecutive years of combined indicator scores for each subgroup greater than the bottom 10% of state Title I schools for each subgroup. This criterion ensures that a school that exits no longer meets the criteria under which the school was identified, except if the statewide percentages decrease over the years being measured. Schools that remain in the comprehensive support and improvement designation for 4 consecutive years will be required to implement more rigorous interventions as defined by WDE.
<i>Strengths</i>	A two-year timeline for exiting this designation is appropriate and ensures continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in Wyoming. WDE also provides for progressively more support if a school does not exit this status within a four-year period.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The exit criteria are not explicitly aligned with the state’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress. This relationship should be made clear to ensure understanding on the part of schools and stakeholders.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE describes the more rigorous interventions after locally-selected interventions fail to result in exiting. Schools in this category will be required to meet the requirement of strong or moderate evidence and conduct an annual review of the effectiveness of the interventions; this review will be conducted by the WDE. In addition, schools that don’t improve will be required to implement a multi-tiered system of support.
<i>Strengths</i>	WDE has described a tiered approach to intervention allowing local schools to first address their deficits. Schools self-selecting their interventions is appropriate for differentiation among the needs of diverse districts.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	WDE does not clearly define several terms in this response. For example, WDE does not define “locally-selected interventions,” interventions that meet the requirements of either “strong evidence or the moderate evidence” as outlined by the cited law, and “self-selected interventions.” Additionally, limited information is provided about how the annual review will proceed and what the goals of such a review will be.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.viii.d: Resource Allocation Review (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(ii))

- Does the SEA describe how it will periodically review resource allocation to support school improvement in each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE will conduct periodic resource allocation reviews in two ways. Using the data collected for school report cards, WDE will review the financial data of LEAs for which most of their schools are identified for comprehensive or targeted support. This review examines whether districts are receiving an appropriate level of funding. Furthermore, WDE will review school level

	resource allocations using demographics and other district-specific factors to identify any subgroups that are underserved with school resources.
<i>Strengths</i>	Reviewing building-level resources can be an effective method for identifying resources that are inequitably distributed or ineffectively used.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	It is not clear from the response how WDE will identify schools in need of technical assistance and what the building level resource allocation review will consist of. WDE should provide more information about how the review will support school improvement.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.viii.e: Technical Assistance (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(iii))

- Does the SEA describe the technical assistance that it will provide to each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement?
- Is the technical assistance likely to improve student outcomes by, for example, 1) identifying State-approved evidence-based interventions; 2) supporting LEAs and schools in the development and implementation of support and improvement plans; and 3) differentiating the technical assistance?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE will require that LEAs identified with most of the schools identified for comprehensive and targeted support implement MTSS through the LEA, using a checklist as a resource. Fidelity will be monitored through a Wyoming MTSS checklist. In addition, WDE will require the LEAs to participate in leadership training and other supports such as performance data reviews.
<i>Strengths</i>	A checklist is given for the schools in Wyoming to ensure that the implementation is followed through. These schools are also required to participate in leadership training and other performance review.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Two reviewers indicated that it is not clear what portion of this work will be state-driven TA and specifically how that TA is likely to improve student outcomes. The response also does not differentiate the technical assistance across districts and/or schools.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (2 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (2 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	WDE must clarify the technical assistance that the SEA will provide to LEAs that is likely to improve student outcomes.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	NA
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE explains that it has not previously measured “ineffective teachers” so it has created a definition of this term through a multi-stakeholder committee, which will continue to meet and develop guidance for LEAs about how to ensure equity across schools and student demographics. Data sources used to calculate equity gaps are listed; the metrics for which it considers an equity

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.

	issue to exist (e.g., percentage difference of 5% for teacher experience/qualifications/absence and percentage difference of 10% or higher for teacher turnover) are also provided. While a link to data reporting is included, WDE does not describe the actual extent to which low income or minority children in Title I schools are served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out of field, or inexperienced teachers.
<i>Strengths</i>	WDE includes both a robust set of definitions for key terms as well as an explanation of the data sources used in its equity measures, in addition to listing the organizations it consulted with to determine its measurements. It appears that similar measures have been examined by WDE in the past and that while changes need to align with the new law, WDE has made significant progress with data collection and analysis in this area. Additionally, WDE has effectively described its collaboration with stakeholders.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	WDE does not give actual rates of disproportionality for these measures, only stating that there have been “limited equity gaps in Wyoming” and that those gaps are larger for teacher turnover and special education teachers. WDE also does not explain how it reached its percentages for determining equity gaps, instead just listing the data used and the overarching gap percentages.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	WDE must describe the measures it will use to evaluate and publicly report to stakeholders the state’s progress for ensuring that low-income and minority children are not disproportionately served by inexperienced, ineffective, or out-of-field teachers at a rate higher than their non-minority peers.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE’s main substantive response to this question focuses on state law and use of Title I moneys to improve school conditions for student learning. To reduce incidences of bullying and harassment, WDE cites the Safe School Climate Act expectations. To support schools in reducing the overuse of discipline that removes students from the classroom, WDE utilizes Title I funds to implement PBIS and to cover costs for mental health services. To reduce the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student

	health and safety, WDE cites state requirements that all LEAs have a policy around the use of restraint and seclusion. Additionally, an anonymous reporting system for students who wish to report these incidences directly without fear of retribution is in place. WDE describes a better than average counselor to student ratio.
<i>Strengths</i>	WDE promotes positive school culture development and solicits input from practitioners in the field to help LEAs build robust and inclusive policies.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	By encouraging districts to self-monitor, WDE may be losing an opportunity to further influence the development of healthy, safe cultures in schools across the state. WDE's plan would benefit from further description and evidence that use of PBIS will lead to decreases in overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE provides many examples of how it supports LEAs in meeting the needs of students at all levels of schooling (e.g., early childhood, K-12 span, CTE, EL and special education students (including transition services), college/career readiness initiatives, competitive grants for drop-out prevention, post-secondary transition support through university partnerships and programming). Much of its response focuses on supporting academic attainment and advancement in the higher grades which inevitably will lead to fewer students dropping out. WDE only explicitly addresses drop-out prevention through its description of a competitive grant to support at-risk students.
<i>Strengths</i>	WDE provides many initiatives across the state and across age and special populations groups that likely improve student engagement, promote positive outcomes, and encourage students to stay in school.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	WDE could benefit from providing additional detail around supporting students undergoing routine transitions such as during matriculation.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the</i>	

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE describes both their statewide entrance and revised exit criteria. All parents newly enrolling a student in a Wyoming school are asked to complete a home language survey. If the survey responses meet the established criteria, the student is assessed with a WIDA Consortium screener. Based on the score, the student may qualify as an Active EL. The cut-scores are prescribed by WDE in the <i>Active EL Identifying, Serving, and Reporting Guidebook</i> . This same Guidebook mandates that students must be identified and placed within 30 calendar days of the beginning of the school year or within 14 days if the student enrolls after the first 30 days of the school year. WDE indicates that the exit criteria is changing for the current (2016-17) school year. WDE has established statewide exit criteria using an overall composite score on the WIDA ACCESS 2.0 of 4.6; the criterion will be revisited when new data becomes available. WDE describes consultation, during which feedback regarding entrance and exit criteria was collected both before and throughout the plan development process, as including LEAs from across the state.
<i>Strengths</i>	The requirements for entrance and exit of ELs into the WDE program are clear and concise.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	WDE could further explain how the stakeholder input regarding the state plan influenced the new exit criteria. Little information is provided beyond stating that stakeholder input was gathered.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE describes a process in which the WDE Title III program manager provides technical assistance and professional development to LEAs receiving Title III funds to help meet WY’s long-term goals and academic standards. TA is offered through phone calls, LEA visits, face-to-face meetings and conferences. WDE will provide professional development to LEAs focused on the WIDA EL proficiency standards and research-based instructional strategies that support ELs in accessing academic content. WDE will continue to collaborate with stakeholders to determine best practice in assuring ELs acquire academic language and language proficiency. WDE will use a variety of platforms to deliver the PD opportunities.
<i>Strengths</i>	WDE uses the resources available, namely human capital, to offer technical assistance and professional development to districts on both meeting EL standards and accessing rigorous academic content.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

E.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 sub-grant in helping English learners achieve English language proficiency?
- Does the SEA describe the steps it will take to further assist eligible entities if the strategies funded under Title III, Part A are not effective, such as by providing technical assistance and support on how to modify such strategies?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	WDE will monitor the progress of districts through several mechanisms – assurances, improvement plans, accreditation review, and external reviews (every five years). Additionally, all districts receiving Title III funds are required to submit quarterly expenditure reports and undergo annual monitoring for federal compliance. Additional strategies are used (desk

	<p>audits, risk management and on-site monitoring), though WDE does not specify when and to what extent each are used.</p> <p>WDE does not indicate when it will determine a district is not making appropriate progress given these interim measures, but it explains that data will be shared between state and local entities and ongoing technical assistance will be provided and increased, if necessary.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>WDE appears to have several touchpoints with districts from which it can monitor the progress of schools and students. Frequent data review enables the state to work with districts to course-correct in close to real time if sufficient progress is not indicated.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>WDE does not specify how it will determine additional technical assistance is needed (e.g., what is specifically being looked for in the data) and to what extent it will offer TA or seek alternative methods of support for districts if a district continues to not make adequate progress toward long-term goals. External reviews may need to be conducted more frequently than every five years.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s))</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	