

ESEA Flexibility

Peer Panel Notes



State Request: South Carolina

Date: March 28, 2012

REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF REQUESTS

The U.S. Department of Education (Department) will use a review process that will include both external peer reviewers and staff reviewers to evaluate State educational agency (SEA) requests for this flexibility. This review process will help ensure that each request for this flexibility approved by the Department is consistent with the principles, which are designed to support State efforts to improve student academic achievement and increase the quality of instruction, and is both educationally and technically sound. Reviewers will evaluate whether and how each request for this flexibility will support a comprehensive and coherent set of improvements in the areas of standards and assessments, accountability, and teacher and principal effectiveness that will lead to improved student outcomes. Each SEA will have an opportunity, if necessary, to clarify its plans for peer and staff reviewers and to answer any questions reviewers may have during the on-site review. The peer reviewers will then provide comments to the Department. Taking those comments into consideration, the Secretary will make a decision regarding each SEA's request for this flexibility. If an SEA's request for this flexibility is not granted, reviewers and the Department will provide feedback to the SEA about the components of the SEA's request that need additional development in order for the request to be approved.

This document provides guidance for peer review panels as they evaluate each request during the on-site peer review portion of the review process. The document includes the specific information that a request must include and questions to guide reviewers as they evaluate each request. **Questions that have numbers or letters represent required elements.** The italicized questions reflect inquiries that reviewers will use to fully consider all aspects of an SEA's plan for meeting each principle, but do not represent required elements.

In addition to this guidance, reviewers will also use the document titled *ESEA Flexibility*, including the definitions and timelines, when reviewing each SEA's request. As used in the request form and this guidance, the following terms have the definitions set forth in the document titled *ESEA Flexibility*: (1) college- and career-ready standards, (2) focus school, (3) high-quality assessment, (4) priority school, (5) reward school, (6) standards that are common to a significant number of States, (7) State network of institutions of higher education, (8) student growth, and (9) turnaround principles.

Review Guidance

Consultation

1. Did the SEA meaningfully engage and solicit input on its request from teachers and their representatives?

- *Is the engagement likely to lead to successful implementation of the SEA's request due to the input and commitment of teachers and their representatives at the outset of the planning and implementation process?*
- *Did the SEA indicate that it modified any aspect of its request based on input from teachers and their representatives?*

Consultation Question 1 Panel Response

Tally of Peer Responses: 4 Yes, 2 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE) provided numerous opportunities for meaningful input through multiple avenues including face to face and online with various constituency groups including teachers.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCDE conducted stakeholder meetings facilitated by staff from the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL), which included teacher of the year awardees and runner-ups, institutions of higher education, and the Committee of Practitioners. • The SEA addressed modification of the draft request by running simulations for each LEA and inviting two representatives from each LEA to a meeting to explain the proposed methodology which had been modified based on stakeholder input. • SCDE held 20 community meetings at which many of the attendees were teachers or principals.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent of input provided by the two teacher associations was not clear. • There was not a targeted strategy to have separate conversations with the two teachers associations.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although SCDE included many teachers in the input process, SCDE may wish to engage the teacher associations if they were not invited to provide input.

2. Did the SEA meaningfully engage and solicit input on its request from other diverse communities, such as students, parents, community-based organizations, civil rights organizations, organizations representing students with disabilities and English Learners, business organizations, and Indian tribes?

- *Is the engagement likely to lead to successful implementation of the SEA's request due to the input and commitment of relevant stakeholders at the outset of the planning and implementation process?*
- *Did the SEA indicate that it modified any aspect of its request based on stakeholder input?*
- *Does the input represent feedback from a diverse mix of stakeholders representing various perspectives and interests, including stakeholders from high-need communities?*

Consultation Question 2 Panel Response

Tally of Peer Responses: 6 Yes, 0 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant engagement and input is evident.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders from diverse communities were represented by the NAACP, Hispanic Leadership Council, Commission on Minority Affairs, and the Special Education Advisory Council. • The United Way, Chamber of Commerce, Public Charter School Alliance, and Commission on Higher Education represented community and business groups. • Online feedback was solicited with 699 feedback forms submitted by LEA teachers and administrators. • SEA modified its initial draft based on stakeholder feedback by incorporating science and social studies into the AYP determinations.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While acknowledging the significant amount of community and educational feedback is not evident if all parents and the English Learner community were as aware of the opportunity to provide input to the flexibility request.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to articulate the specific impact of the community groups in the flexibility request. • The SEA should consider continued engagement with community groups as part of the implementation process.

Principle 1: College- and Career-Ready Expectations for All Students

Note to Peers: Staff will review 1.A Adopt College-And Career-Ready Standards, Options A and B.

1.B Transition to college- and career-ready standards

1.B Part A: Is the SEA’s plan to transition to and implement college- and career-ready standards statewide in at least reading/language arts and mathematics no later than the 2013–2014 school year realistic, of high quality?

Note to Peers: See ESEA Flexibility Review Guidance for additional considerations related to the types of activities an SEA includes in its transition plan.

1.B Panel Response, Part A

Tally of Peer Responses: 6 Yes, 0 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Common Core State Standards (CCSS) have been formally adopted by the State Board.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State adopted the CCSS at the July 14, 2010 State Board of Education meeting for implementation in the 2013-14 school year. The SEA reallocated its professional development resources to the implementation of the CCSS.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since the State Board of Education is the accrediting agency for schools of education, consider having them exercise their leadership in the expectation of common core standards in the teacher preparation programs.

Part B: Is the SEA’s plan likely to lead to all students, including English Learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students, gaining access to and learning content aligned with the college- and career-ready standards?

Note to Peers: See ESEA Flexibility Review Guidance for additional considerations related to the types of activities an SEA includes in its transition plan.

1.B Panel Response, Part B

Tally of Peer Responses: 6 Yes, 0 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	South Carolina provided a reasonable approach to statewide implementation.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SEA assigned two review panels to conduct an alignment of the current State standards to the CCSS and provide recommendations on implementation. • The SEA is participating in the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Consortium and the National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) to address the linguistic demands and needs of students with disabilities and English Learners. • Several professional development options are available through the Implementing Common Core video series, Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL) training modules, training at the Regional Education Centers, CCSS website support with lesson plans, public engagement activities for parents as well as a Family Friendly Standards documents. • Joint professional development is conducted across program areas as well as continuing English as a second language (ESOL) and Office of Exceptional Children specific training to incorporate specific supports to teachers in implementation for students with disabilities and English Learner populations. • Articulation agreements between LEAs and public Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs) for seamless pathways as well as the Transfer and Articulation Center with course equivalencies and 770 transfer agreements to assist students and educators in this process. • SCDE recognized the necessity to reallocate professional development fiscal and human resources to the rollout.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	No weaknesses noted.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider quality assurance check points in the roll out of the CCSS so that mid-course corrections may be addressed, rather than waiting for the summative evaluation. • Consider establishing a community of practice for English Learners, similar to what SC has for students with disabilities.

1.C Develop and Administer Annual, Statewide, Aligned, High-Quality Assessments that Measure Student Growth

1.C Did the SEA develop, or does it have a plan to develop, annual, statewide, high-quality assessments, and corresponding academic achievement standards, that measure student growth and are aligned with the State’s college- and career-ready standards in reading/language arts and mathematics, in at least grades 3-8 and at least once in high school, that will be piloted no later than the 2013–2014 school year and planned for administration in all LEAs no later than the 2014–2015 school year, as demonstrated through one of the three options below? Does the plan include setting academic achievement standards?

Note to Peers: Staff will review Options A and C.

If the SEA selected Option B:

If the SEA is neither participating in a State consortium under the RTTA competition nor has developed and administered high-quality assessments, did the SEA provide a realistic, high-quality plan describing activities that are likely to lead to the development of such assessments, their piloting no later than the 2013–2014 school year, and their annual administration in all LEAs beginning no later than the 2014–2015 school year? Does the plan include setting academic achievement standards?

1.C, Option B Panel Response

Not applicable because the SEA selected 1.C, Option A or Option C

Tally of Peer Responses: NA

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	NA
<i>Strengths</i>	NA
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	NA
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	NA

Principle 1 Overall Review

Is the SEA’s plan for transitioning to and implementing college-and career-ready standards, and developing and administering annual, statewide, aligned high-quality assessments that measure student growth, comprehensive, coherent, and likely to increase the quality of instruction for students and improve student achievement? If not, what aspects are not addressed or need to be improved upon?

Principle 1 Overall Review Panel Response

Tally of Peer Responses: 6 Yes, 0 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCDE demonstrated a high-quality plan to transition to and implement CCSS statewide in reading/language arts and mathematics no later than the 2013-2014 school year. The plan addressed all students, including English Learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students through the SEAs coordinated approach as well as the use of national centers and resources for these populations.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCDE presented a coherent strategy for implementing CCSS from the July 2010 adoption of the standards with the work of the review committees. • Professional development for educators and administrators through multiple venues. • Integration of the needs of students with disabilities and English learners within the professional development delivery system. • Coordination of the IHEs with the implementation of the CCSS.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear strategy for ongoing engagement with the State Teacher Associations was not provided.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCDE will need to ascertain capacity needs of schools and LEAs, have resources available to aid with the rollout, and mechanism for monitoring and ensuring the quality of the rollout.

Principle 2: State-Developed Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support

2.A Develop and Implement a State-Based System of Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support

2.A.i Did the SEA propose a differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system, and a high-quality plan to implement this system no later than the 2012–2013 school year, that is likely to improve student achievement and school performance, close achievement gaps, and increase the quality of instruction for students? (*note to Peers, please write to this question after completing 2.A.i.a and 2.A.i.b*)

2.A.i Panel Response

Tally of Peer Responses: 3 Yes, 3 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The architecture of the SCDE proposed accountability system breaks new ground by demonstrating how the goals of the current ESEA (100% proficiency goal and strong subgroup and graduation rate accountability) can be incorporated into a multi-measure continuous improvement index system. Moreover, it extends accountability by including gender and graduation rate accountability by subgroup. However, it is unclear if the expected rate of progress, particularly at the elementary level, is sufficient to propel schools to substantially improve their educational practice. The schools are ranked by a letter grading system that may provide a disincentive to raising student achievement.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong subgroup accountability • Sets Graduation Rate goal at 90 percent for all students, and all subgroups. • Identifies non-Title I low-performing or achievement-gap schools for intervention in addition to Title I schools.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The A-F grading scale undercuts the State's new emphasis on continuous improvement and growth. The letter grading system grounds perceptions in status as opposed to continuous improvement. • By not incorporating a value-added measure separately into the accountability system, real progress in terms of continuous improvement would not be captured. • It is not clear if the rate of growth, particularly for elementary schools, is sufficient to propel improvement.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underscore the movement of the State towards continuous improvement by reevaluating the use of letter grades and finding language for the different school categories that incentivizes continuous improvement. • Consider keeping 100 point index system, but do not assign letter grades – use different descriptors.

- a. Does the SEA’s accountability system provide differentiated recognition, accountability, and support for all LEAs in the State and for all Title I schools in those LEAs based on (1) student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics, and other subjects at the State’s discretion, for all students and all subgroups of students identified in ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); (2) graduation rates for all students and all subgroups; and (3) school performance and progress over time, including the performance and progress of all subgroups?

2.A.i.a Panel Response

Tally of Peer Responses: 5 Yes, 1 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	State does provide differentiated recognition, accountability, and support for all LEAs and all Title I schools in LEAs per requirements stated above.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong subgroup accountability • Sets Graduation Rate goal at 90 percent for all students, and all subgroups • Has achievement goals for science and social studies in addition to math and English across elementary, middle, and high school. • Over time requires high schools students to score a B or better on high school end-of-course exams in science and social studies for school to hit performance targets. • Identifies non-Title I low-performing or achievement-gap schools for intervention in addition to Title I schools. • The SCDE strategy has both school and district accountability and links the two together in its school improvement strategies. • Incentivizes continual improvement by giving partial credit for gains.

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be giving too much weight to test participation and not enough weight to graduation rates. SCDE purposely gave graduation rate highest individual weight--25% to signal its importance, but combined academic weights are two times greater, and combined with 20 percent for test participation, could still provide unanticipated push out incentives. • Notes considerable stakeholder concern over moving to A to F grading system but does not detail any strategy to address it. • Unclear whether grading system, particularly with an F, will accomplish what SC expects. • By not incorporating a value-added measure separately into the accountability system, real progress in terms of continuous improvement won't be captured. • The statement on the top of page 55 indicates that the "percent of progress" achieved on an index measure will be calculated, then converted to a decimal. This does not match the methodology description provided on p. 65 where each 1 point increase in the scale score is 0.1 point on the index.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider adding a value-added measure into overall school performance so that levels and rates of progress can be reported upon. • Increase graduation rate weight to at least 30%. • Need to be able to easily explain all of the calculations in the index and for AYP. Growth calculations will not be easy to understand.

- b. Does the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system create incentives and provide support that is likely to be effective in closing achievement gaps for all subgroups of students?

2.A.i.b Panel Response

Tally of Peer Responses: 3 Yes, 3 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The school composite index continues to include all subgroups as previously reported, plus the addition of the male and female subgroups. However there were concerns that without an appropriate growth measure subgroup progress could go unrecognized. Also, the decimal representations on the index score can mask how far the subgroup is below the target.

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintains all NCLB sub-groups in accountability system and adds male/female categories • Makes focus school selection based on sub-group achievement gaps and focuses interventions on improving closing those gaps. • Maintains schools in focus school status until subgroup gap has at least been cut in half • Provides schools with incentives for continuous improvement of sub-group performance, by awarding points in accountability systems for any improvement, but proportional to the amount of improvement. • Good to leverage higher-performing LEAs for case studies.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notion of “Former LEP” and how they will be treated in accountability systems was not fully clear (p. 56). • Not clear in how many schools maintaining n-size of 40 for subgroups will have effect of negating some of intended focus on subgroup accountability • Redefining of English Learner subgroup to include former English Learners could mask underperformance of current English Learners. • By using decimal point equivalents to represent growth, it could appear that a subgroup with a .9 in the accountability chart is very close to the target when in reality they could be very far away.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make sure school report cards show subgroup performance, not just the index score. • Consider decreasing elementary school and middle school participation rate in the index from 15 to 10 each and add back into test score weights. Consider decreasing HS participation rate from 10 to 5 and add weights back to grad rates. • Require 95% participation rate of each of the component subgroups of the redefined English Learner subgroup (English Learners and former English Learners) and continue reporting English Learner AMOs separately. • Need to be explicit with how this approach will improve subgroup performance to get the buy-in from districts.

c. Note to Peers: Staff will review 2.A.i.c

Note to Peers: Staff will review 2.A.ii Option A.

ONLY FOR SEAs SELECTING OPTION B: If the SEA elects to include student achievement on assessments other than reading/language arts and mathematics in its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system by selecting Option B, review and respond to peer review questions in section 2.A.ii. If the SEA does not include other assessments, go to section 2.A.iii.

- 2.A.ii** Did the SEA include student achievement on assessments in addition to reading/language arts and mathematics in its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system and to identify reward, priority, and focus schools?
- a. Note to Peers: Staff will review 2.A.ii.a
 - b. Does the SEA’s weighting of the included assessments result in holding schools accountable for ensuring all students achieve the State’s college- and career-ready standards?
 - c. Note to Peers: Staff will review 2.A.ii.c

2.A.ii.b PANEL RESPONSE

Not applicable because the SEA selected 2.A, Option A

Tally of Peer Responses: 6 Yes, 0 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Adding science and social studies does not weaken accountability for math and English.
<i>Strengths</i>	Math and English are weighted significantly higher in the index score.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	None
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	None

2.B Set Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives

2.B *Note to Peers: Staff will review Options A and B.*

Did the SEA describe the method it will use to set new ambitious but achievable annual measurable objectives (AMOs) in at least reading/language arts and mathematics, for the State and all LEAs, schools, and subgroups, that provide meaningful goals and are used to guide support and improvement efforts through one of the three options below?

If the SEA selected Option C:

Did the SEA describe another method that is educationally sound and results in ambitious but achievable AMOs for all LEAs, schools, and subgroups?

- i. Did the SEA provide the new AMOs and the method used to set these AMOs?
 - ii. Did the SEA provide an educationally sound rationale for the pattern of academic progress reflected in the new AMOs?
 - iii. If the SEA set AMOs that differ by LEA, school, or subgroup, do the AMOs require LEAs, schools, and subgroups that are further behind to make greater rates of annual progress?
 - iv. Did the SEA attach a copy of the average statewide proficiency based on assessments administered in the 2010–2011 school year in reading/language arts and mathematics for the “all students” group and all subgroups? (Attachment 8)
- *Are these AMOs similarly ambitious to the AMOs that would result from using Option A or B above?*
 - *Are these AMOs ambitious but achievable given the State’s existing proficiency rates and any other relevant circumstances in the State?*
 - *Will these AMOs result in a significant number of children being on track to be college- and career-ready?*

2.B, Option C (including Questions i–iv) Panel Response

Not applicable because the SEA selected 2.B, Option A or Option B

Tally of Peer Responses: 4 Yes, 2 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	SCDE created AMOs that annually increase the level of scores that students must reach in order to be considered proficient, but it is unclear if the rate of growth is measured in the right way, and there is concern that, at the elementary and middle school levels, the goals are not sufficiently ambitious.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For high schools in particular, use of actual test scores on end of course exam-in science and social studies does provide clear proficiency metric that is understandable to students and public. • AMOs for all sub-groups tightly linked to accountability system-not just reported • AMO targets are increasing annually for all students and subgroups. • Awarding credit for improvement in subgroup and all students performance, proportional to amount of improvement does incentivize focus on improving the outcomes for all students, as all levels of achievement (except for students who have reached the proficiency cut point), in so doing de-emphasizes disproportionate focus on students just below proficiency. • For high schools the targets do seem ambitious but achievable.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCDE provided clarification in the phone call with peer reviewers that SCDE will actually be increasing the target score for each student to the scale scores as described in the proposal, as opposed to keeping the current cut score for proficiency and just reporting using the average scale score as a target for each group to meet. This has the effect of raising the expectations for students to meet annually. SCDE will be reporting the proportion of students that meet the AMO targets, which is analogous to reporting the percent proficient, but not using that term. SCDE indicated that it would not be reporting the percentage of students according to the four proficiency levels required under NCLB, but only against the one target. • Low-performing students not in any subgroup could be masked by the index. • For elementary and middle schools, it is unclear if targets are sufficiently ambitious given South Carolina's current achievement levels. • Unclear how SCDE arrived at 1-point annual gains for science and social studies end-of-course exams.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See suggestions related to AMOs and growth in earlier sections.

2.C Reward Schools

2.C.i Did the SEA describe its methodology for identifying highest-performing and high-progress schools as reward schools?

2.C.i PANEL RESPONSE

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	No rationale provided.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focuses on identifying schools with 50% or more free and reduced price lunch who do well or show substantial improvement • For high schools uses gains in graduation rates to identify high progress schools
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The requirements for high progress schools are confusing. • Clarify how many or what percentage of Title I schools would be identified as Title I Highest Performing and Title I High Progress schools. There were 10 schools reported on Table 2 on p. 157 for high performance and only 5 for high progress. • The request lacked clarity about how the top six-semifinalists and top schools in each category were determined. It was unclear if the schools applied for this recognition or simply received it through ranking of the scores. • It was unclear how the improvement on statewide assessments or making progress on the graduation rates was calculated for the high-progress schools. Clarify if it is based on the overall ranking of index scores, or on some subset of the index scores.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify the requirements for what constitutes a high-progress school. • Need to establish the criteria for choosing the 6 semi-finalists for reward schools.

Note to Peers: Staff will review 2.C.ii.

2.C.iii Are the recognition and, if applicable rewards, proposed by the SEA for its highest-performing and high-progress schools likely to be considered meaningful by the schools?

➤ *Has the SEA consulted with LEAs and schools in designing its recognition and, where applicable, rewards?*

2.C.iii PANEL RESPONSE

Tally of Peer Responses: 6 Yes, 0 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State proposed recognition and rewards systems which combines public notice, with modest, but to schools meaningful financial rewards, and the opportunity to serve as case-study and peer leader for other schools.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combination of recognitions-notice, cash, and model for other schools. • Focuses on identifying schools with 50% or more free- and reduced-price lunch who do well or show substantial improvement. • For high schools, SCDE uses gains in graduation rates to identify high progress schools.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are multiple reward systems in the State and it is unclear how the Reward schools will fit into this system.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	None provided.

2.D Priority Schools

Note to Peers: Staff will review 2.D.i and 2.D.ii.

- 2.D.iii** Are the interventions that the SEA described aligned with the turnaround principles and are they likely to result in dramatic, systemic change in priority schools?
- a. Do the SEA's interventions include all of the following?
- (i) providing strong leadership by: (1) reviewing the performance of the current principal; (2) either replacing the principal if such a change is necessary to ensure strong and effective leadership, or demonstrating to the SEA that the current principal has a track record in improving achievement and has the ability to lead the turnaround effort; and (3) providing the principal with operational flexibility in the areas of scheduling, staff, curriculum, and budget;
 - (ii) ensuring that teachers are effective and able to improve instruction by: (1) reviewing the quality of all staff and retaining only those who are determined to be effective and have the ability to be successful in the turnaround effort; (2) preventing ineffective teachers from transferring to these schools; and (3) providing job-embedded, ongoing professional development informed by the teacher evaluation and support systems and tied to teacher and student needs;
 - (iii) redesigning the school day, week, or year to include additional time for student learning and teacher collaboration;
 - (iv) strengthening the school's instructional program based on student needs and ensuring that the instructional program is research-based, rigorous, and aligned with State academic content standards;
 - (v) using data to inform instruction and for continuous improvement, including by providing time for collaboration on the use of data;
 - (vi) establishing a school environment that improves school safety and discipline and addressing other non-academic factors that impact student achievement, such as students' social, emotional, and health needs; and
 - (vii) providing ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement?

2.D.iii.a (including questions (i)-(vii)) Panel Response*Tally of Peer Responses: 6 Yes, 0 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Interventions described are aligned with the turnaround principles. The extent to which they will result in dramatic, systematic changes will depend on the skill and insight of the Transformative Learning Communities which are to be established for each priority school
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Idea of Transformative Learning Communities consisting of a variety of stakeholders from school, district, school board, state and community has to design and lead school turnaround has the potential to create the buy in and sustained commitment needed to bring about and maintain significant improvements. • Use of comprehensive capacity assessment conducted by external source to identify school needs • Range of state provides supports and support personnel-creation of unified school turnaround efforts in SEA. • Use of rigorous interview and application process to identify external partners to help with supplemental education supports linked to school and state instructional practices • Strong action taken if school fails to leave priority status within 5 years. • Building off some prior experience supporting significant numbers of schools in need of major reform (e.g., Palmetto Priority Schools). • Plans to work with Office of Exceptional Children to provide guidance to Priority Schools with students with disabilities.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How Transformative Learning Communities will be established, facilitated, and guided is not clear. • Mentions Challenge to Achieve plan for School Transformation based on capacity assessment but does not detail what the Challenge to Achieve plan is and how it works. • Research has not shown supplemental educational services (SES) to be effective, but the SEA would require LEAs to set aside 20% for that purpose. SEA clarified that, based on stakeholder feedback and some success with certain SES providers, it is being required. • Not clear why response to intervention (RTI) was listed as a school environment intervention as well as an instructional strategy.

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to focus on the resources. If implementation is faulty, LEAs will blame the system and this will undercut the buy-in at the LEA and school level. • Need to flesh out how SCDE will help schools improve school environment. Need to acknowledge that the perception of safety can be difficult to change. • Consider moving to reorganization after 3 years of poor trend data and not wait for 5 years. • Reconsider the percentage of the set-aside for SES, correlate the set-aside required based on the number of schools.

- b. Are the identified interventions to be implemented in priority schools likely to —
- (i) increase the quality of instruction in priority schools;
 - (ii) improve the effectiveness of the leadership and the teaching in these schools; and
 - (iii) improve student achievement and, where applicable, graduation rates for all students, including English Learners, students with disabilities, and the lowest-achieving students?

2.D.iii.b (including questions (i)-(iii)) Panel Response

Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 6 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	While the plan includes all required interventions, there are concerns about the lack of inclusion of strategies for instructional improvement, including for English Learners and students with disabilities. While the use of TLCs is promising as a means of getting widespread buy-in for creating and sustaining school improvement, it is unclear if the SCDE has sufficient mechanisms in place to train, build the capacity, and monitor the effectiveness of the TLCs.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State includes a larger number of schools in priority and focus status than is required in order to serve all schools in bottom 5% as well as all D and F schools regardless of Title I Status • Have plans for leadership academy for school transformation but no detail provided • Partnership between Office of Exceptional Children and Office of School Transformation indicates potential for greater collaboration at the State level.

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not clear how specified reforms and reform process will impact instruction in classrooms. • Unclear of the financial resources that will be available to do this work. • There are no descriptions of targeted service or interventions for English Learners. • Instructional intervention is weak, including around English Learners and students with disabilities.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SC needs network for Transformational Learning Communities (TLC) to learn from each other. Use the principal leadership training as part of the training for TLCs. • Identify the steps that SCDE will take to ensure that the partnership between Office of Exceptional Children and Office of School Transformation will produce better outcomes. • Clarify that the Office of Exceptional Children will work with priority schools. • More thought on how all of these elements will contribute to instructional improvement. • Integrate in statewide early warning system into RTI and student support work. • As SC continues to try to break down silos, make sure that the English Learners office is included in the priority schools strategy around instruction. • Consider developing an on-line system that will track services that children get over time. • Consider providing universal screeners to districts that do not have the resources to purchase their own.

c. Note to Peers: Staff will review 2.D.iii.c

2.D.iv Does the SEA’s proposed timeline ensure that LEAs that have one or more priority schools will implement meaningful interventions aligned with the turnaround principles in each priority school no later than the 2014–2015 school year?

- *Does the SEA’s proposed timeline distribute priority schools’ implementation of meaningful interventions aligned with the turnaround principles in a balanced way, such that there is not a concentration of these schools in the later years of the timeline?*

2.D.iv Panel Response

Tally of Peer Responses: 5 Yes, 1 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	State proposed timeline does align with the Principle.
<i>Strengths</i>	The timeline for implementing the interventions in priority schools is ambitious.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	SCDE only allows 1 month for the Challenge to Achieve Plan. This is far too short of a timeline. SCDE also allows only a 1 month period for evaluation; again this is unrealistic and too short of a time period. These timelines will undermine the credibility and effectiveness of the work.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider revising the timelines so schools have more time to give careful thought to their Challenge to Achieve Plan and to the evaluation. Perhaps have newly identified schools begin to implement the interventions in 2013-2014 to ensure that a solid plan is in place. • Need to differentiate who is responsible for implementing the timeline over the summer months. Teachers will need to be compensated if they need to work in July.

2.D.v Did the SEA provide criteria to determine when a school that is making significant progress in improving student achievement exits priority status?

- a. Do the SEA's criteria ensure that schools that exit priority status have made significant progress in improving student achievement?
 ➤ *Is the level of progress required by the criteria to exit priority status likely to result in sustained improvement in these schools?*

2.D.v and 2.D.v.a PANEL RESPONSE

Tally of Peer Responses: 3 Yes, 3 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	State does provide exit criteria, but it is difficult to tell whether schools will have to show significant improvement in order to exit priority status.
<i>Strengths</i>	SCDE uses multiple criteria to establish whether there is a positive improvement trajectory.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear what is meant by earn value added growth measure of .2 or greater. Also “positive” comprehensive capacity assessment is not defined or benchmarked. • Need to clarify whether a school that meet overalls performance (total composite index score) meets or exceeds the annual AMO for two years would automatically keep the school from being in the lowest 5% of Title I schools. It is unclear whether it would be possible for a school to not be in the lowest 5% of Title I schools for two years without meeting the AMOs.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	None provided.

2.E Focus Schools

Note to Peers: Staff will review 2.E.i, 2.E.i.a, and 2.E.ii

2.E.i Did the SEA describe its methodology for identifying a number of low-performing schools equal to at least 10 percent of the State’s Title I schools as focus schools? If the SEA’s methodology is not based on the definition of focus schools in *ESEA Flexibility* (but is instead, e.g., based on school grades or ratings that take into account a number of factors), did the SEA also demonstrate that the list provided in Table 2 is consistent with the definition, per the Department’s “Demonstrating that an SEA’s Lists of Schools Meet ESEA Flexibility Definitions” guidance?

- a. Note to Peers: Staff will review 2.E.i.a.
- b. Is the SEA’s methodology for identifying focus schools educationally sound and likely to ensure that schools are accountable for the performance of subgroups of students?

2.E.i.b Panel Response

Tally of Peer Responses: 5 Yes, 1 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Methodology is educationally sound, but there is some concern whether the methodology will lead to greater school accountability.
<i>Strengths</i>	Puts focus on schools with largest average achievement gaps.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	It is unclear whether the methodology will lead to greater school accountability.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Put an example that is easy to understand of how a focus school is identified on the SCDE website. The current methodology is not easy to follow.

2.E.ii *Note to Peers: Staff will review 2.E.ii*

2.E.iii Does the SEA’s process and timeline ensure that each LEA will identify the needs of its focus schools and their students and implement interventions in focus schools at the start of the 2012–2013 school year? Did the SEA provide examples of and justifications for the interventions the SEA will require its focus schools to implement? Are those interventions based on the needs of students and likely to improve the performance of low-performing students and reduce achievement gaps among subgroups, including English Learners and students with disabilities?

- *Has the SEA demonstrated that the interventions it has identified are effective at increasing student achievement in schools with similar characteristics, needs, and challenges as the schools the SEA has identified as focus schools?*
- *Has the SEA identified interventions that are appropriate for different levels of schools (elementary, middle, high) and that address different types of school needs (e.g., all-students, targeted at the lowest-achieving students)?*

2.E.iii Panel Response

Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 6 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Timeline does ensure identification of schools and student needs by start of 2012-13 school year. SEA does provide examples of and justification of interventions to be used, yet there was no evidence provided that interventions selected will have record of effectiveness in increasing achievement in schools with similar characteristics.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process is focused on identifying needs of students with achievement gaps and then aligning targeted interventions based on those needs

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence provided that interventions selected have a record of effectiveness in increasing achievement in schools with similar characteristics. • There is no evidence that SES will help close gaps, yet it is a required intervention. • SCDE only allows 1 month for the Challenge to Achieve Plan. This is far too short of a timeline. SCDE also allows only a 1 month period for evaluation; again, this is unrealistic and too short of a time period. These timelines will undermine the credibility and effectiveness of the work. • SCDE does not list English Learners as a subgroup for disaggregated data and no discussion around interventions that will meet the needs of English Learners. • Plan for interventions is weak. Unclear how schools will identify causes of underperformance and use to target interventions. • It was not specified whether the focus schools would need to do a needs assessment other than simply disaggregating subgroup data. • SCDE did not consider parent and community engagement to be a key part of the improvement process.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider revising the timelines so schools have more time to give careful thought to their Challenge to Achieve Plan and to the evaluation. • Need to differentiate who is responsible for implementing the timeline over the summer months. Teachers will need to be compensated if they need to work in July. • Need to develop a better needs assessment to identify the causes of underperformance. • For focus schools, instead of having the 10% set-aside required for SES, consider allowing the schools to determine if they want to provide SES or to provide targeted services aimed at closing the achievement gaps of the identified groups.

2.E.iv Did the SEA provide criteria to determine when a school that is making significant progress in improving student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps exits focus status?

a. Do the SEA’s criteria ensure that schools that exit focus status have made significant progress in improving student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps?

➤ *Is the level of progress required by the criteria to exit focus status likely to result in sustained improvement in these schools?*

2.E.iv and 2.E.iv.a PANEL RESPONSE

Tally of Peer Responses: 6 Yes, 0 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	SEA does provide exit criteria.
<i>Strengths</i>	The exit criteria are ambitious.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	No weaknesses noted.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Need to identify what capacities are needed at the school and district level so improvement is maintained. Clarify the exit criteria for focus schools on page 87.

2.F Provide Incentives and Support for other Title I Schools

2.F.i Does the SEA’s differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system provide incentives and supports for other Title I schools that, based on the SEA’s new AMOs and other measures, are not making progress in improving student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps?

2.F.i Panel Response

Tally of Peer Responses: 5 Yes, 1 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	SCDE provides differentiated support based on needs assessment to C and D schools that are not priority or focus schools.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCDE is working with an external partner to redesign SEA school supports to be less fragmented and more unified. • SCDE is targeting supports to lower-performing schools that are not designated as priority or focus.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear how SCDE will evaluate the success of external partners. • English Learners are missing from SCDE’s strategies. It is unclear how SCDE will support the instruction of English Learners.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address English Learner issues in the SCDE strategies to improve student achievement.

- 2.F.ii** Are those incentives and supports likely to improve student achievement, close achievement gaps, and increase the quality of instruction for all students, including English Learners and students with disabilities?

2.F.ii Panel Response

Tally of Peer Responses: 3 Yes, 3 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Subgroup AMOs in four subjects and for graduation rates as part of the accountability system, with credit for improvement proportional to amount of improvement, provides continual incentive for schools to improve achievement and close gaps for all students. However, there is a lack of explicit support for English Learners.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCDE requires C and D Title I schools that are not priority or focus to complete a needs assessment, allow them to request technical assistance, and provide a funding source to these schools to implement school improvement strategies. • SCDE places particular emphasis on subgroups that do not meet AMOs.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The support provided to general education and specialized teachers for improving English Learner achievement appears to be limited and not well-integrated into broader instructional improvement initiatives. • There are concerns about SCDE requiring that schools submit their plans to the state before technical assistance is provided. Some schools may need TA first to create an effective school improvement plan.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address English Learner issues in the SCDE strategies to improve student achievement. • Make it possible for schools to have access to technical assistance prior to submitting their plans.

2.G Build SEA, LEA, and School Capacity to Improve Student Learning

- 2.G** Is the SEA’s process for building SEA, LEA, and school capacity to improve student learning in all schools and, in particular, in low-performing schools and schools with the largest achievement gaps, likely to succeed in improving such capacity?
- i. Is the SEA’s process for ensuring timely and comprehensive monitoring of, and technical assistance for, LEA implementation of interventions in priority and focus schools likely to result in successful implementation of these interventions and in progress on leading indicators and student outcomes in these schools?
 - *Did the SEA describe a process for the rigorous review and approval of any external providers used by the SEA and its LEAs to support the implementation of interventions in priority and focus schools that is likely to result in the identification of high-quality partners with experience and expertise applicable to the needs of the school, including specific subgroup needs?*
 - ii. Is the SEA’s process for ensuring sufficient support for implementation of interventions in priority schools, focus schools, and other Title I schools under the SEA’s differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system (including through leveraging funds the LEA was previously required to reserve under ESEA section 1116(b)(10), SIG funds, and other Federal funds, as permitted, along with State and local resources) likely to result in successful implementation of such interventions and improved student achievement?
 - iii. Is the SEA’s process for holding LEAs accountable for improving school and student performance, particularly for turning around their priority schools, likely to improve LEA capacity to support school improvement?

2.G (including i, ii, and iii) Panel Response*Tally of Peer Responses: 6 Yes, 0 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
Rationale	SCDE provides monitoring and technical assistance, funding support and describes LEA-level accountability. The support is focused at both district and school levels.
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCDE is reorganizing to better provide assistance and support to schools. • In the conference call with the SEA, SCDE showed significant learning from its previous school improvement work with low-performing schools. • SCDE is developing a Transformational Leaders Academy, which is intended to increase capacity of principals in low-performing schools.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear how SCDE will develop a rigorous process for approving providers. • Unclear how TLCs will be monitored.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None provided.

Principle 2 Overall Review

Is the SEA’s plan for developing and implementing a system of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support likely to improve student achievement, close achievement gaps, and improve the quality of instruction for students? Do the components of the SEA’s plan fit together to create a coherent and comprehensive system that supports continuous improvement and is tailored to the needs of the State, its LEAs, its schools, and its students? If not, what aspects are not addressed or need to be improved upon?

PRINCIPLE 2 OVERALL REVIEW PANEL RESPONSE

Tally of Peer Responses: 3 Yes, 3 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The architecture of the SCDE proposed accountability system breaks new ground by demonstrating how the goals of the current ESEA (100% proficiency goal and strong subgroup and graduation rate accountability) can be incorporated into a multi-measure continuous improvement index system. Moreover, it extends accountability by including gender and graduation rate accountability by subgroup. However, it is unclear if the expected rate of progress, particularly at the elementary level, is sufficient to propel schools to substantially improve their educational practice. The schools are ranked by a letter grading system that may provide a disincentive to raising student achievement.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do a good job of focusing on sub-group performance and proficiency gaps. • The request includes ambitious graduation rates for all subgroups. • SCDE is attempting to take a look at itself to better support schools and improve capacity.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By not incorporating a value-added measure separately into the accountability system, real progress in terms of continuous improvement won’t be captured. • It is not clear if the rate of growth, particularly for elementary schools, is sufficient to propel meaningful improvement. • Weak on instructional improvement strategies in priority and focus schools. • There was concern about implementing the timelines for school reform. • The support provided to general education and specialized teachers for improving English Learner achievement appears to be limited and not well integrated into broader instructional improvement initiatives.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See technical assistance in specific sections.

Principle 3: Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership

3.A Develop and Adopt Guidelines for Local Teacher and Principal Evaluation and Support Systems

3.A.i Has the SEA developed and adopted guidelines consistent with Principle 3 through one of the two options below?

If the SEA selected **Option A**:

If the SEA has not already developed and adopted all of the guidelines consistent with Principle 3:

- i. Is the SEA's plan for developing and adopting guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems likely to result in successful adoption of those guidelines by the end of the 2011–2012 school year?

3.A.i, Option A.i Panel Response

Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option B

Tally of Peer Responses: 6 Yes, 0 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both the Assisting, Developing, and Evaluating Professional Teaching (ADEPT) system for Teachers and the Program for Assisting, Developing, and Evaluating Principal Performance (PADEPP) system for teachers are currently being revised and will be approved by the end of the 2011-2012 school year.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Because these systems will not be completely new, they will reflect a number of years of implementation refinements. Even with changes, the approach is one that will be familiar to stakeholders. Also, the SEA conducted crosswalk against other nationally recognized standards for evaluation.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Because some of the guidelines are still in the process of being developed (e.g., differentiated levels of performance) final versions are not yet ready for review.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SCDE should ensure that a strategic communications plan is developed to rollout out the finalized guidelines throughout the State.

- ii. Does the SEA’s plan include sufficient involvement of teachers and principals in the development of these guidelines?

3.A.i, Option A.ii Panel Response

Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option B

Tally of Peer Responses: 6 Yes, 0 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	ADEPT has had several groups comprised of educators informing its rollout including the 2006 ADEPT Steering Committee and the more recent ADEPT Upgrade Task Force (2011). Additionally, the SCDE is forming a new statewide group of stakeholders to include principals, teachers, district superintendents, district administrators, and representatives from higher education. The Educator Evaluation Stakeholder Group will offer the SCDE input on the new, enhanced guidelines for both ADEPT and PADEPP evaluation and support processes. The revised South Carolina Educator Evaluation Guidelines will be brought to the State Board of Education for approval in the spring of 2012.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing commitment to leverage the voice of educators in developing and refining a statewide appraisal is an important communication point.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State was able to include the voice of a large number of teachers, however it is unclear to what extent teacher and administrator associations were involved in the development of these guidelines.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCDE should continue to involve teachers and administrators in the rollout and monitoring of these guidelines after adoption. • SCDE needs to ensure that the educator evaluation stakeholder group is credible and representative of teachers and principals and teacher and principal associations.

iii. *Note to Peers: Staff will review iii.*

If the SEA selected Option B:

If the SEA has developed and adopted all guidelines consistent with Principle 3:

- i. Are the guidelines the SEA has adopted likely to lead to the development of evaluation and support systems that increase the quality of instruction for students and improve student achievement? (See question 3.A.ii to review the adopted guidelines for consistency with Principle 3.)

3.A.i, Option B.i Panel Response

Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A

Tally of Peer Responses: NA

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	NA
<i>Strengths</i>	NA
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	NA
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	NA

ii. *Note to Peers: Staff will review ii.*

iii. Did the SEA have sufficient involvement of teachers and principals in the development of these guidelines?

3.A.i, Option B.iii Panel Response

Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A

Tally of Peer Responses: NA

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	NA
<i>Strengths</i>	NA
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	NA
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	NA

ONLY FOR SEAs SELECTING OPTION B: If the SEA has adopted all guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems by selecting Option B in section 3.A, review and respond to peer review question 3.A.ii below.

3.A.ii Are the SEA’s guidelines for teacher and principal evaluation and support systems consistent with Principle 3 — *i.e.*, will they promote systems that:

a. Will be used for continual improvement of instruction ?

➤ *Are the SEA’s guidelines likely to result in support for all teachers, including teachers who are specialists working with students with disabilities and English Learners and general classroom teachers with these students in their classrooms, that will enable them to improve their instructional practice?*

3.A.ii.a Panel Response

Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A

Tally of Peer Responses: NA

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	NA
<i>Strengths</i>	NA
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	NA
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	NA

b. Meaningfully differentiate performance using at least three performance levels?

- *Does the SEA incorporate student growth into its performance-level definitions with sufficient weighting to ensure that performance levels will differentiate among teachers and principals who have made significantly different contributions to student growth or closing achievement gaps?*

3.A.ii.b Panel Response

Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A

Tally of Peer Responses: NA

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	NA
<i>Strengths</i>	NA
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	NA
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	NA

- c. Use multiple valid measures in determining performance levels, including as a significant factor data on student growth for all students (including English Learners and students with disabilities), and other measures of professional practice (which may be gathered through multiple formats and sources, such as observations based on rigorous teacher performance standards, teacher portfolios, and student and parent surveys)?
 - (i) Does the SEA have a process for ensuring that all measures that are included in determining performance levels are valid measures, meaning measures that are clearly related to increasing student academic achievement and school performance, and are implemented in a consistent and high-quality manner across schools within an LEA?

3.A.ii.c(i) Panel Response

Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A

Tally of Peer Responses: NA

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	NA
<i>Strengths</i>	NA
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	NA
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	NA

- (ii) For grades and subjects in which assessments are required under ESEA section 1111(b)(3), does the SEA define a statewide approach for measuring student growth on these assessments?

3.A.ii.c(ii) Panel Response

Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A

Tally of Peer Responses: NA

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	NA
<i>Strengths</i>	NA
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	NA
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	NA

- (iii) For grades and subjects in which assessments are not required under ESEA section 1111(b)(3), does the SEA either specify the measures of student growth that LEAs must use or select from or plan to provide guidance to LEAs on what measures of student growth are appropriate, and establish a system for ensuring that LEAs will use valid measures?

3.A.ii.c(iii) Panel Response

Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A

Tally of Peer Responses: NA

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	NA
<i>Strengths</i>	NA
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	NA
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	NA

- d. Evaluate teachers and principals on a regular basis?

3.A.ii.d Panel Response

Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A

Tally of Peer Responses: NA

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	NA
<i>Strengths</i>	NA
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	NA
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	NA

- e. Provide clear, timely, and useful feedback, including feedback that identifies needs and guides professional development?
 - *Will the SEA’s guidelines ensure that evaluations occur with a frequency sufficient to ensure that feedback is provided in a timely manner to inform effective practice?*
 - *Are the SEA’s guidelines likely to result in differentiated professional development that meets the needs of teachers?*

3.A.ii.e Panel Response

Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A

Tally of Peer Responses: NA

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	NA
<i>Strengths</i>	NA
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	NA
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	NA

f. Will be used to inform personnel decisions?

3.A.ii.f Panel Response

Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A

Tally of Peer Responses: NA

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	NA
<i>Strengths</i>	NA
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	NA
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	NA

3. B Ensure LEAs Implement Teacher and Principal Evaluation and Support Systems

- 3.B** Is the SEA’s process for ensuring that each LEA develops, adopts, pilots, and implements, with the involvement of teachers and principals, evaluation and support systems consistent with the SEA’s adopted guidelines likely to lead to high-quality local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems?
- *Does the SEA have a process for reviewing and approving an LEA’s teacher and principal evaluation and support systems to ensure that they are consistent with the SEA’s guidelines and will result in the successful implementation of such systems?*
 - *Does the SEA have a process for ensuring that an LEA develops, adopts, pilots, and implements its teacher and principal evaluation and support systems with the involvement of teachers and principals?*
 - *Did the SEA describe the process it will use to ensure that all measures used in an LEA’s evaluation and support systems are valid, meaning measures that are clearly related to increasing student academic achievement and school performance, and are implemented in a consistent and high-quality manner across schools within an LEA (i.e., process for ensuring inter-rater reliability)?*
 - *Does the SEA have a process for ensuring that teachers working with special populations of students, such as students with disabilities and English Learners, are included in the LEA’s teacher and principal evaluation and support systems?*
 - *Is the SEA’s plan likely to be successful in ensuring that LEAs meet the timeline requirements by either (1) piloting evaluation and support systems no later than the 2013–2014 school year and implementing evaluation and support systems consistent with the requirements described above no later than the 2014–2015 school year; or (2) implementing these systems no later than the 2013–2014 school year?*
 - *Do timelines reflect a clear understanding of what steps will be necessary and reflect a logical sequencing and spacing of the key steps necessary to implement evaluation and support systems consistent with the required timelines?*
 - *Is the SEA plan for providing adequate guidance and other technical assistance to LEAs in developing and implementing teacher and principal evaluation and support systems likely to lead to successful implementation?*
 - *Is the pilot broad enough to gain sufficient feedback from a variety of types of educators, schools, and classrooms to inform full implementation of the LEA’s evaluation and support systems?*

3.B Panel Response*Tally of Peer Responses: 6 Yes, 0 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Once the ADEPT and PADEPP guidelines are adopted in 2012, the SCDE will select a demographically representative group of LEAs throughout the state to pilot these new evaluation systems in SY 2013-2014. Training would then begin in summer 2014 for an anticipated rollout to all school districts in SY 2014-2015. Because there is a history of using a State system of evaluation in South Carolina, the SEA is not anticipating much variation from LEAs in the use of this new model. LEAs will have to submit to SCDE any requests for departures from ADEPT or PADEPP.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beginning with a representative pilot will allow the SEA to work through implementation issues at a smaller scale and make corrections before going statewide. • The SEA is committed to providing ongoing technical assistance to LEAs regarding the implementation of these new systems. This will also help ensure fidelity to the models. • The establishment of a new Office of Educator Evaluation will provide additional focus and bandwidth for the SEA to support the rollout and monitoring of these new systems.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not clear from SCDE's request how many districts will participate in the SY 2013-2014 pilot. While SCDE will invite feedback on the implementation of ADEPT and PADEPP, this feedback loop should be more formalized. • It is not clear what a formal evaluation of the effectiveness of these systems will look like. • There were several large areas that are still under investigation (e.g., use of value-added data, peer review, student response surveys.) The path forward on due-diligence and decision-making in these areas was not always clear.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCDE should consider allowing a LEA opt-in into the pilot as a way to ensure additional educator buy-in. It may also be advisable to attach financial incentives to pilot participation that could be tied to additional data gathering that would help assess the efficacy of the system and its first year rollout. • Create a standing teacher/administrator task force that will monitor the rollout of ADEPT and PADEPP.

Principle 3 Overall Review

If the SEA indicated that it has not developed and adopted all guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems consistent with Principle 3 by selecting Option A in section 3.A, is the SEA’s plan for the SEA’s and LEAs’ development and implementation of teacher and principal evaluation and support systems comprehensive, coherent, and likely to increase the quality of instruction for students and improve student achievement? If not, what aspects are not addressed or need to be improved upon?

If the SEA indicated that it has adopted guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems consistent with Principle 3 by selecting Option B in section 3.A, are the SEA’s guidelines and the SEA’s process for ensuring, as applicable, LEA development, adoption, piloting, and implementation of evaluation and support systems comprehensive, coherent, and likely to increase the quality of instruction for students and improve student achievement? If not, what aspects are not addressed or need to be improved upon?

Principle 3 Overall Review Panel Response

Tally of Peer Responses: 6 Yes, 0 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	It appears that the SCDE is committed to a continuous improvement model regarding its evaluation system for teachers and principals. The ADEPT and PADEPP systems have gone through multiple iterations and appear to be responsive to the voices of educators who were involved in their development. The SEA has also expressed an interest in looking even more broadly at comprehensive measures of teacher effectiveness such as peer review and student response surveys. Despite much work in this area during the past six years, the SEA is still planning a thoughtful rollout with an initial pilot year.
<i>Strengths</i>	SCDE proposes to incorporate multiple measures of teacher performance, particularly with measures that will provide more detail to teachers on how to improve. A more recent addition to the ADEPT system, the Research and Development Goals-Based Evaluation creates a learning environment in which teachers will collaborate on an inquiry project, test their plan, and then share their results with colleagues. Work like this empowers teachers, builds capacity, and strengthens campus learning environments.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	Because this plan is still in development, there are still a number of key aspects that have not yet been fully resolved, such as the use of value-added data, differentiated performance levels, student response surveys, and peer review. Additionally, more thought should be given to the structure of the pilot, particularly with the potential for LEA opt-in that could create a more engaged group of experts willing to test out these new systems and provide ongoing feedback on their implementation.

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<p>Maintaining a robust feedback loop with state teacher associations will be critical in ensuring two-way communication, problem-solving, and engendering an overall feeling of collaboration that will support an effective evaluation rollout.</p> <p>The construction of the 2013-2014 pilot framework will require a great deal of thought to ensure a representative sample of LEAs will participate, that there are clear learning goals for what the SEA hopes to learn, and detailed mechanisms for how data will be collected and analyzed. The SEA may want to consider contracting with a neutral third party to conduct the pilot evaluation. Because a number of leading-edge LEAs around the country are using new appraisal systems, the SEA may want to engage representatives from these LEAs to inform their pilot.</p>

Overall Request Evaluation

Did the SEA provide a comprehensive and coherent approach for implementing the waivers and principles in its request for the flexibility? Overall, is implementation of the SEA's approach likely to increase the quality of instruction for students and improve student achievement? If not, what aspects are not addressed or need to be improved upon?

Overall Request Evaluation Panel Response

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	SCDE has demonstrated the potential for a strongly integrated system that will move the State forward in student achievement and closing achievement gaps.
<i>Strengths</i>	Principle 1 is strong and Principle 3 was a strong plan overall, and the accountability system re-imagined how the current ESEA goals of 100% proficiency and strong subgroup and graduation accountability can be incorporated into a next-generation accountability system.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	Where the system is strong is as an accountability system, it is weak as an improvement system. Additional work ensuring that systems and resources exist to move from simply reporting results to using those results to improve instructional practices.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	See suggestions throughout.