

ESEA Flexibility

Peer Panel Notes



State Request: Washington

Date: March 30, 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: 5 Yes, 1 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) has made substantial effort to engage teachers and their representatives at the outset of the planning and implementation process (p. 16).
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSPI met three times with leaders of the Washington Education Association (WEA) during deliberations. • The request identifies changes OSPI made in its application as a result of feedback, and included as an attachment the verbatim comments of all teachers solicited from the statewide survey. • The request describes the ongoing role teachers have in shaping the design and implementation of Principles 1 and 3.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	Some panel members believe that few of the strategies to engage educators solicited meaningful feedback.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	None.

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>	OSPI used a variety of outreach strategies to inform and engage a range of stakeholders: email list-serves, surveys, web postings, webinars, and presentations to stakeholder groups and committees (p. 16). The request includes a detailed analysis of the responses and details the changes made to the request as a result of the feedback received.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSPI used a range of methods used to inform and engage stakeholders. • The survey response was the largest OSPI has ever received for a survey of this type.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	None.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	None.

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: 1 Yes, 5 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Although the panel has identified strengths in individual components of the plan, until a more detailed overall implementation plan is presented, the panel cannot have sufficient confidence that OSPI’s plan is realistic or of sufficient quality.

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given local control, OSPI has a realistic strategy involving knitting together diverse stakeholders into a coherent delivery system for CCSS implementation (e.g., Steering Committee convening of Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) and regional Educational Service Districts (ESDs), convening of State content associations to align professional development with CCSS through Learning Forward standards). • OSPI envisions a differentiated implementation support system for its 295 districts, some of which are large and have substantial capacity of their own, while others are small and must rely heavily on regional ESDs for support. • OSPI’s request includes several plans that contain at least some components of a high quality plan (e.g., the Common Core Steering Committee’s Communication Team’s Communication Plan (Attachment 4.4) and Phase II and III support system development (p. 40)). • The four core strategies proposed for establishing a support system for district collaboration are promising: Network Pilot Project Grants, Content Specialist Professional Learning, Curriculum Leader Collaboratives, and Professional Learning Association Collaboration. • OSPI has identified a number of promising activities designed to ensure its strategic plan remains dynamic and responsive to stakeholder needs (pp. 43-44). • A draft district implementation rubric is a promising tool for district self-assessment and planning (Attachment 4.5). • OSPI’s Common Core Steering Committee plans to develop performance measures for CCSS implementation and report on their attainment.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	While the four core strategies for Phase II and III hold promise for building a support system for districts to communicate and learn from one another, there is insufficient detail about the intended outcomes to draw conclusions about their likely impact.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	OSPI should provide a complete plan (i.e., a plan with key milestones, timeline, parties responsible, evidence, resources, and significant obstacles) for the four core activities described on pp. 40-41 that also makes explicit the intended outcomes of each and how they are expected to build both OSPI and district capacity to support effective implementation at the school and classroom level.

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?

1.B Panel Response, Part B

Tally of Peer Responses: 3 Yes, 3 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	OSPI’s request describes well the characteristics of effective practice for English Learners and students with disabilities and identifies a number of important collaborative efforts underway with other States designed to support effective implementation for all students, including students with disabilities and English Learners (pp. 33-34). The request does not, however, translate these into a comprehensive plan that will lead to all students gaining access to and learning content aligned with the new standards.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSPI is a member of the Stanford-led consortium that is aligning English Learner standards with the CCSS by 2013, and plans are in place to use a new English Language proficiency assessment. • OSPI is also engaged with 6 other States in developing the assessment system and measures aligned with CCSS being designed specifically to target English learners with disabilities (p. 35). • The comprehensive research-based descriptions of what students with disabilities and English Learners require to have success in school is designed to serve as a foundation for OSPI implementation support (pp. 33-34). • The request cites a deliberate and public shift by OSPI from the term “achievement gap” to “educational opportunity gap” as evidence of its commitment to an asset model of intervention rather than a deficit model.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the four core strategies for Phase II and III hold promise for building a support system for districts to communicate and learn from one another, there is insufficient detail about their implementation and intended outcomes to draw conclusions about their likely impact. • There is insufficient specificity about the actions OSPI proposes to support schools and districts to implement the CCSS in ways that will ensure access for English Learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students.

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSPI should incorporate into the more detailed plan recommended above more explicit activities related to supporting district and school efforts to develop their capacity to make CCSS accessible to students with disabilities and English Learners. • Develop the professional development and other supports for teachers and principals that align to the CCSS. • Ensure that all supports for schools and educators to implement the CCCS are in alignment and integrated with the supports and expectations in Principle 2 and Principle 3. For example, a school should experience the responsibility of implementing all three Principles in a seamless manner.

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 Panel Responses: 2 Yes, 4 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	<p>OSPI has presented a strong proposal in many respects, but a lack of detail in its plans for implementation support leaves the panel unsure that it is realistic and of high quality. The peer panel does not see sufficient evidence of deliberate action by OSPI to coordinate and integrate across the agency the activities under the respective principles to leverage resources of time, money, and staff, and, more importantly, to support district efforts to approach their implementation of the three principles in a coherent, integrated and strategic way.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given local control, OSPI has a realistic strategy involving knitting together diverse stakeholders into a coherent delivery system for CCSS implementation. • OSPI envisions a differentiated implementation support system for its 295 districts, some of which are large and have substantial capacity of their own, while others are small and must rely heavily on regional educational service districts for support. • The four core strategies proposed for establishing a support system for district collaboration are promising: Network Pilot Project Grants, Content Specialist Professional Learning, Curriculum Leader Collaboratives, and Professional Learning Association Collaboration. • The research-based descriptions of what students with disabilities and English Learners require to have success in school are a firm foundation for OSPI implementation support (pp. 33-34). • OSPI is a member of three consortia of states focused on ensuring that assessment practices address the needs of English Learners and students with disabilities, respectively. • The proposed interim assessments and formative assessment tools are likely to provide needed resources to districts and schools.

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is insufficient specificity about what OSPI will do to support schools and districts to implement CCSS in ways that will ensure access for English Learners, students with disabilities and low-achieving students. • Activities to support districts to transition to CCSS are not sufficiently integrated with activities described to support district implementation of Principles 2 and 3 when such integration is appropriate and would help districts implement all three ambitious initiatives in a coherent, coordinated way.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate into the more detailed plan recommended above more explicit activities related to supporting districts and schools to develop greater capacity to make the common core accessible to students with disabilities and English Learners (e.g., teacher training on the English language proficiency standards being developed by the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment consortium). • Ensure that development of interim assessments and formative tools aligned to CCSS can be used to support interventions in priority and focus schools (Principle 2) as well as help districts address the need for assessments for educator evaluations (Principle 3).

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: 0 Yes, 6 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	OSPI has described a transitional accountability system and plans to transition to a new system in one year. The transitional system proposed provides differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system, but important elements of a high-quality plan are absent, which leaves the panel unable to determine OSPI's ability to implement this system in a way that improves student achievement and school performance.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSPI provided a transition plan with timeline. • OSPI has proposed several promising programs, assistance mechanisms, and interventions to reward high-performing schools and address achievement and gaps in low-performing schools.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The interventions and supports proposed, while promising, do not sufficiently instill confidence in the panel that they will lead to dramatic, rapid improvements in student achievement. • Some elements of a high-quality plan are absent (objectives, point people, benchmarks/key milestones, aligned resources).
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate efforts to ensure high-quality instruction and needed supports. • Include all elements of a high-quality plan.

- 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: 4 Yes, 2 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
Rationale	OSPI is in the process of revising its accountability index and provides little information about its index and how it will be used to meet the requirements of ESEA Flexibility. Comments about strengths and weaknesses refer to the index that will be used for the transition year.
Strengths	Five outcomes (in reading, math, writing, and science, as well as graduation rates) are rated on three indicators (non-poverty students, poverty students, and changes in results in the past year).
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	The current index does not take into account performance of subgroups other than the disadvantaged student subgroup.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When developing the new index, ensure that there is alignment between the proposed method for identifying focus schools and index implementation in order to ensure maximum school attention to the factors of the index. • In finalizing the index, ensure that schools and districts have sufficient incentive to address the needs of subgroups with urgency.

- 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: 0 Yes; 6 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	OSPI’s differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system has many important elements in place; however, it is unlikely to be effective in closing the achievement gap for all students because the plan lacks important details.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSPI has a vision, purpose, and core values guiding implementation of CCSS that includes all students. • The minimum group size is being reduced from 30 to 20 students, which will include more students in the system.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little evidence is provided regarding the effectiveness of OSPI’s efforts as they relate closing subgroup achievement gaps. • OSPI highlights the importance of the subgroups, but its request lacks details regarding how the recognition, accountability, and support system will create incentives and provide supports that are likely to be effective in closing achievement gaps for all subgroups of students.
<i>Technical assistance suggestions</i>	Develop a detailed plan that includes all of the elements of a high-quality plan (e.g., timeline, persons responsible, key activities, etc.).

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.B.

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 or 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: 3 Yes; 3 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	In addition to assessing reading/language arts and mathematics, the new system will assess student achievement on writing and science; however, little detail is provided (p. 81). The panel applauds the inclusion of more subjects, but without more detail is unable to comment on whether the weighting of subjects in the index will result in holding all schools accountable.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSPI considers it important to include science and writing in the new accountability index.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little information is provided about the writing and science assessments. • No detail is provided regarding alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards in writing and science.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide additional information regarding the writing and science assessments.

2.B Set Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives

2.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?

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

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: 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

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

Tally of Peer Responses: 5 Yes, 1 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The panel sees OSPI's transition year plan as acceptable; however, there are features of OSPI's current system that should not be carried over into the new system following the transition year. The panel's technical assistance suggestions identify priority needs.
<i>Strengths</i>	The State provides a detailed methodology for identifying highest-performing and high-progress schools as reward schools (p. 88).
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal does not contain a definition of “highest absolute performance” for purposes of identifying highest-performing schools. • The proposal does not contain a definition of “significant gaps” for purposes of identifying high-progress schools. • Some panel members believe it is a weakness that little weight is given to progress in the proposed system.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create an operational definition of “highest absolute performance” for purposes of identifying highest-performing schools. • Create an operational definition of “significant gaps” for purposes of identifying high-progress schools. • Some panel members believe that, in the new system, progress should be weighted more heavily for purposes of identifying high-progress 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: 1Yes, 5 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The recognition and rewards proposed by OSPI have components likely to be considered meaningful by schools; however, OSPI does not include meaningful methods for sharing best practices (p. 89).
<i>Strengths</i>	OSPI's experience in implementing the multi-faceted Washington Achievement Awards program provides a good starting point for its awards program.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	The current proposed rewards do not include meaningful methods for sharing best practices.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	OSPI should implement its proposal to provide opportunity for higher-performing schools to mentor lower-performing schools as a component of intervention for focus schools.

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: 3 Yes, 3 No***

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	While many of the interventions that OSPI describes are aligned with the turnaround principles, it does not provide sufficient detail on the nature of the interventions or how the OSPI will ensure that the districts and schools implement the interventions in priority schools (pp. 94-100).
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSPI proposes a data-based review of the effectiveness of the current principal and a commitment to retaining only teachers who have the skills and ability to assist in the intervention effort. • OSPI will provide feedback through formative, summative, and benchmark assessments.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSPI's proposal shows an awareness of the turnaround principles, but many of the principles are not addressed in sufficient detail to determine the quality of OSPI's plans. For example, despite a commitment to evaluate the effectiveness of teachers and leaders in priority schools, OSPI does not put forth a concrete plan for how it will achieve this goal and how it will ensure that districts and schools adhere to the general principle. In addition, OSPI does not connect this effort to ongoing efforts described in Principle 3 (teacher and leader evaluation). • Similarly, while it states its commitment to providing data, OSPI does not describe in detail how it will support districts in providing teachers and leaders with timely data to support instruction. • While OSPI commits, in general terms, to providing curriculum, instruction, and assessment aligned to standards, it does not describe how it will leverage the work described in Principle 1 to support priority schools and to ensure that students have access to high-quality curriculum and standards.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a process for ensuring that the plans developed for priority schools include concrete strategies that substantially address the turnaround principles. Specifically address how OSPI will ensure that these principles are being implemented and which party is responsible for implementation (i.e., provide elements of a high-quality plan). Describe OSPI's authority for each turnaround principle.

- 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>	The identified interventions in priority schools will not likely lead to increases in student achievement.
<i>Strengths</i>	Some panel members believe that OSPI has proposed a plan for supporting the development of, and closely monitoring, districts' turnaround plans for priority schools.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal does not contain sufficient evidence that proposed strategies have been effective in the past and will be effective in the future. • Absence of closure, State takeover, or a comparably strong consequence for a priority school's failure to significantly improve student achievement after three years leaves the panel very concerned that neither districts nor the priority schools will implement turnaround strategies with the urgency that the schools' performance demands. The panel is concerned that OSPI has neither the authority nor capacity to implement turnaround principles or to mandate that districts do so.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe OSPI's authority and implementation plan for ensuring that schools implement the turnaround principles. • Mandate closure, State takeover, or a comparably strong consequence for a priority school's failure to significantly improve student achievement after three years.

- 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: 6 Yes, 0 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	OSPI’s proposed timeline ensures 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 (p. 103).
<i>Strengths</i>	The proposal includes a detailed timeline showing when and how priority schools will be selected such that all of them will be implementing the full reform program by 2014-15.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	None.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	None.

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: 0 Yes, 6 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	OSPI’s exit criteria do not adequately ensure that schools that exit priority status have made significant progress in improving student achievement (pp. 103-04).
<i>Strengths</i>	OSPI recognizes the critical role the district plays in supporting or inhibiting performance of its schools.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational meaning of “sufficient progress” with respect to superintendent’s determination of sufficient progress is unclear. • OSPI does not assess a school’s (or its district’s) capacity to sustain improvements following exit. • OSPI does not specifically consider subgroup performance in its exit criteria. • OSPI permits schools to exit priority status if they have met targets for the “all students” category for two out of three (i.e., non-consecutive) years.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set differentiated targets that include leading and lagging indicators that align with the specific needs of and plan for the school. • Consider including subgroup performance in exit criteria.

2.E Focus Schools

Note to Peers: Staff will review 2.E.i

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: 6 Yes, 0 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	OSPI’s method for identifying focus schools complies with the definition set forth in the ESEA Flexibility document (p. 104).
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To identify focus schools, OSPI intends to apply the criteria required for identifying Persistently Lowest-Achieving (PLA) schools to individual subgroups based on magnitude by which they missed their AMOs. • OSPI is reducing its minimum subgroup size from 30 to 20 students. • OSPI is including additional, non-required subgroups (e.g., Pacific Islanders).
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	None.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	When developing the new index, ensure that there is alignment between the proposed method for identifying focus schools and index implementation in order to ensure maximum school attention to the factors of the index.

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: 3 Yes, 3 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	While OSPI has created an ambitious timeline for focus schools and describes some elements of an aligned approach to monitoring, many members of the panel are not confident that steps described will truly result in improving the performance of students and reducing achievement gaps (pp. 105-08).
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSPI's plans include a series of needs assessments at the school and district levels, and a variety of actions including the development of improvement plans, 90-day action plans, State monitoring and on-site coaching, and web-based resources. • The proposal demonstrates awareness of the research literature on school reform, a literature to which the OSPI staff has contributed. • OSPI provides nice examples of the alignment between findings of needs assessment and implementation of interventions.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On-site coaching appears to be directed to schools without an explicit link to district staff and therefore runs the risk of not being aligned with district supports. • OSPI provides insufficient evidence of the effectiveness of proposed interventions. • OSPI appears to lack sufficient authority to require that school plans include strategies most likely to improve academic performance for students, including for student subgroups.

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link coaching to district staff to ensure alignment with district supports. • Provide additional data, evidence, and past institutional learning on why the proposed interventions are likely to be effective.

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: 1 Yes, 5 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	OSPI’s exit criteria are not likely to ensure that focus schools have made significant progress (p. 108).
<i>Strengths</i>	None.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational meaning of “sufficient progress” with respect to superintendent’s determination of sufficient progress is unclear. • OSPI does not assess a school’s (or its district’s) capacity to sustain improvements following exit. • OSPI permits schools to exit focus status if they have met subgroup targets for two out of three (i.e., non-consecutive) years.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Set differentiated targets that include leading and lagging indicators that align with the specific needs of and plan for the school.

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: 6 Yes, 0 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	OSPI’s differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system provides incentives and supports for other Title I schools that are likely to improve student achievement and narrow achievement gaps (pp. 111-17).
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSPI plans to identify other needy schools and tailor services to them as set forth in the Washington Performance Management Framework and the Washington Improvement and Implementation Network (WIIN). • System for school improvement and assistance demonstrates organizational learning. • Schools on the cusp of being designated as priority or focus schools are identified as consistently low-achieving schools and will receive more intensive assistance. • OSPI has a well-developed array of web-based and other resources to address the needs of other Title I schools.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	None.
<i>Technical assistance suggestions</i>	Ensure that districts and schools have sufficient incentives to address the needs of subgroups with urgency.

- 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: 5 Yes, 1 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The incentives and supports are likely to improve student achievement, close achievement gaps, and increase the quality of instruction for all students, including English Learners and students with disabilities.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSPI's plans include giving recognition to schools beyond reward schools. • OSPI will also provide a variety of professional development modules through the WIIN. • OSPI provides innovative training and support to educators (for example, WIIN training on incorporating academic learning standards into individualized education plans (IEPs), use of Innovation Zones).
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	With the exception of a promising example mentioned in Principle 3 regarding serving English Learners (<i>i.e.</i> ,GLAD training), the proposal makes little mention of efforts to help schools improve their programs and services for English learners.
<i>Technical assistance suggestion</i>	Provide additional information about the incentives and supports that will help schools improve their programs and services for English learners.

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: 2 Yes, 4 No***

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
Rationale	OSPI's process for building SEA, district, and school capacity to improve learning in all schools has some strong points, but is unlikely to succeed in improving capacity (p. 119).
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSPI will hold districts and schools accountable in a variety of ways, including through action plans, State liaisons, and on-site monitoring. • The 90-day benchmarks will help districts monitor and evaluate progress toward meeting identified goals. • State liaisons are assigned to each priority and focus school, and engage with district as well as school staff.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was very little information on how OSPI will train district staff to perform their crucial role. • OSPI has little authority to ensure that school improvement plans are rigorous and relevant. • The peers do not see evidence of deliberate action by OSPI to coordinate and integrate across the agency the activities under the respective principles.
Technical assistance suggestions	Secure adequate authority so that OSPI is able to ensure that school improvement plans are rigorous and relevant.

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: 0 Yes, 6 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	OSPI’s plan for developing and implementing a system of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support is not likely to improve student achievement, close achievement gaps, and improve the quality of instruction for students.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSPI will hold districts and schools accountable in a variety of ways, including through action plans, State liaisons, and on-site monitoring. • OSPI utilizes several innovative methods of providing professional development.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSPI has not provided an explicit link between the CCSS resources it will provide (as in Principle 1), its support for intervention implementation in schools (as in this Principle), and its support for educator evaluation systems (in Principle 3). As a result, schools may well be overwhelmed by competing initiatives. • There is inadequate consideration of issues related to English Learners and students with disabilities (e.g., accommodations, interventions, universal design, etc.)
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate, integrate, and streamline implementation support strategies and services across the principles. • In finalizing the index, ensure that schools and districts have sufficient incentive to address the needs of subgroups. • Secure adequate authority so that OSPI is able to ensure that school improvement plans are rigorous and relevant.

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: 0 Yes, 6 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Currently there are significant statutory obstacles that prevent OSPI from fully meeting requirements for educator evaluation systems under ESEA Flexibility Principle 3. OSPI is exercising the authority it has effectively by moving forward with development of the models called for in Washington law. Its addendum asserts that there is legislative intent to require all districts to use student growth data and to give OSPI authority to review district systems (Addendum). Legislative action will be needed to achieve both requirements.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Washington State Teacher and Principal Evaluation System (WSTPES) is built around six core principles that are focused on professional growth and accountability for student learning. • OSPI created the Teacher and Principal Evaluation Project (TPEP) Steering Committee to oversee and monitor the policy direction and decisions of the TPEP pilot. • TPEP pilot districts already comply with many areas of the new law to identify measures of effective teaching and leading.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current Washington law (ESSB 5895) mandates that student growth data be used as a factor in educator evaluations; however, it does not mandate that such data be used as a significant factor as required by ESEA Flexibility. Further, the law allows for use of State assessment data but does not require it. • Current Washington law requires that experienced educators be evaluated comprehensively only once every four years. This is a barrier to OSPI’s developing evaluation guidelines that meet ESEA Flexibility requirements.

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	OSPI should secure passage of legislation that mandates (1) use by school districts of multiple measures of student growth, including district assessments and, when available, State assessments that measure growth, as a significant factor in educator evaluations; and (2) more frequent evaluation of educators.

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>	OSPI describes a process that has and continues to engage key educator stakeholders deeply.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By law, teachers and principals are represented in the development of the State’s educator evaluation models. • OSPI contracted with the American Institutes for Research (AIR) to conduct surveys and focus groups with educators both in and out of the evaluation pilot districts in order to gather feedback and inform development of the State’s guidelines.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	None.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	None.

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 Peer 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: 0 Yes, 6 No***

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The panel is not convinced that this request outlines an adequate plan for ensuring that each district develops, adopts, pilots, and implements evaluation and support systems consistent with the State's guidelines.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSPI's extensive engagement with leadership of organizations representing teachers and administrators will increase the likelihood of local stakeholder commitment later on. • Pilot districts will produce information (through the Teacher and Principal Evaluation Project) that is critical for OSPI to develop models that stakeholders at the local level can trust. • Consensus around key aspects of a comprehensive educator evaluation framework, including rubrics, standards, four levels of performance, and multiple measures, lays the foundation for effective implementation at the local level.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSPI appears not to have authority to monitor district implementation and ensure evaluation systems meet State guidelines (and ESEA Flexibility requirements). • Ambitious statutory timelines for local implementation of evaluation systems following legislative action (i.e., implementation by SY 2013-2014) may hinder effective implementation of those systems. • There is a mismatch in timelines for OSPI's guidelines, TPEP recommendations, and legislative action that creates uncertainty about the substance of the final guidelines for district implementation.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSPI should consider seeking a one-year delay of the statutory local implementation requirement in order to afford more time for planning and development of resources and tools to guide effective implementation. • OSPI should seek sufficient authority to monitor district implementation and ensure that district evaluation systems meet State guidelines.

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 is 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: 0 Yes, 6 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Because there are currently significant statutory obstacles that prevent the SEA from fully meeting requirements for educator evaluation systems under ESEA Flexibility Principle 3, the SEA’s plan for developing and implementing teacher and principal evaluation and support systems with the district is only somewhat comprehensive and coherent. The statutory obstacles create uncertainty about the substance of the final guidelines for district implementation.

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSTPES is built around six core principles that are focused on professional growth and accountability for student learning. • OSPI created the Teacher and Principal Evaluation Project (TPEP) Steering Committee to oversee and monitor the policy direction and decisions of the TPEP pilot. • TPEP pilots already comply with many areas of the new law to identify measures of effective teaching and leading. • By law, teachers and principals were represented in the development of the State’s educator evaluation models. • OSPI contracted with AIR to conduct surveys and focus groups with educators both in and out of the evaluation pilot districts in order to gather feedback and inform development of OSPI’s guidelines. • Extensive engagement with State leadership for teachers and administrators will increase the likelihood of local stakeholder commitment later on. • Pilot districts will produce information (through the Teacher and Principal Evaluation Project) that is critical for OSPI to develop models that stakeholders at the local level can trust. • Consensus around key aspects of a comprehensive educator evaluation framework, including rubrics, standards, four levels of performance, and multiple measures, lay the foundation for effective implementation at the local level.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current Washington law (ESSB 5895) mandates that student growth data be used as a factor in educator evaluations; however, it does not mandate that such data be used as a significant factor as required by ESEA Flexibility. Further, the law allows for use of State assessment data but not does not require it. • Current Washington law requires that experienced educators be evaluated comprehensively only once every four years. This is a barrier to OSPI’s developing evaluation guidelines that meet ESEA Flexibility requirements. • OSPI appears not to have authority to monitor district implementation and ensure evaluation systems meet State guidelines (and ESEA Flexibility requirements). • Ambitious statutory timelines for local implementation of evaluation systems following legislative action (i.e., implementation by SY 2013-2014) may compromise effective implementation of those systems. • There is a mismatch in timelines for OSPI’s guidelines, TPEP recommendations, and legislative action that creates uncertainty about the substance of the final guidelines for district implementation.

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secure passage of legislation that mandates: (1) use by school districts of multiple measures of student growth, including district assessments and, when available, State assessments that measure growth, as a significant factor in educator evaluations; and (2) more frequent evaluation of educators. • Consider seeking a one-year delay of the statutory local implementation requirement in order to afford more time for planning and development of resources and tools to guide effective implementation. • Seek sufficient authority to monitor district implementation and ensure that systems meet OSPI guidelines.

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>	<p>The ESEA flexibility application submitted by Washington State provides some evidence of a comprehensive and coherent approach for implementing the waivers and principles in its request for flexibility, but the peers agreed that the overall approach is not developed enough yet to increase the quality of instruction for students and improve student achievement.</p> <p>Principle 1: OSPI has presented a strong proposal in many respects, but the lack of sufficient detail in its plan for implementation support leaves the panel unsure that it is realistic and of high quality.</p> <p>Principle 2: OSPI's transition plan for developing and implementing a system of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support is acceptable for one year; however, OSPI is encouraged to strengthen the system as it moves forward developing a new system to help ensure that the new system will student achievement, close achievement gaps, and improve the quality of instruction for students.</p> <p>Principle 3: OSPI's plan for developing and implementing teacher and principal evaluation and support systems with LEAs is somewhat comprehensive and coherent. Currently, there are significant statutory obstacles that prevent the State from fully meeting requirements for educator evaluation systems under ESEA Flexibility Principle 3. This creates uncertainty about the substance of the final guidelines for district implementation.</p>

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Principle 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Given local control, OSPI has a realistic strategy involving knitting together diverse stakeholders into a coherent delivery system for Common Core implementation. ● OSPI envisions a differentiated implementation support system for its 295 districts, some of which are large and have substantial capacity of their own, while others are small and must rely heavily on regional educational service districts for support. ● The four core strategies proposed for establishing a support system for district collaboration are promising: Network Pilot Project Grants, Content Specialist Professional Learning, Curriculum Leader Collaboratives, and Professional Learning Association Collaboration. ● OSPI’s inclusion of interim assessments and formative tools in assessment plan provides needed resources to districts and schools. <p>Principle 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● OSPI will hold districts and schools accountable in a variety of ways-- including the action plans, state liaisons, and on-site monitoring. ● OSPI utilizes several innovation methods of providing professional development. <p>Principle 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Washington State Teacher and Principal Evaluation System (WSTPES) is built around six core principles that are focused on professional growth and accountability for student learning. ● OSPI created the Teacher and Principal Evaluation Project (TPEP) Steering Committee to oversee and monitor the policy direction and decisions of the TPEP pilot. ● TPEP pilots already comply with many areas of the new law to identify measures of effective teaching and leading. ● Extensive engagement with State leadership for teachers and administrators will increase the likelihood of local stakeholder commitment later on. ● Pilot districts will produce information (through the TPEP) that is critical for OSPI to develop models that stakeholders at the local level can trust. ● Consensus around key aspects of a comprehensive educator evaluation framework, including rubrics, standards, four levels of performance, and multiple measures, lay the foundation for effective implementation at the local level.

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<p><i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i></p>	<p>Principle 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is insufficient specificity about what OSPI will do to support schools and districts to implement CCSS in ways that will ensure access for English Learners, students with disabilities and low-achieving students. • While the four core strategies for Phase II and III hold promise for building a support system for districts to communicate and learn from one another, there is insufficient detail about their implementation and intended outcomes to draw conclusions about their likely impact. <p>Principle 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSPI has not provided an explicit link between the CCSS resources it will provide (as in Principle 1), its support for intervention implementation in schools (as in this Principle), and its support for educator evaluation systems (in Principle 3). As a result, schools may well be overwhelmed by competing initiatives. • Some elements of a high quality plan are absent (objectives, point people, benchmarks/key milestones, aligned resources). • There is inadequate consideration of issues related to English Learners and students with disabilities (e.g., accommodations, interventions, universal design, etc.) <p>Principle 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current Washington law (ESSB 5895) mandates that student growth data be used as a factor in educator evaluations; however, it does not mandate that such data be used as a significant factor as required by ESEA Flexibility. Further, the law allow for use of district assessment data but does not require it • Current Washington law requires that experienced educators be evaluated comprehensively only once every four years. This is a barrier to OSPI’s developing evaluation guidelines that meet ESEA Flexibility requirements. • OSPI appears not to have authority to monitor district implementation and ensure evaluation systems meet State guidelines (and ESEA Flexibility requirements). • Ambitious statutory timelines for local implementation of evaluation systems following legislative action (i.e., implementation by school year 2013-2014) may compromise effective implementation of those systems. • There is a mismatch in timelines for OSPI’s guidelines, TPEP recommendations, and legislative action that creates uncertainty about the substance of the final guidelines for district implementation.

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSPI should provide a complete plan (i.e., a plan with key milestones, timeline, parties responsible, evidence, resources, and significant obstacles) for the four core activities described on pp. 40-41 that also makes explicit the intended outcomes of each and how they are expected to build both OSPI and district capacity to support effective implementation at the school and classroom level. • Coordinate, integrate, and streamline implementation support strategies and services across the principles. • In finalizing the index, ensure that schools and districts have sufficient incentive to address the needs of subgroups. • Secure passage of legislation that mandates: (1) use by school districts of multiple measures of student growth, including district assessments and, when available, State assessments that measure growth, as a significant factor in educator evaluations; and (2) more frequent evaluation of educators.