

# **ESEA Flexibility**

## **Window 4**

### **Request Review Form**



**State Request:** Wyoming Department of Education (WDE)

**Date:** May 9, 2013

## 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**

**Consultation Question 1 Peer Response**

*Response: (2 Yes or 4 No)*

<p><b>Consultation Question 1</b></p>	<p>Did the SEA meaningfully engage and solicit input on its request from teachers and their representatives?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>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?</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Did the SEA indicate that it modified any aspect of its request based on input from teachers and their representatives?</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Response Component</b></p>	<p><b>Panel Response</b></p>

<b>Consultation Question 1</b>	<p>Did the SEA meaningfully engage and solicit input on its request from teachers and their representatives?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>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?</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Did the SEA indicate that it modified any aspect of its request based on input from teachers and their representatives?</i></li> </ul>
<i>Rationale</i>	While there was some evidence of outreach, it is not clear that it was meaningful across the entire scope of the proposal.
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) posted the waiver information on its website and sent an email to all relevant education groups to solicit input in February, two days prior to the submission. However, WDE solicited input from teachers and their representatives during the last three years while working on its legislation. (p.10)</p> <p>Under Enrolled Act 116 (p. 137), WDE is required by law to engage in outreach activities.</p> <p>When the deadline for submission was moved to a later date, the SEA’s request states that the SEA solicited input from teachers and their representatives via requests for comments. In fact, it states that a part of the request was modified (seeking an optional waiver #12) as a results of teacher feedback (p. 9).</p>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<p>Given that the final decision to apply for ESEA flexibility was made only two days prior to the original submission deadline of February 28, 2013, the feedback from teachers and their representatives regarding the request cannot be considered meaningful. The request provides no evidence of input received from teachers or their representatives (Attachments 2 and 3).</p> <p>WDE did not provide any documentation of input solicited directly from teachers and their representatives, except that teachers are on the Advisory Committee to the Select Committee on Education Accountability.</p>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Although WDE did attempt to solicit meaningful input from teachers on this request, additional opportunities to learn directly from teachers and their representatives and teacher organizations on this request may be gained through focus groups at state and regional sessions either on site or through the use of technology.

**Consultation Question 2 Peer Response***Response: (0 Yes or 6 No)*

<b>Consultation Question 2</b>	<p>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?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>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?</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Did the SEA indicate that it modified any aspect of its request based on stakeholder input?</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Does the input represent feedback from a diverse mix of stakeholders representing various perspectives and interests, including stakeholders from high-need communities?</i></li> </ul>
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	While the SEA conducted some outreach to some diverse communities, it is not clear that outreach occurred to communities representing students with disabilities or English Learners, nor is it clear that the input of relevant stakeholders contributed adequately to the request.
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>WDE solicited input from various educator groups, such as special education directors, title programs, and the University of Wyoming/University Partnership, as well as conducting direct outreach to the State-Tribal Education Partnership (p. 10).</p> <p>WDE provided documentation to demonstrate how the request was modified based on input for waivers #11 (p. 9) and #12, and annual measurable objectives’ (AMOs) calculations (p. 10).</p>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<p>The SEA’s request does not provide sufficient evidence of input received from students, parents, community-based organizations, civil rights organizations, organizations representing students with disabilities and English Learners, business organizations, organizations representing educational leaders and administrators, or Indian tribes.</p> <p>There is no reference to any diverse group outreach except the State-Tribal Education Partnership. The State Advisory Panel for special education is required under federal law for each state and this panel is available to review and comment on any programs which impacts disability populations.</p> <p>It is not clear how many stakeholders had an opportunity to provide feedback, how many actually provided feedback, or from whom the feedback came across the range of stakeholder groups.</p>

<p><b>Consultation Question 2</b></p>	<p>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?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>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?</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Did the SEA indicate that it modified any aspect of its request based on stakeholder input?</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Does the input represent feedback from a diverse mix of stakeholders representing various perspectives and interests, including stakeholders from high-need communities?</i></li> </ul>
<p><i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i></p>	<p>The SEA should consider conducting face-to-face meetings with diverse populations including focus groups, and documenting modifications to the ESEA flexibility request made as a result of such activities.</p>

## 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 Peer Response, Part A Peer Response

*Response: (3 Yes or 3 No)*

<b>1.B Peer Response, Part A</b>	<p><b>Part A:</b> 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?</p> <p><i>Note to Peers: See ESEA Flexibility Review Guidance for additional considerations related to the types of activities an SEA includes in its transition plan.</i></p>
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	WDE has taken initial steps towards the development of a plan to transition to and implement the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) ; however, considerable work remains to address the gaps in its implementation plan, particularly with regard to reaching all teachers and leaders who will be critical to the success of the plan.
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>A crosswalk between the 2008 WDE Content &amp; Performance Standards in math and language arts and the newly adopted CCSS in math and language arts was done in 2010 and again in 2012 (p. 18). WDE indicated that these crosswalks will be used to develop professional development identifying shifts between the 2008 WDE Content &amp; Performance Standards and the CCSS in language arts and math.</p> <p>Access to teacher and parent resources is available on the website. More than half of the districts provide college-level courses via dual or concurrent enrollment as well as AP or IB programs (p. 20).</p> <p>WDE provided a chart describing its CCSS implementation activities including timelines, parties responsible, evidence, resources, and significant obstacles (pp. 14-18).</p>

<p><b>1.B Peer Response, Part A</b></p>	<p><b>Part A:</b> 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?</p> <p><i>Note to Peers: See ESEA Flexibility Review Guidance for additional considerations related to the types of activities an SEA includes in its transition plan.</i></p>
<p><i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i></p>	<p>WDE does not have a specific plan in place between WDE and institutions of higher education (IHEs) related to teacher/principal preparation programs (p. 21). The request indicates that the SEA has assumed that awareness of WDE’s adoption of CCSS is leading to a shift in teacher/principal preparation programs at the university.</p> <p>The roll-out plan appears limited to isolated professional development activities. There is no evidence of sustained implementation support.</p> <p>Clarification is needed for the following statement in the request: “It should be noted that as a local control state, WDE has no authority over curriculum. Those decisions reside at the district level. Therefore, any instructional materials developed for general education, special education, and EL teachers will be related to standards and assessment frameworks, strategies, and alignment. No curriculum will be developed or suggested for implementation. Previous sections have described collaboration efforts between divisions within our agency to develop professional development and outreach opportunities that will serve <i>all</i> students” (p. 20).</p> <p>The SEA’s request lacks details on professional development activities to prepare school administrators to provide educational leadership necessary for a successful implementation of CCSS. In addition, it does not provide evidence of the SEA’s efforts to work with IHEs to prepare incoming teachers to teach to the CCSS.</p>



<p><b>1.B Peer Response, Part A</b></p>	<p><b>Part A:</b> 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?</p> <p><i>Note to Peers: See ESEA Flexibility Review Guidance for additional considerations related to the types of activities an SEA includes in its transition plan.</i></p>
<p><i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i></p>	<p>The SEA should consider taking steps necessary to prepare principals to provide leadership necessary for successful implementation of CCSS. In addition, the SEA should consider working with its IHEs to make changes in the teacher preparation programs to prepare new teacher to teach to CCSS.</p> <p>WDE should conduct ongoing and more meaningful outreach about the purpose and content of the new standards to key stakeholders, including families, IHEs, administrators, and teachers, to be included in the full implementation plan to be developed during the summer of 2013.</p> <p>WDE should develop a means to reach and support all teachers in a large rural state, such as a strong online solution and/or a train-the-trainer model.</p> <p>WDE should build on its strong technology infrastructure and maximize its use in providing supports and information to educators and others throughout implementation.</p>

### 1.B Peer Response, Part B Peer Response

*Response: (0 Yes or 6 No)*

<p><b>1.B Peer Response, Part B</b></p>	<p><b>Part B:</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?</p>
<p><b>Response Component</b></p>	<p><b>Panel Response</b></p>
<p><i>Rationale</i></p>	<p>Though WDE has plans to conduct activities and professional development for the teachers of students with disabilities and English Learners, these plans were of a general nature with no specificity of dates and activities and how all these teachers would be reached. In addition, there were no plans to address the transition to CCSS for teachers of low-achieving students in order to ensure that these students will be able to make the gains required under the new more rigorous standards.</p>

<p><b>1.B Peer Response, Part B</b></p>	<p><b>Part B:</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?</p>
<p><i>Strengths</i></p>	<p>WDE is a part of the World-Class Design and Assessment (WIDA) consortium. WDE’s English Language Development Standards correspond to the CCSS (p. 19).</p> <p>The Standards and Assessment division meets with the Special Education team and English Learners team at least once a month to develop professional development that specifically addresses students with disabilities, English Learners, and other at-risk students and is designed to help all educators (including general education teachers) to support these students in accessing the CCSS within the same timeframe as general education students (p. 20).</p> <p>WIDA and the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) may be used to provide additional professional development for special educators and teachers of English Learners (p. 20).</p>

<p><b>1.B Peer Response, Part B</b></p>	<p><b>Part B:</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?</p>
<p><i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i></p>	<p>Although there is a statement that the Standards and Assessment division is working with the Special Education team and the English Learners team to develop additional outreach opportunities as the professional development planning process is being developed, teachers are merely invited and “encouraged” to attend the existing outreach activities (p. 19). It is not clear why the English Learner and students with disabilities communities were not formal participants in the process.</p> <p>The SPDG is used to provide professional development but there is a statement that “It is anticipated that the needs assessment may identify achievement gaps between students with disabilities and general education students with regard to the CCSS and, in this event, professional development will be designed...” (p. 20). It is unclear if the SEA has utilized available achievement gap data to identify the areas of need for professional development.</p> <p>WDE did not identify specific outreach with the State-Tribal Education Partnership with regard to professional development to support the implementation of CCSS.</p> <p>Though WDE noted some activities planned for addressing access to the CCSS for students with disabilities and English Learners, none of these had been completed. These activities are planned to begin during the fall of the 2013–2014 school year, which is not sufficiently timely. Although much of the work appears to have been conducted within WDE, inadequate timelines and insufficient professional development are planned for how all teachers of students with disabilities and English Learners would be provided the tools to assist in instruction on the CCSS for their students.</p> <p>WDE did not address low-achieving students and activities to assist teachers in those students’ access to CCSS.</p>

<p><b>1.B Peer Response, Part B</b></p>	<p><b>Part B:</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?</p>
<p><i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i></p>	<p>WDE should review the annual performance report for special education to analyze the data on achievement gaps and determine priorities for professional development.</p> <p>WDE should consider providing professional development opportunities to the teachers of English Learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students during the summer of 2013, before the planned full implementation of CCSS during the 2013–2014 school year.</p>

**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.*

**1.C, Option B Peer Response**

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

Response: (Yes or No)

<b>1.C, Option B</b>	<b>If the SEA selected Option B:</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 and 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?
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	N/A
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	N/A
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	N/A

## Principle 1 Overall Review

### Principle 1 Overall Review Peer Response

Response: (0 Yes and 6 No)

<b>Principle 1 Overall Review</b>	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?
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	<p>WDE provided limited information on activities, timelines, responsibilities and evidence related to the transition to the CCSS (pp. 14-18).</p> <p>WDE’s plan includes some appropriate activities with plans for professional development in the initial stages. More details should be provided, especially in terms of how the needs of special populations will be addressed.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>WDE provided a chart describing its CCSS’ implementation activities, including timelines, parties responsible, evidence, resources, and significant obstacles (pp. 14-18).</p> <p>WDE’s Standards website has CCSS resources for educators, community members and parents (p. 20).</p> <p>Dual enrollment courses and AP and IB courses are offered in over half of the state’s LEAs, which indicate a commitment to quality and rigor for a large number of students.</p> <p>WDE conducted a gap analysis between its existing WDE standards and the CCSS.</p>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<p>WDE did not provide sufficient information regarding how it will ensure all teachers, including those of students with disabilities, English Learners and low-achieving students, would have timely and sustained professional development and materials to assist in the transition to the CCSS.</p> <p>There does not appear to be any formal coordination with the IHEs and personnel preparation programs.</p>

<p><b>Principle 1 Overall Review</b></p>	<p>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?</p>
	<p>WDE’s request lacks specificity on how professional development and materials for use in the transition to the CCSS will be provided for all teachers.</p> <p>The SEA’s request states that it assumes that there will be a shift in teacher-preparation programs simply because the University of Wyoming is aware of the state’s shift to CCSS (p. 21).</p>
<p><i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i></p>	<p>The SEA should take a more hands-on role to ensure that teacher and leader preparation programs across the State take steps to prepare teachers and leaders for the many changes that will be required as a result of the adoption of new standards.</p> <p>The SEA should consider preparing model instructional materials for teachers of English Learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students.</p> <p>The SEA needs to develop a cohesive and long-term implementation plan to support professional development for teachers and leaders that ensures that teachers can provide instructional activities necessary for students to learn to the CCSS and for leaders to provide necessary instructional support.</p>

**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 Peer Response**

*Response: (0 Yes or 6 No)*

<b>2.A.i</b>	Did the SEA propose a differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system, and a high-quality plan to implement this system no later than the 2013–2014 school year, that is likely to improve student achievement and school performance, close achievement gaps, and increase the quality of instruction for students? ( <i><b>note to Peers, please write to this question after completing 2.A.i.a and 2.A.i.b</b></i> )
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	<p>Since the proposed system is still under development, it is too early to determine whether it can accomplish the goals of improved student achievement, closing achievement gaps, and increasing the quality of instruction.</p> <p>The SEA does propose a differentiated recognition, accountability and support system that has the potential to reach the goals outlined above. It plans to field test the system in 2013–2014 with a transitional plan and bring it to scale the following year.</p> <p>The index weightings for each component and for sub-components within them have not been set. Hence, the possibility remains that the actual weightings could undercut some of the power and potential of the proposed system, in particular with regards to subgroup improvement and graduation rate accountability.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The accountability plan proposed provides an index system that takes into account achievement, growth, equity, and readiness. A support system was outlined, which described assistance and interventions appropriate for the different levels of students.</p> <p>The different elements of the accountability system — achievement, growth, equity, and readiness — in concert, have the potential to propel school improvement.</p>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<p>The request suggests that there are several areas of the accountability plan to be developed, including assigning point values in the index. For example, graduation rate will be measured using a graduation rate index that is applied at the student level. The Professional Judgment Panel will assign the actual point values for the index (p. 37).</p>



<b>2.A.i</b>	Did the SEA propose a differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system, and a high-quality plan to implement this system no later than the 2013–2014 school year, that is likely to improve student achievement and school performance, close achievement gaps, and increase the quality of instruction for students? <b><i>(note to Peers, please write to this question after completing 2.A.i.a and 2.A.i.b)</i></b>
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
	Without knowing the actual point values for the index, it is difficult to make a determination of how likely it is to improve student achievement and increase graduation rates. The number of points assigned in the criteria for the graduation rate index (p. 37) would make a difference in the emphasis on graduation in four years.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	WDE should ensure that the weightings given to different components of the index place a high value on closing ESEA subgroup achievement gaps and raising graduation rates of all students. WDE should consider setting minimum progress goals for graduation rate improvement that, if a school does not meet, bear a significant impact on the school’s ability to meet its overall accountability goals.

**2.A.i.a Peer Response**

*Response: (3 Yes or 3 No)*

<b>2.A.i.a</b>	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?
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>

<b>2.A.i.a</b>	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?
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	Though implementation of WDE’s Accountability in Education Act (WAEA) is still in the early stages, WDE presented an interim accountability plan that addresses the requirements of ESEA flexibility for implementation in 2013–2014. The proposed new accountability plan is still under development, and the details in the request do not sufficiently address critical details such as graduation rates and subgroup accountability.
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The WDE flexibility request proposes a single accountability system that is already under development through the WAEA, WS § 21-2-204 (p. 24).</p> <p>WDE’s accountability plan for 2013-2014 is based on student achievement in four subjects, graduation rates, and school performance and progress over time, including the performance and progress of all subgroups.</p> <p>WDE described a system of support to address areas identified through the application of the accountability index ratings (p. 40).</p> <p>WDE provided descriptions of how the accountability ratings would be made for schools of different grade configurations (pp. 31-32).</p> <p>WDE plans to use only the reading and mathematics proficiency scores in accountability determinations for 2013-2014 and pilot the new accountability system for implementation in 2014–2015 (p. 44). Science and writing will be used in the 2014-2015 year as part of the accountability system (p. 31).</p> <p>Using Grade 9 credits as a part of the readiness indicator can encourage schools to emphasize the importance of gaining credits in this grade to be on target for graduation and may help increase the graduation rates.</p> <p>The sub-indicators, both leading and lagging, used for readiness encourage college- and career-readiness (p. 34).</p>

<p><b>2.A.i.a</b></p>	<p>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?</p>
<p><b>Response Component</b></p>	<p><b>Panel Response</b></p>
<p><i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i></p>	<p>The graduation rate index is problematic in that it may put insufficient emphasis on graduating students in four years with a regular diploma. Although the final weightings for the determination of the graduation rate index are to be determined, an example (p. 37) lists categories of students for which points are to be earned for diplomas earned in more than four years, certificates of completion, and continued enrollment. These are not incentives to increase the rate for graduating in four years with a regular diploma.</p> <p>It is unclear how the position of a school within the decision table for assigning school performance levels will determine the final school performance level (p. 39).</p> <p>The selection process for and responsibilities of the Professional Judgment Panel are not adequately described, beyond the current legislation.</p> <p>WDE did not include a plan and timeline for piloting the new accountability system in which many decisions on the index would need to be made, such as weightings for the graduation index and readiness sub-indicators. The plan may include the makeup of the Professional Judgment Panel and data that would be generated to assist the panel.</p> <p>High schools that serve students in grades 9 through 12 do not have measures that permit the measurement of individual student growth (p. 33).</p>
<p><i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i></p>	<p>WDE should ensure that the Professional Judgment Panel includes representatives of students with disabilities, English Learners, and low-achieving students. Additionally, the SEA should provide more descriptive information regarding the selection process, responsibilities and expectations of the panel.</p> <p>WDE should address the graduation rate index so that greater emphasis is put on graduating students with a regular diploma in four years.</p>

<b>2.A.i.a</b>	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?
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
	WDE should consider how the “end users” of its accountability system, including teachers, parents, etc., will understand the overall accountability system and how it will be used to identify areas for improvement in their schools.

**2.A.i.b Peer Response***Response: (0 Yes or 6 No)*

<b>2.A.i.b</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?
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	It is not clear whether the proposed system will lead to improvements in the performance of all ESEA subgroups. Specific supports for ESEA subgroups were not described.
<i>Strengths</i>	WDE’s index took into account the size of schools and subgroups. Methodologies were identified to include more schools and students in rural areas. For example, instead of using within-school gaps, the average for each subgroup will be compared to the average for the “all students” group at the state level to determine the achievement gap for each subgroup (p. 57). WDE provided a rationale for this methodology that more subgroup comparisons could be made using this methodology.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<p>The request does not indicate that graduation rates by subgroups would be used in the accountability system.</p> <p>Specific supports for English Learners and students with disabilities were not included.</p> <p>For “other Title I schools,” WDE indicates that “narrowing achievement gaps” is required; however, WDE has not defined what that means (p. 74).</p> <p>It is not clear whether the proposed system will lead to improvements in the performance of all ESEA subgroups.</p>

<b>2.A.i.b</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?
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	WDE should provide clarity as to how the proposed system will lead to improvements in the performance of all ESEA subgroups.

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

**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?

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 question in section 2.A.ii below. If the SEA does not include other assessments (Option A), go to section 2.B.

**2.A.ii., Option B Peer Response**

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

*Response: (6 Yes or 0 No)*

<b>2.A.ii., Option B</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?
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	WDE provided information regarding the relative weightings of proficiency scores for subjects in addition to reading and mathematics.
<i>Strengths</i>	WDE plans to use only reading and mathematics in its accountability system for the 2013–2014 school year and to pilot the new accountability system for implementation in 2014–2015 (p. 44). Science and writing will be used in the 2014–2015 year, but they will not be emphasized as much as reading and mathematics since they are not administered in every grade (p. 31).
<i>Weaknesses, issues,</i>	Specific cut scores for determining levels of performance within the indicators have not been determined

<b>2.A.ii., Option B</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?
<i>lack of clarity</i>	(p. 45).
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	None.

Note to Peers: Staff will review 2.A.ii.a and 2.A.ii.c (Option B)

**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,** review and respond to the following peer question:

**2.B, Option C Peer Response**

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

*Response: (Yes or No)*

<b>2.B, Option C</b>	<p>Did the SEA describe another method that is educationally sound and results in ambitious but achievable AMOs for all LEAs, schools, and subgroups?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Did the SEA provide the new AMOs and the method used to set these AMOs?</li> <li>ii. Did the SEA provide an educationally sound rationale for the pattern of academic progress reflected in the new AMOs?</li> <li>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?</li> <li>iv. Did the SEA attach a copy of the average statewide proficiency based on assessments administered in the 2011–2012 school year in reading/language arts and mathematics for the “all students” group and all subgroups? (Attachment 8)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>Are these AMOs similarly ambitious to the AMOs that would result from using Option A or B above?</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Are these AMOs ambitious but achievable given the State’s existing proficiency rates and any other relevant circumstances in the State?</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Will these AMOs result in a significant number of children being on track to be college- and career-ready?</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>



<p><b>2.B, Option C</b></p>	<p>Did the SEA describe another method that is educationally sound and results in ambitious but achievable AMOs for all LEAs, schools, and subgroups?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Did the SEA provide the new AMOs and the method used to set these AMOs?</li> <li>ii. Did the SEA provide an educationally sound rationale for the pattern of academic progress reflected in the new AMOs?</li> <li>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?</li> <li>iv. Did the SEA attach a copy of the average statewide proficiency based on assessments administered in the 2011–2012 school year in reading/language arts and mathematics for the “all students” group and all subgroups? (Attachment 8) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>Are these AMOs similarly ambitious to the AMOs that would result from using Option A or B above?</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Are these AMOs ambitious but achievable given the State’s existing proficiency rates and any other relevant circumstances in the State?</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Will these AMOs result in a significant number of children being on track to be college- and career-ready?</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><i>Rationale</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><i>Strengths</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>

**2.C Reward Schools**

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

**2.C.i Peer Response**

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

*Response: (6 Yes or 0 No)*

<b>2.C.i</b>	<p>Did the SEA describe its methodology for identifying highest-performing and high-progress schools as reward schools? If the SEA’s methodology is not based on the definition of reward schools in <i>ESEA Flexibility</i> (but is instead, <i>e.g.</i>, 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?</p> <p>a. Is the SEA’s methodology for identifying reward schools educationally sound and likely to result in the meaningful identification of the highest-performing and high-progress schools?</p>
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>

<b>2.C.i</b>	<p>Did the SEA describe its methodology for identifying highest-performing and high-progress schools as reward schools? If the SEA’s methodology is not based on the definition of reward schools in <i>ESEA Flexibility</i> (but is instead, <i>e.g.</i>, 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?</p> <p>a. Is the SEA’s methodology for identifying reward schools educationally sound and likely to result in the meaningful identification of the highest-performing and high-progress schools?</p>
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	The SEA does propose an educationally sound methodology that is likely to result in identification of high-performing and high-progress schools.
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The methodology for identification of rewards schools was sound. Both high-performing and high-progress schools will be identified:</p> <p>WDE will use the achievement ranking of the “all students” subgroup and all subgroups as compared to the State average of the “all students” subgroup to identify high-performing schools. Schools that are ranked among the top ten (10) percent of Title I schools may be included in the group of reward schools. These schools will be cross-referenced with the distribution tables used in the achievement gap analysis to ensure that there are no significant achievement gaps across subgroups that are not closing (p. 58).</p> <p>Achievement gap analysis will be used to determine high-progress reward schools. The “all students” subgroup distribution table will be examined to determine which Title I schools are in the high-achieving area and have made high-progress as well. Those Title I schools that fall in the lower-right cells (most positive gap – most positive progress) may be included in the high-progress reward school category. These schools will be cross-referenced with the frequency tables used in the achievement gap analysis to ensure that there are no significant achievement gaps across subgroups that are not closing (p. 58).</p>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	It is unclear how the SEA will include students that have not attended schools for a full academic year in the accountability system with regard to proficiency determinations, such as those used for the determination of rewards schools.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	None.

**2.C.iii Peer Response**

Response: (4 Yes or 2 No)

<b>2.C.iii</b>	<p>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?</p> <p>➤ <i>Has the SEA consulted with LEAs and schools in designing its recognition and, where applicable, rewards?</i></p>
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	The rewards for high-performing schools appear appropriate.
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Reward schools receive award letters, memorandum to superintendents, press releases, postings on the SEA’s website, and certificates and plaques (p. 60).</p> <p>Schools in the “Exceeds Expectation” category will document their effective practices and communicate them to other schools (p. 60).</p> <p>The SEA provides monetary support for those schools selected to present at the Title I conference as a “distinguished” school (p. 60).</p>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	The recognition and awards are those that have been done in the past and it is not clear whether the SEA consulted with LEAs in their design.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	The SEA should consult with LEAs and schools regarding what rewards and recognitions would be considered meaningful (e.g., visits by senior state officials such as the state Chief, Governor, etc.; special professional development opportunities; or other financial awards).

## 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 Peer Response**

*Response: (6 Yes or 0 No)*

<b>2.D.iii</b>	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 components noted above (i.-vii.)??
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>

<b>2.D.iii</b>	<p>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?</p> <p>a. Do the SEA’s interventions include all components noted above (i.-vii.)??</p>
<i>Rationale</i>	<p>The interventions the SEA details are aligned with the turnaround principles and if implemented well are likely to result in significant improvements in priority schools</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Priority schools must conduct a self-assessment based on <i>The High Performing School-Benchmarking the 10 Indicators of Effectiveness</i>.</p> <p>WDE’s request asserts that priority schools will implement all turnaround principles(p. 64).</p> <p>A School Evaluation Team will be assigned to each priority school (and a coach for 2014-2015)(p. 64).</p> <p>An on-line tracking system will be used to monitor implementation progress.</p> <p>WDE reviews the completed needs assessments, goals, and evaluations and provides feedback (p. 64).</p> <p>WDE provided a projected timeline for implementation (p. 65).</p>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<p>The degree to which the improvement system will work will depend heavily on the skills and insights of the coaches and liaisons. No information is provided on the caseloads of the coaches.</p> <p>There is no discussion of what happens to priority schools that do not improve under this system.</p> <p>Given that the SEA required all schools, except those identified as “Exceed Expectations,” to conduct a self-assessment in the past, it’s not clear how the SEA will ensure that the required self-assessment will be of high quality.</p>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<p>WDE should review past needs assessments and coaching activities that led to success for students and incorporate into ongoing planning.</p>

## 2.D.iii.b Peer Response

Response: (0 Yes or 6 No )

<b>2.D.iii.b</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?
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	If WDE follows through with its plans to align interventions and monitoring to the turnaround principles, the above outcomes are likely to improve, but interventions are not described in enough detail.  Basic structure of the intervention system is sound (a needs assessment leading to a tailored implementation plan supported by external technical assistance and review); however, beyond stating WDE will apply the turnaround principles and monitor implementation through Indistar, little detail is provided on how the system will work to specifically improve instruction, the effectiveness of teachers and leaders, and the achievement and graduation rates of all students.
<i>Strengths</i>	WDE’s interventions, as presented, are aligned with the turnaround principles.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	WDE did not discuss specific interventions that would be used for low graduation rates or increasing student achievement for English Learners, students with disabilities, and the lowest-achieving students.  There seems to be a lack of provision of tools or training directed to specific interventions. This leaves the school, LEA, and coach to carry out the reform effort based on their own background and training, which might not have involved school turnaround work.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	The SEA should provide the types of interventions that would be implemented for improving graduation rates and increasing student achievement for subgroups. For example, graduation coaches could be placed in schools.  WDE might build a suite of tools and training that can build LEA, principal, and coach capacity to successfully implement effective turnaround strategies.

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

**2.D.iv Peer Response***Response: (6 Yes or 0 No )*

<b>2.D.iv</b>	<p>Does the SEA’s proposed timeline ensure that LEAs that have one or more priority schools will implement interventions in each priority school no later than the 2014–2015 school year?</p> <p>➤ <i>Does the SEA’s proposed timeline distribute priority schools’ implementation of interventions in a balanced way, such that there is not a concentration of these schools in the later years of the timeline?</i></p>
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	WDE’s timeline indicates that interventions aligned with all turnaround principles would occur in 2013–2014 in all priority schools.
<i>Strengths</i>	WDE’s request indicates full implementation of interventions in all priority schools in 2013–2014, which is one year ahead of the required schedule. They have a small number of schools.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	None.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	None.

**2.D.v Peer Response***Response: (0 Yes or 6 No )*

<b>2.D.v</b>	<p>Did the SEA provide criteria to determine when a school that is making significant progress in improving student achievement exits priority status?</p> <p>a. Do the SEA’s criteria ensure that schools that exit priority status have made significant progress in improving student achievement?</p> <p>➤ <i>Is the level of progress required by the criteria to exit priority status likely to result in sustained improvement in these schools?</i></p>
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>



<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2.D.v</b></p>	<p>Did the SEA provide criteria to determine when a school that is making significant progress in improving student achievement exits priority status?</p> <p>a. Do the SEA’s criteria ensure that schools that exit priority status have made significant progress in improving student achievement?</p> <p>➤ <i>Is the level of progress required by the criteria to exit priority status likely to result in sustained improvement in these schools?</i></p>
<p><b>Response Component</b></p>	<p><b>Panel Response</b></p>
<p><i>Rationale</i></p>	<p>The SEA provides exit criteria but it does not ensure that exiting schools make significant progress that will be sustained.</p>
<p><i>Strengths</i></p>	<p>WDE has identified specific criteria that schools must meet to exit priority status.</p> <p>WDE provided a description of possible consequences for priority schools that fail to improve (p. 77).</p>
<p><i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i></p>	<p>Schools only have to move a fraction above the cut point which identifies a school as a priority school to exit priority status. This might mean it moves from among the lowest-performing schools to just barely above the lowest-performing schools. For example, a school could be identified as a priority school because its graduation rate is 59% and then exit priority status if its graduation rate increases to 61%, representing at best a very small level of improvement that could be achieved without any significant and long-lasting changes in practice.</p> <p>Elementary and middle schools have only a single criterion for exiting priority status.</p>
<p><i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i></p>	<p>The SEA should consider establishing more stringent criteria for exiting from priority status. In addition, the SEA should consider requiring any successful interventions in priority schools to continue for a longer period to ensure continuous improvement.</p> <p>The SEA should consider an additional criterion for elementary and middle schools to exit priority status.</p> <p>For high schools, it is recommended that exit criteria include both increasing the graduation rate and remaining out of the lowest-achieving 5% of schools for two consecutive years (p. 66).</p>

**2.E Focus Schools****2.E.i Peer Response***Response: (0 Yes or 6 No)*

<b>2.E.i</b>	<p>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 <i>ESEA Flexibility</i> (but is instead, <i>e.g.</i>, 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?</p> <p>a. <i>Note to Peers: Staff will review 2.E.i.a.</i></p> <p>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?</p>
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	Although the SEA has indicated it will identify 10% of Title I schools as focus schools, more clarity is needed on the methodology for the identification of focus schools
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>WDE uses a performance-gap and progress frequency distribution in identification of focus schools. Both achievement gap status and progress towards closing gaps over two years are used (pp. 57-58, 67).</p> <p>WDE uses performance of the “all students” group at the State level as a basis of comparison with school subgroup performance for identifying focus schools.</p>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<p>While the SEA has identified eight schools as focus schools based on subgroup performance, the methodology presented on page 67 is the same methodology as that used for identifying priority schools and therefore does not guarantee that focus schools will be identified based on subgroup performance gaps in the future.</p> <p>It is not clear whether using “all students” at the school level as a subgroup for focus school determinations meets the requirements of ESEA flexibility.</p>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	The SEA should consider not using the “all students” subgroup as a basis of comparison against the state average of “all students” to identify focus schools.

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

**2.E.iii Peer Response***Response: (0 Yes or 6 No)*

<b>2.E.iii</b>	<p>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 2013–2014 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?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>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?</i></li> <li>➤ <i>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)?</i></li> </ul>
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	<p>WDE did not discuss specific interventions to target the identified needs of the focus schools.</p> <p>The SEA does provide a timeline that meets timing goals stated above, but it does not provide examples and justifications for the required interventions. The SEA’s basic approach is to apply the turnaround principles needed by the school based on a needs assessment.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Focus schools must conduct a self-assessment based on <i>The High Performing School-Benchmarking the 10 Indicators of Effectiveness</i>.</p> <p>WDE’s request asserts that all focus schools will implement each of the turnaround principles.</p> <p>A School Evaluation Team will be assigned to each focus school (and a coach for 2014–2015) (p. 64).</p> <p>WDE will use an on-line tracking system to monitor implementation progress plans.</p> <p>WDE reviews the completed needs assessments, goals, and evaluations and provides feedback (p. 64).</p> <p>WDE plans to implement interventions in focus schools at the start of the 2013–2014 school year, which conforms to the Department’s required timeline.</p>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of</i>	WDE did not discuss interventions for different grade levels of schools.

<p><b>2.E.iii</b></p>	<p>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 2013–2014 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?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>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?</i></li> <li>➤ <i>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)?</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Response Component</b></p>	<p><b>Panel Response</b></p>
<p><i>clarity</i></p>	<p>The SEA’s proposal did not include details on which interventions in its focus schools the affected LEAs will implement or how the specific interventions addressing the needs of students and subgroups who are academically behind will be selected. The SEA did not provide examples of and justifications for the interventions the SEA will require its focus schools to implement. It is not clear from the request whether the interventions in focus schools will be aligned with the specific needs of English Learners or students with disabilities.</p>
<p><i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i></p>	<p>The SEA could develop a set of tools and trainings that have been shown effective in similar schools to those in the state.</p> <p>The SEA should develop a process to ensure that LEAs use interventions based on the needs of the students in the schools that are identified as focus schools and that are likely to improve the performance of all students, including English Learners and students with disabilities.</p>

**2.E.iv Peer Response***Response: (0 Yes or 6 No)*

<b>2.E.iv</b>	<p>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?</p> <p>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?</p> <p>➤ <i>Is the level of progress required by the criteria to exit focus status likely to result in sustained improvement in these schools?</i></p>
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	The SEA provides exit criteria but it does not ensure that exiting schools have made significant progress that will be sustained.
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>WDE has identified specific criteria that schools must meet to exit focus status.</p> <p>WDE provided a description of possible consequences for focus schools that fail to improve.</p>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<p>Schools only have to move a fraction above the cut point that identifies schools as focus to exit focus status. This might mean they move from among the lowest-performing schools to just barely above the lowest-performing. For example, a school could be identified as a focus school because its graduation rate is 59% and then exit priority status if its graduation rate increases to 61%, representing at best a very small level of improvement that could be achieved without any significant and long-lasting changes in practice.</p> <p>Elementary and middle schools have only a single criterion for exiting focus status (closing achievement gaps).</p>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<p>The SEA should consider establishing more stringent criteria for exit from focus status and in addition, should consider requiring any successful interventions in focus schools to continue for a longer period to ensure continuous improvement.</p> <p>The SEA should consider an additional criterion for elementary and middle schools to exit focus status.</p> <p>For high schools, the SEA should consider exit criteria that is more rigorous than merely increasing proficiency scores above the bottom 5% cut-score, and should include in its exit criteria both increasing the graduation rate and improving student achievement for two consecutive years (instead of “or”) (p. 66).</p>

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

**2.F.i Peer Response**

*Response: (2 Yes or 4 No )*

<b>2.F.i</b>	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?
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	State law requires all but the highest performing schools to write school improvement plans based on a needs analysis. What is unclear is the extent to which the SEA has capacity to provide adequate supports to these schools.
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>All schools, except Exceeds Expectations schools, are required to develop improvement plans. Liaisons from WDE (coaches in 2013–2014) will work with these schools in the development of the plan, which is reviewed by WDE (p. 74).</p> <p>Resources requested in the improvement plan need to be for interventions that are based upon a comprehensive review of the available research and need to be commensurate with the level of intervention, support and consequences required to be administered under WAEA (p. 74).</p> <p>In order to ensure a school is effectively implementing the turnaround principles necessary to improve achievement, it will be required to report its results regularly to the WDE through the coaches (2013–2014) or liaisons (after 2013–2014) (p. 75).</p> <p>In addition to providing a comprehensive needs assessment, the school will also be responsible for providing goals and its own evaluation process (to determine if school officials have made satisfactory progress) (p. 76).</p>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<p>The SEA did not identify how many coaches and/or liaisons will be available to assist other Title I schools, what their caseloads would be, and whether the staffing patterns are appropriate.</p> <p>It is unclear how the SEA will ensure fidelity of implementation of the school improvement plans in “other Title I” schools.</p>

<b>2.F.i</b>	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?
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
	It is unclear how the SEA will use performance against the State’s proficiency AMOs and graduation rate targets to drive incentives in other Title I schools.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	The SEA should develop tools and trainings to increase LEA capacity to support other Title I schools that are not reaching their performance targets.

**2.F.ii Peer Response***Response: (0 Yes or 6 No)*

<b>2.F.ii</b>	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?
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	Though WDE includes support and requirements of school improvement plans, there were no specifics of how these plans address the needs of English Learners and students with disabilities.
<i>Strengths</i>	The development of school improvement plans to be reviewed by WDE for all schools that are not in the Exceeds Expectation category can improve achievement if based on identified needs and interventions address these needs.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<p>There was no indication that the proficiency AMOs and graduation rate targets would be used to identify areas of needs for other Title I schools.</p> <p>Development of school improvement plans alone does not guarantee that the supports are likely to improve achievement, close achievement gaps, and increase the quality of instruction for all students, including English Learners and students with disabilities.</p> <p>Beyond saying that the interventions will be tailored to specific needs of schools and their students, the request does not include details on how these interventions will be selected; it does not provide examples of interventions, nor does it discuss the selection of outside providers (if any). It is not clear how the specific needs of English Learners or students with disabilities will be addressed.</p>



<b>2.F.ii</b>	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?
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	The SEA should develop a process for determining which interventions will be selected, with appropriate supports provided, and targeted to the needs of schools and students, including English Learners and students with disabilities.

## 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 Peer Response

*Response: (0 Yes or 6 No)*

<b>2.G</b>	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? (including components i.-iii. above)
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>

<b>2.G</b>	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? (including components i.-iii. above)
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	The SEA appears to be building a system to build capacity at the SEA and school level in priority and focus schools. It is less clear if proposed strategies will build capacity at the LEA level, and in other Title I schools.
<i>Strengths</i>	All schools, except “Exceeds Expectations” schools, are required to develop improvement plans. Liaisons from WDE (or coaches in 2013–2014) will work with these schools in the development of the plan, which is reviewed by WDE (p. 74).
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<p>A desk audit conducted once every three years for non-priority and non-focus schools is not sufficient to build LEA and school capacity, or to monitor school or LEA progress. The content of the Desk Audit was not addressed.</p> <p>The SEA’s request does not provide sufficient information on how it plans to hold LEAs accountable for improving school and student performance.</p> <p>The SEA’s request indicates that it is going to monitor the implementation of interventions in priority and focus schools directly (via reports submitted by the coaches or liaisons), and not through its LEAs, which shifts the responsibility away from LEAs.</p> <p>It is not clear whether the SEA has the capacity to monitor the implementation of school improvement efforts to priority, focus, and other Title I schools.</p>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	The SEA should develop tools and trainings to support building LEA capacity.

**Principle 2 Overall Review**

**PRINCIPLE 2 OVERALL REVIEW Peer Response**

*Response: (0 Yes or 6 No)*

<p><b>Principle 2 Overall Review</b></p>	<p>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?</p>
<p><b>Response Component</b></p>	<p><b>Panel Response</b></p>
<p><i>Rationale</i></p>	<p>WDE’s proposal still needs more details on the index system and specific interventions.</p> <p>The SEA’s plan has coherence and could result in improved student achievement and instruction, as well as closing achievement gaps, in particular in priority and focus schools. The request is less clear about what will occur in other Title 1 schools given that the weights used in the accountability system have not been established, nor is there clarity in the types of improvement supports that will be available. Thus, it is possible that the accountability system will not provide strong incentives or supports to improve achievement in other Title I schools.</p>
<p><i>Strengths</i></p>	<p>The accountability plan proposed provided an index system that took into account achievement, growth, equity, and readiness.</p> <p>WDE provided a rationale for its index system in terms of how to compare subgroups, how to address schools with different grade levels, and preparing students for college or careers.</p>
<p><i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i></p>	<p>There was insufficient information on interventions to address the needs of students with disabilities, English Learners, and low-achieving students.</p> <p>Because the SEA is still developing the weights and performance levels for the proposed system, it is too early to determine whether it can accomplish the goals of improved student achievement, closing achievement gaps, and increasing the quality of instruction.</p> <p>Weightings for the graduation component are potentially too low (currently 30% of Readiness, and overall weighting of Readiness, which is one of three categories, is to be determined).</p>

<p><b>Principle 2 Overall Review</b></p>	<p>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?</p>
<p><b>Response Component</b></p>	<p><b>Panel Response</b></p>
	<p>There was insufficient information regarding the case loads of school turnaround coaches and liaisons.</p> <p>The SEA did not detail how it would use performance against proficiency AMOs and graduation rate targets to drive interventions in other Title I schools.</p> <p>It is unclear to what extent subgroup performance gaps will drive the identification of focus schools in the future.</p>
<p><i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i></p>	<p>The SEA should ensure that weightings in the accountability system place significant emphasis on raising graduation rates for all students and closing achievement gaps across subgroups.</p> <p>The SEA should develop criteria for school turnaround coaches that ensure coaches have prior experience or needed training to both analyze school needs and help schools implement effective reforms to meet those needs.</p> <p>The SEA should consider not including measures of completion and continuation in its graduation rate index.</p>

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

**3.A.i, Option A.i Peer Response**

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

Response: (0 Yes or 6 No)

3.A.i, Option A.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 2012–2013 school year
Response Component	Panel Response
<i>Rationale</i>	<p>The timeline established by the SEA does not lead to adoption of guidelines by the end of the 2012–2013 school year.</p> <p>WDE is in the initial stages of developing an evaluation system. Beyond some general principles, very little is provided in terms of specifics for building the system.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>WDE provided a “Legislative Framework for Evaluating Teacher and Leader Effectiveness” recommendation to the Select Committee that proposed legislation, House Bill 72. There is no statement as to the status of that legislation.</p> <p>Enrolled Act 60 describes the development and implementation of the statewide educator accountability system and was passed in February 2013.</p> <p>The State legislature passed a law in 2012 that requires the SEA to establish an evaluation and accountability system that is generally aligned with the ESEA flexibility requirements, which would create a cohesive system of school accountability, including educator and school leader accountability.</p>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<p>The timeline laid out in the request does not result in successful adoption of guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems by the end of the 2012–2013 school year, based</p>

<p><b>3.A.i, Option A.i</b></p>	<p>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 2012–2013 school year</p>
<p><b>Response Component</b></p>	<p><b>Panel Response</b></p>
	<p>on text in current State statute. The statute notes a deadline of October 15, 2013, for the Advisory Committee to report on the design of the evaluation system to the Select Committee (p. 84).</p> <p>Beyond the five domains listed on page 83, it is difficult to determine the fundamental philosophical foundation for WDE’s system. There does not appear to be a model framework guiding the work.</p> <p>It is not clear whether the SEA will create one sample model that LEAs can choose or the LEAs will have the complete autonomy in this matter. For example, the request lacks details on how measures of student growth will be incorporated into the teacher and school leader evaluation systems.</p> <p>LEAs may not have the capacity for creating a system that incorporates measures of student academic growth into a teacher and leader evaluation and support system.</p>
<p><i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i></p>	<p>The SEA should establish a process for developing guidelines and a timeline for their adoption that is aligned with the requirements of the new State legislation.</p>

**3.A.i, Option A.ii Peer Response**

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

*Response: (0 Yes or 6 No)*

<b>3.A.i, Option A.ii</b>	Does the SEA's plan include sufficient involvement of teachers and principals in the development of these guidelines?
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	WDE is in the initial stages of developing a statewide educator accountability system.  The request states that a thoroughly developed plan for the inclusion of teachers and principals, in all phases of the educator evaluation and accountability system, will be developed (p. 85).
<i>Strengths</i>	The request states that the SEA will develop a plan for the inclusion of teachers and principals in all phases of the educator evaluation and accountability system.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	There is little evidence in the information provided that educators, including elementary, middle, and high school teachers and specialists have been involved in the process of developing the State's guidelines. Also, the input from school leaders is not clear in the provided information.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	The SEA should establish a plan to ensure sufficient involvement of teachers and principals in the development of the guidelines.

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

If the SEA selected **Option B** (the SEA has developed and adopted all guidelines consistent with Principle 3):

**3.A.i, Option B.i Peer Response**

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

*Response: (Yes or No)*

<b>3.A.i, Option B.i</b>	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?
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	N/A
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of</i>	N/A

<b>3.A.i, Option B.i</b>	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?
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>clarity</i>	
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	N/A

**3.A.i, Option B.ii:** ED Staff will review B.ii. [Evidence of adoption of final guidelines by the SEA]

**3.A.i, Option B.iii Peer Response**

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

Response: (Yes or No)

<b>3.A.i, Option B.iii</b>	Did the SEA have sufficient involvement of teachers and principals in the development of these guidelines?
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	N/A
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	N/A
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	N/A

**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.a Peer Response**

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

Response: (Yes or No)



<b>3.A.ii.a</b>	<p>Are the SEA’s guidelines for teacher and principal evaluation and support systems consistent with Principle 3 — <i>i.e.</i>, will they promote systems that will...be used for continual improvement of instruction?</p> <p><u>Consideration:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>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?</i></li> </ul>
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	N/A
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	N/A
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	N/A

**3.A.ii.b Peer Response**

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

Response: (Yes or No)

<b>3.A.ii.b en text</b>	<p>Are the SEA’s guidelines for teacher and principal evaluation and support systems consistent with Principle 3 — <i>i.e.</i>, will they promote systems that will...meaningfully differentiate performance using at least three performance levels?</p> <p><u>Consideration:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>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?</i></li> </ul>
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	N/A
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	N/A
<i>Technical Assistance</i>	N/A

<b>3.A.ii.b en text</b>	<p>Are the SEA’s guidelines for teacher and principal evaluation and support systems consistent with Principle 3 — <i>i.e.</i>, will they promote systems that will...meaningfully differentiate performance using at least three performance levels?</p> <p><u>Consideration:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>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?</i></li> </ul>
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Suggestions</i>	

**3.A.ii.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)?

**3.A.ii.c.(i) Peer Response**

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

Response: (Yes or No)

<b>3.A.ii.c.(i)</b>	<p>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?</p>
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	N/A
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	N/A
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	N/A

**3.A.ii.c(ii) Peer Response**

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

Response: (Yes or No)

<b>3.A.ii.c(ii)</b>	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?
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	N/A
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	N/A
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	N/A

**3.A.ii.c(iii) Peer Response**

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

Response: (Yes or No)

<b>3.A.ii.c(iii)</b>	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?
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	N/A
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	N/A
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	N/A

**3.A.ii.d Peer Response**

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

Response: (Yes or No)

<b>3.A.ii.d</b>	Are the SEA’s guidelines for teacher and principal evaluation and support systems consistent with Principle 3 — i.e., will they promote systems that will...evaluate teachers and principals on a regular basis?
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	N/A
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	N/A
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	N/A

**3.A.ii.e Peer Response**

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

Response: (Yes or No)

<b>3.A.ii.e</b>	<p>Are the SEA’s guidelines for teacher and principal evaluation and support systems consistent with Principle 3 — i.e., will they promote systems that will...provide clear, timely, and useful feedback, including feedback that identifies needs and guides professional development?</p> <p><u>Considerations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>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?</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Are the SEA’s guidelines likely to result in differentiated professional development that meets the needs of teachers?</i></li> </ul>
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	N/A
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	N/A
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	N/A

**3.A.ii.f Peer Response**

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

Response: (Yes or No)

3.A.ii.f	Are the SEA’s guidelines for teacher and principal evaluation and support systems consistent with Principle 3 — i.e., will they promote systems that will...be used to inform personnel decisions?
Response Component	Panel Response
<i>Rationale</i>	N/A
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	N/A
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	N/A

**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?

**Considerations:**

- *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 2014–2015 school year in preparation for full implementation of the evaluation and support systems consistent with the requirements described above no later than the 2015–2016 school year; or (2) implementing these systems no later than the 2014–2015 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 Peer Response**

*Response: (0 Yes or 6 No)*

<b>3.B.</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? <i>(See italicized considerations above.)</i>
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>

<b>3.B.</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? ( <i>See italicized considerations above.</i> )
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	The request provides information on legislative requirements for the SEA’s new evaluation systems. It does not provide sufficient detail on how the SEA will implement this legislation to ensure that its requirements are met. More information is needed to determine whether the SEA is likely to successfully develop, pilot, and implement high-quality local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems.
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>WDE is proposing a three-year approach to implementing the evaluation systems that includes piloting, professional development opportunities, and adjustments to the system (pp 84).</p> <p>The SEA has made a commitment to design an evaluation system within the parameter of State legislation that is generally aligned with the waiver requirements. An advisory committee that included a small group of stakeholders (possibly, but not necessarily, including teachers) assisted with this process. It is not clear what process the SEA will use moving forward to ensure that LEAs develop, adopt, pilot, and implement teacher and principal evaluation and support systems with the involvement of teachers and principals.</p>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<p>Beyond the three-year proposed pilot and training, it is difficult to get a clear understanding of a system still under development.</p> <p>The SEA has not yet established 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.</p> <p>It is not clear that the SEA has 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.</p> <p>The timeline is not entirely clear. It does not necessarily reflect a clear understanding of the practical steps that will be necessary to meet the required deadlines. It does not seem to meet the requirement that the SEA ensure that LEAs either (1) pilot the evaluation and support systems no later than the 2014–2015 school year in preparation for full implementation of the evaluation and support systems consistent with the</p>

<p><b>3.B.</b></p>	<p>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? (<i>See italicized considerations above.</i>)</p>
<p><b>Response Component</b></p>	<p><b>Panel Response</b></p>
	<p>requirements described above no later than the 2015–2016 school year; or (2) implement these systems no later than the 2014–2015 school year. The request lays out the following timeline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2013–2014- a sample of volunteer districts (not clear which districts or how many districts) will pilot data collection methods and select components of the new system;</li> <li>• 2014–2015- all districts will pilot the new system, but may implement only select components of it</li> <li>• 2015–2016- full pilot of all components of the teacher evaluation system based on peer review (not clear what this is) and all districts implement leader evaluation systems;</li> <li>• 2016–2017- full implementation</li> </ul> <p>The request does not address the SEA’s plan for providing adequate guidance and other technical assistance to LEAs in developing and implementing teacher and principal evaluation and support systems.</p> <p>More information is needed about the pilot. It is not clear which districts will participate and whether participation will be broad enough to gain sufficient feedback from a variety of types of educators, schools, and classrooms to inform full implementation of an LEA’s evaluation and support systems.</p>
<p><i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i></p>	<p>WDE should provide attachments and additional evidence to the peers to better understand what direction WDE plans to take with its system.</p> <p>WDE should establish a process for ensuring that school leaders and teachers working with special populations of students, such as students with disabilities and English Learners, are included in the LEAs’ teacher and principal evaluation and support systems.</p> <p>WDE should establish a plan to provide adequate guidance and other technical assistance to LEAs in</p>



<p><b>3.B.</b></p>	<p>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? (<i>See italicized considerations above.</i>)</p>
<p><b>Response Component</b></p>	<p><b>Panel Response</b></p>
	<p>developing and implementing teacher and principal evaluation and support systems.</p> <p>WDE should establish steps to ensure that pilot participation will be broad enough to gain sufficient feedback from a variety of types of educators, schools, and classrooms to inform full implementation of an LEA’s evaluation and support systems.</p> <p>WDE should clarify how the personnel requirement will work in practice — including how teachers will be rewarded based on successful evaluations and how they will be supported to improve and/or terminated after a series of ineffective evaluations.</p>

## Principle 3 Overall Review

### Principle 3 Overall Review Peer Response

*Response: (0 Yes or 6 No)*

<b>Principle 3 Overall Review</b>	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?
<b>Response Component</b>	<b>Panel Response</b>
<i>Rationale</i>	<p>WDE is at the emerging level of developing a statewide educator accountability system. With limited information available beyond a timeline for piloting and training, it is difficult to understand the SEA’s plan or approach.</p> <p>The WAEA is largely consistent with Principle 3 but details are lacking on how the SEA will ensure that the intent of the legislation is carried out. Many details are missing on how the SEA will ensure that LEAs develop, adopt, pilot and implement the new systems.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>WDE has a three-year plan for piloting and providing training on the educator accountability systems.</p> <p>With enactment of the WAEA, the SEA has taken an important first step towards the creation of evaluation and support systems that could improve the quality of instruction for students and increase student achievement. Each of the principles is addressed in legislation enacted by the state — including continual improvement of instruction, meaningfully differentiation of performance using at least three levels, use of multiple valid measures in determining performance levels, regular evaluation of teachers and principals, clear and timely feedback, and use of evaluations to inform personnel decisions.</p>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<p>The input from stakeholder groups, including teachers, specialists, and school leaders, is not clear.</p> <p>The framework and basic approach to the system is very unclear. Too many significant details are not yet developed to support the SEA’s submission in this area.</p> <p>It is not clear how the SEA will ensure that the legislation is implemented in ways that will ensure that its goals are actually met. While the request states that all educators will be evaluated regularly, it does not define what “regularly” means. The fact that an evaluation is required of each teacher in 2016–2017 “and each</p>

<p><b>Principle 3 Overall Review</b></p>	<p>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?</p>
<p><b>Response Component</b></p>	<p><b>Panel Response</b></p>
	<p>school year thereafter” implies that the evaluation will be annual, but the frequency of evaluations should be explicit. It is not clear how many observations of each teacher will be included in her/his evaluation. While the legislation requires a report to include a summary of professional development activities made available to an identified school and to district leaders and teachers to improve instruction, it is not clear how the SEA will ensure that the professional development will be changed based on the needs of teachers as identified by the evaluations, nor is it clear that the professional development will be differentiated according to educators’ needs (p. 84 demonstrates intent for alignment but lacks sufficient detail).</p>
<p><i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i></p>	<p>WDE must provide the guidelines and supporting documents for further review prior to approval in this area. No supporting information was provided with the submission of WDE’s request.</p> <p>WDE should develop a clear, specific plan for implementing the WAEA, including determining what steps the SEA needs to take and when it needs to take them in order to meet the deadlines required by Principle 3.</p> <p>WDE should provide additional details on steps the SEA and/or LEAs will take to ensure that professional development is adjusted as necessary based on evaluation results and that it is appropriately differentiated according to educators’ needs.</p> <p>WDE should clarify how often educators will be evaluated and by whom.</p>

**Overall Evaluation of Request**

<p><b>Overall Evaluation</b></p>	<p>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?</p>
<p><b>Response Component</b></p>	<p><b>Panel Response</b></p>

<p><b>Overall Evaluation</b></p>	<p>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?</p>
<p><b>Response Component</b></p>	<p><b>Panel Response</b></p>
<p><i>Rationale</i></p>	<p>WDE provided limited information on activities, timelines, responsibilities and evidence related to the transition to the CCSS (pp. 14-18).</p> <p>WDE’s plan includes some appropriate activities with plans for professional development in the initial stages. More details should be provided, especially in terms of how the needs of special populations will be addressed.</p> <p>WDE still needs to complete the index system including weightings of performance indicators and cut scores for determining school performance levels in a manner that leads to improving achievement and graduation rates for all students.</p> <p>The SEA needs to identify the ways in which specific interventions will be selected and implemented so that they can address the needs of low-performing students and all ESEA subgroups.</p> <p>The SEA plan could, if further refined and implemented with fidelity, result in improved student achievement and instruction, as well as closing achievement gaps, in particular in priority and focus schools. It is less clear what will occur in other Title 1 schools given that the weights used in the accountability system have not been established nor is there clarity in the types of improvement supports that will be available. Thus, it is possible that the accountability system will not provide strong incentives or supports to improve achievement in an LEA’s other Title 1 schools.</p> <p>WDE’s evaluation system is currently under development. With limited information available beyond a timeline for piloting and providing training, it is difficult to understand the SEA’s plan or approach.</p> <p>The state legislation is largely consistent with Principle 3 but details are lacking on how the SEA will ensure that the intent of the legislation is carried out. Many details are missing on how the SEA will ensure that LEAs develop, adopt, pilot and implement the new systems.</p>

<p><b>Overall Evaluation</b></p>	<p>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?</p>
<p><b>Response Component</b></p>	<p><b>Panel Response</b></p>
<p><i>Strengths</i></p>	<p>WDE provided a chart describing its CCSS implementation activities, including timelines, parties responsible, evidence, resources, and significant obstacles (pp. 14-18).</p> <p>WDE’s Standards website has CCSS resources for educators, community members and parents (p. 20).</p> <p>Dual enrollment courses and AP and IB courses are offered in over half of the State’s LEAs, which indicates a commitment to quality and rigor for a large number of students.</p> <p>WDE conducted a gap analysis between its existing WDE standards and the CCSS.</p> <p>The accountability plan provides an index system that takes into account achievement, growth, equity, and readiness.</p> <p>WDE provided a rationale for its index system in terms of how to compare subgroups, how to address schools with different grade levels, and preparing students for college/career.</p> <p>WDE has a three-year plan for piloting and providing training on the educator accountability system.</p> <p>With the legislation referenced in the request, the SEA has taken an important first step towards the creation of evaluation and support systems that could improve the quality of instruction for students and increase student achievement. Each of the principles is addressed in legislation enacted by the State, including continual improvement of instruction, meaningful differentiation of performance using at least three levels, use of multiple valid measures in determining performance levels, regular evaluation of teachers and principals, clear and timely feedback, and use of evaluations to inform personnel decisions.</p>
<p><i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of</i></p>	<p>There does not appear to be any formal coordination with the IHEs and personnel preparation programs.</p>

<p><b>Overall Evaluation</b></p>	<p>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?</p>
<p><b>Response Component</b></p>	<p><b>Panel Response</b></p>
<p><i>clarity</i></p>	<p>The SEA’s request states that it assumes that there will be a shift in teacher-preparation programs just because the University of Wyoming is aware of the move to CCSS (p. 21).</p> <p>WDE did not provide sufficient information regarding how it will ensure all teachers, including those of students with disabilities, English Learners, and low-achieving students would have timely and sustained professional development and materials to assist in the transition to the CCSS.</p> <p>There was insufficient information on the selection of and plans for the implementation of interventions to address the needs of students with disabilities, English Learners, and low-achieving students.</p> <p>Since the proposed system is still under development in identifying weights and performance levels, it is too early to determine that it can accomplish the goals of improved student achievement, closing achievement gaps, and increasing the quality of instruction.</p> <p>Weights for the index system have not been established; as a result, it is possible that they could undercut the potential of the accountability system to press schools to improve outcomes for all students.</p> <p>Weights for the graduation component are potentially too low (currently 30% of Readiness and overall weighting of Readiness, which is one of three categories, is to be determined).</p> <p>There was insufficient information regarding the case loads of school turnaround coaches and liaisons.</p> <p>WDE did not detail how it would use performance against proficiency AMOs and graduation rate targets to drive interventions in other Title I schools.</p> <p>It is unclear to what extent subgroup performance gaps will drive the identification of focus schools in the future.</p>

<p><b>Overall Evaluation</b></p>	<p>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?</p>
<p><b>Response Component</b></p>	<p><b>Panel Response</b></p>
	<p>The extent of input from stakeholder groups, including teachers, specialists, and school leaders, is not clear.</p> <p>The framework and basic approach to the system is very unclear. Too many significant details are not yet developed to support the SEA’s submission in this area.</p> <p>It is not clear how the SEA will ensure that the WAEA is implemented in ways that will ensure that its goals are actually met. While the request states that all educators will be evaluated regularly, it does not define what “regularly” means. The fact that an evaluation is required of each teacher in 2016–2017 “and each school year thereafter” implies that the evaluation will be annual, but the frequency of evaluations should be explicit. It is not clear how many observations of each teacher will be included in her/his evaluation.</p> <p>While the WAEA requires a report to include a summary of professional development activities made available to an identified school and to district leaders and teachers to improve instruction, it is not clear how the SEA will ensure that the professional development will be changed based on the needs of teachers as identified by the evaluations, nor is it clear that the professional development will be differentiated according to educators’ needs (p. 84 demonstrates intent for alignment but lacks sufficient detail).</p>
<p><i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i></p>	<p>Given that the teacher and leader accountability system has not been developed and that the school accountability and support system is not yet implemented, the SEA should consider creating guidelines for local teacher and leader accountability systems that would work in concert with the SEA’s school accountability and support system. For example, the SEA should consider including the results of the student growth component in the teacher and leader evaluations for inclusion in the school accountability and support system. Additionally, the SEA might connect the professional responsibilities component of the teacher and leader evaluations system with participation in professional development to support the implementation of CCSS.</p> <p>The SEA should take a more hands-on role to ensure that teacher and leader preparation programs across</p>



<p><b>Overall Evaluation</b></p>	<p>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?</p>
<p><b>Response Component</b></p>	<p><b>Panel Response</b></p>
	<p>the state take steps to prepare teachers and leaders for the many changes that will be required as a result of the adoption of new standards.</p> <p>The SEA should consider preparing model instructional materials for teachers of English Learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students.</p> <p>The SEA should consider use of the SPDG as part of its professional development for teachers of students with disabilities to provide a coordinated approach to address the needs of all teachers and students.</p> <p>The SEA needs to develop a cohesive and long-term implementation plan to support professional development for teachers and leaders that ensures that teachers can provide instructional activities necessary for students to learn to the CCSS and for leaders to provide necessary instructional support.</p> <p>The SEA should make sure weights in its accountability system place significant emphasis on raising graduation rates for all students and closing achievement gaps across subgroups.</p> <p>The SEA should consider not including measures of completion and continuation in its graduation rate index.</p> <p>The SEA should develop a clear, specific plan for implementation of the WAEA, including determining what steps the SEA needs to take and when it needs to take them in order to meet the deadlines required by ESEA flexibility.</p> <p>The SEA should provide additional details on steps the SEA and/or LEAs will take to ensure that professional development is adjusted as necessary based on evaluation results and that it is appropriately differentiated according to educators’ needs.</p>

<p><b>Overall Evaluation</b></p>	<p>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?</p>
<p><b>Response Component</b></p>	<p><b>Panel Response</b></p>
	<p>The SEA should clarify how often educators will be evaluated and by whom.</p>