ESEA Flexibility

Peer Panel Notes

State Request: New Mexico

Date: Notes for Principle 2 were drafted on December 7, 2011 and notes for Principle 1 and Principle 3 were drafted on February 1, 2012

Note: These peer comments reflect the views of the 7 peers that comprised the panel that reviewed the SEA's initial submission during the December 5–9, 2011 on-site peer review and the panel of 5 Peers that reviewed Principle 1 and Principle 3 of the SEA's revised submission during a peer review on February 1, 2012 Taking these comments into consideration, the U.S. Department of Education provided feedback to the SEA about aspects of the SEA's ESEA flexibility request that needed additional development or clarification. These peer notes do not reflect the peers' views on any materials, clarifications, or modifications received from the SEA following the peer review. Moreover, although the peer notes inform the Secretary's consideration of each SEA's request, the Secretary makes the final decision whether to grant an SEA's request for ESEA flexibility. For both of these reasons, these peer notes may not align with the determination made by the Secretary.

REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF REQUESTS

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

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

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

Review Guidance

Consultation

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

    ➢   *Is the engagement likely to lead to successful implementation of the SEA's request due to the input and commitment of teachers and their representatives at the outset of the planning and implementation process?*

    ➢   *Did the SEA indicate that it modified any aspect of its request based on input from teachers and their representatives?*

CONSULTATION QUESTION 1 PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* 0 Yes, 7 No	
Rationale	The peers did not see evidence that teachers and their representatives were engaged and provided input on the development of the State's plan.
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	There was no involvement of teachers and their representatives, except through Governor's task force.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text

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

    ➢   *Is the engagement likely to lead to successful implementation of the SEA's request due to the input and commitment of relevant stakeholders at the outset of the planning and implementation process?*

    ➢   *Did the SEA indicate that it modified any aspect of its request based on stakeholder input?*

    ➢   *Does the input represent feedback from a diverse mix of stakeholders representing various perspectives and interests, including stakeholders from high-need communities?*

CONSULTATION QUESTION 2 PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* *0 Yes, 7 No*	
Rationale	The peers felt that the SEA did not adequately engage and solicit input from members of other diverse communities, such as community-based organizations, civil rights organizations, organizations representing students with disabilities and English Learners, and Indian tribes.
Strengths	The SEA indicated that it consulted with Business Roundtable.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	The peers observed a lack of outreach to diverse groups. The SEA's approach to notifying diverse communities, such as community-based organizations, civil rights organizations, organizations representing students with disabilities and English Learners, and Indian tribes about its plans was passive. In addition, as noted above, the peers did not see substantial engagement with educator groups.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text

Overview

Note to Peers: Staff will review Questions 1 and 3

2. Does the SEA's overview sufficiently explain the SEA's comprehensive approach to implementing the waivers and principles and describe the Sea's strategy for ensuring that this approach is coherent?

OVERVIEW QUESTION 2 PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* 0 Yes, 7 No	
Rationale	The peers felt that the overview of the SEA's plans did not demonstrate the SEA's comprehensive approach to implementing the waivers and principles, nor did it describe the SEA's strategy for ensuring that this approach is coherent.
Strengths	Legislature has already enacted the grading system into State law. The SEA has articulated a general plan of action for its work.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	The overview raised questions about the comprehensiveness and cohesiveness of the SEA's plan. Educators did not seem to be involved in formulating the plan, so peers were unsure if educators would be receptive to this plan. Peers are also concerned about this statement: "Avoid holding schools accountable for characteristics beyond their [educators] control" (page 12). This statement seems to be contrary to the ESEA mission of setting universally high levels of expectations for all students and working to see that *all* students achieve these skills. The SEA's overview does not appear to evidence a strong framework for reform or improvement, and is inconsistent with the three principles of the flexibility request.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text

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   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, and likely to lead to all students, including English Learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students, gaining access to and learning content aligned with such standards?

A high-quality plan will likely include activities related to the following questions or an explanation if one or more of the activities is not included. For the activities below that the SEA selects, will the results be used to inform the intended outcome?

➤ *Does the SEA intend to analyze the extent of alignment between the State's current content standards and the college- and career-ready standards to determine similarities and differences between those two sets of standards? If so, will the results be used to inform the transition to college- and career-ready standards?*

➤ *Does the SEA intend to analyze the linguistic demands of the college- and career-ready standards to inform the development of ELP standards corresponding to the college- and career-ready standards and to ensure that English Learners will be able to access the college- and career-ready standards? If so, will the results be used to inform revision of the ELP standards and support English Learners in accessing the college- and career-ready standards?*

➤ *Does the SEA intend to analyze the learning and accommodation factors necessary to ensure that students with disabilities will have the opportunity to achieve to the college- and career-ready standards? If so, will the results be used to support students with disabilities in accessing the college- and career-ready standards on the same schedule as all students?*

➤ *Does the SEA intend to conduct outreach on and dissemination of standards? If so, does the SEA's plan reach the appropriate stakeholders, including educators, administrators, families, and IHEs? Is it likely that the plan will result in all stakeholders increasing their awareness of the State's college- and career-ready standards?*

➤ *Does the SEA intend to provide professional development and other supports to prepare teachers to teach all students, including English Learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students, to the new standards? If so, will the planned professional development and supports prepare teachers to teach to the new standards, use instructional materials aligned with those standards, and use data on multiple measures of student performance (e.g., data from formative, benchmark, and summative assessments) to inform instruction?*

➤ *Does the SEA intend to provide professional development and supports to prepare principals to provide strong, supportive instructional leadership based on the new standards? If so, will this plan prepare principals to do so?*

➤ *Does the SEA propose to develop and disseminate high-quality instructional materials aligned with the new standards? If so, are the instructional materials designed (or will they be designed) to support the teaching and learning of all students, including English Learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students?*

➢ *Does the SEA plan to expand access to college-level courses or their prerequisites, dual enrollment courses, or accelerated learning opportunities? If so, will this plan lead to more students having access to courses that prepare them for college and a career?*

➢ *Does the SEA intend to work with the State's IHEs and other teacher and principal preparation programs, to better prepare*☐

  o *incoming teachers to teach all students, including English Learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students, to the new college- and career-ready standards; and*

  o *incoming principals to provide strong, supportive instructional leadership on teaching to the new standards?*

  If so, will the implementation of the plan likely improve the preparation of incoming teachers and principals?

➢ *Does the SEA plan to evaluate its current assessments and increase the rigor of those assessments and their alignment with college- and career-ready standards, in order to better prepare students and teachers for the new assessments through one or more of the following strategies:*

  o *Raising the State's academic achievement standards on its current assessments to ensure that the adjusted achievement standards reflect a level of postsecondary readiness, or are being increased over time to that level of rigor (e.g., the SEA might compare current achievement standards to a measure of postsecondary readiness by back-mapping from college entrance requirements or remediation rates, analyzing the relationship between proficient scores on the State assessments and the ACT or SAT scores accepted by most of the State's 4-year public IHEs, or conducting NAEP mapping studies)?*

  o *Augmenting or revising current State assessments by adding questions, removing questions, or varying formats in order to better align those assessments with college- and career-ready standards?*

  o *Implementing another strategy to increase the rigor of current assessments, such as using the "advanced" performance level on State assessments instead of the "proficient" performance level as the goal for individual student performance?*

  Is this activity likely to result in an increase in the rigor of the assessments and their alignment with college- and career-ready standards?

➢ *Does the SEA propose other activities in its transition plan? If so, is it likely that these activities will support the transition to and implementation of college- and career-ready standards?*

1.B PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* 0 Yes, 5 No	
Rationale	New Mexico has made progress since its November submission, but its plan for transition to and implementing college- and career-ready standards is not yet complete, coherent, or likely to lead to all students gaining access to and learning content aligned with such standards. New Mexico has made more progress in explaining why the common core standards are important and less progress in explaining how they will get there. The plan is disjointed and does not show the connection between curriculum, assessment, professional development and communication.
Strengths	• New Mexico has clearly done more work, have some elements of a plan and timeline, they have also identified working groups • New Mexico did a better job with Principal development. • New Mexico is relying on outside experts and centers, not "redesigning the wheel". • In communications plan, NM has informed parents and educators about why this is important.

1.B PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* 0 Yes, 5 No	
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• The plan does not seem to be have thought through in a cohesive way, some ideas and terms are there, but not in an integrated way. New Mexico has not integrated across instructional units, professional development, Special Education, ESL. NM has not thought through how it would be implemented.
	• The plan does not appreciate magnitude of change required related to common core, and how much support teachers will need to make that transition.
	• While New Mexico has provided supports related to math, nothing was provided related to ELA.
	• Peers are concerned about incorporation of teachers, too little information about who is developing materials.
	• New Mexico recognizes that their districts have varying levels of capacity, peers unsure how the SEA will respond to the different levels of need. Peers noted that districts will be able to self-assess their capacity, but are unclear what districts will do with this information. Peers were also unclear what role SEA and RECs play in supporting districts that have weak capacity. Peers were concerned that NM is asking too much of their districts. While NM is leveraging strategic partners, there needs to be more clarity about specific types of resources.
	• Vague about the number of units, lessons, assignments that will be developed
	• Peers were unsure about District capacity for assessing and transitioning teachers
	• New Mexico's plan is vague in terms of coordination between teacher preparation and transition to the common core
	• Peers are concerned that there is not much time to prepare for K-3, unclear about when the SEA expects to be fully trained in 4-12
	• New Mexico did not adequately address Special Education issues, and where it is mentioned is not integrated fully into the whole. There did not seem to be clear support for teachers working with SWD and ELLs who will be transitioning to the common core. Not enough work done assessing how SWD will have access to the curriculum.
	• New Mexico said there was representation from ELL and SWD on committees, peers did not see that representation
	• Failure to secure approval of funding request will severely limit capacity to implement the plan
	• New Mexico does not explain how they will expand access to college-level courses or their prerequisites, dual enrollment courses, or accelerated learning opportunities
	• Peers were unclear about plan for assessment transition, including what is meant by "locally developed assessment". Is "local" State-level or district-level? What is the rationale for undertaking what appears to be a major overhaul to create the bridge assessment against a one year timeframe?

1.B PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* *0 Yes, 5 No*	
Technical Assistance Suggestions	• Provide a single timeline and set of activities across the domains of assessment development curriculum, Professional Development, and communication

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

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

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

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

1.C, OPTION B PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* NA	
Rationale	No text
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	No text
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text
☒ *Not applicable because the SEA selected 1.C, Option A or Option C*	

Principle 1 Overall Review

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

PRINCIPLE 1 OVERALL REVIEW PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 5 No*	
Rationale	These comments are limited to the plan the peers received on January 27, 2012. The peers understand that this differs somewhat from the plan that was released statewide on January 31, 2012. New Mexico has made progress since its November submission, but its plan for transition to and implementing college- and career-ready standards is not yet complete, coherent, or likely to lead to all students gaining access to and learning content aligned with such standards. New Mexico has made more progress in explaining why the common core standards are important and less progress in explaining how they will get there. The plan is disjointed and does not show the connection between curriculum, assessment, professional development and communication.
Strengths	See 1B
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	See 1B
Technical Assistance Suggestions	See 1B

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

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

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

2.A.i PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* *0 Yes, 7 No*	
Rationale	The A-F grading system as designed does not meet the Flexibility guidelines. As constructed, it does not seem likely to improve student achievement or school performance for all groups of New Mexico's students.
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	The use of conditioned status calculations provides adjustments to student performance due to demographic characteristics, rather than addressing the discrepancies through improved instruction and learning opportunities for affected students. Peers believe that the assumptions in the model run counter to treating all children the same in the model, plus the system is not transparent to parents or educators. No information on distribution of student performance in each quartile was provided. Several variables are added up, and then a grade is applied. This creates a compensatory grading system with compensation coming from non-academic variables. This does not meet the requirements of the Flexibility guidelines and will not help all students achieve the academic standards being assessed. There is not a clear, coherent articulated support system for schools that includes the necessary components of a waiver request. The A-F grading system as designed does not meet all of the Flexibility guidelines.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text

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

2.A.i.a PANEL RESPONSE Tally of Peer Responses: *0 Yes, 7 No*	
Rationale	The SEA does not appear to be far enough along in the planning process for peers to comment on the plans provided by the SEA. In addition, the plan as presented does not include interventions specifically for sub-groups as required – for achievement, graduation rates, or performance and progress.
Strengths	The A-F grading system has been adopted into law, so the SEA already has the authority to implement the A-F grading system.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	ESEA subgroups are not utilized either in accountability or support. One reference to this appears on the bottom of page 27 of the State's request, although peers did not understand this reference. This appears to be a reference to reporting, but peers were not clear about when or how. Nothing about goals around groups, grad rate, etc.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	Need to provide clarification on how the bottom quartile includes the ESEA subgroups.

b. Do the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system create incentives and provide support to close achievement gaps for all subgroups of students?

2.A.i.b PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* *0 Yes, 7 No*	
Rationale	Specifics for how the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system creates incentives and provide support to close achievement gaps for all subgroups of students were not provided. The SEA does not appear to be far enough in the planning process for peers to comment on the plans that were provided by the SEA.
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	No incentives to close the gaps were mentioned in the SEA request. The support system for schools was not well articulated. For example, the request did not describe how a school's specific needs would be determined, how resources shown to meet such needs, and then using targets for interventions to address those needs is not described in the SEA request.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text

c. Does the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system include interventions specifically focused on improving the performance of English Learners and students with disabilities?

2.A.i.c PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* *0 Yes, 7 No*	
Rationale	The SEA plan does not include interventions specifically focused on improving the performance of English Learners and students with disabilities.
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	Incentives and interventions for these student populations are not described in the SEA request, so peers were not sure how interventions will be targeted to these students.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text

d. Did the SEA provide a plan that ensures that the system will be implemented in LEAs and schools no later than the 2012☐2013 school year?

2.A.i.d PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* *0 Yes, 7 No*	
Rationale	Peers did not see a coherent plan for intervention and improvement provided in the SEA's request, so peers are uncertain that LEAs and schools will be able to implement the system by the conclusion of the 2012-13 school year.
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	No concrete plan is provided, so peers are uncertain that implementation will occur when required.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text

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

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

2.A.ii Did the SEA include student achievement on assessments in addition to reading/language arts and mathematics in its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system and to identify reward, priority, and focus schools?

a. Did the SEA provide the percentage of students in the "all students" group that performed at the proficient level on the State's most recent administration of each additional assessment for all grades assessed?

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?

2.A.ii (INCLUDING QUESTIONS a AND b) PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* *NA*	
Rationale	Not applicable.
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	No text
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text
☒ *Not applicable because the SEA selected 2.A, Option A*	

2.B   Set Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives

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

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

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

    i.   Did the SEA provide the new AMOs and the method used to set these AMOs?

    ii.   Did the SEA provide an educationally sound rationale for the pattern of academic progress reflected in the new AMOs?

    iii.   If the SEA set AMOs that differ by LEA, school, or subgroup, do the AMOs require LEAs, schools, and subgroups that are further behind to make greater rates of annual progress?

    iv.   Did the SEA attach a copy of the average statewide proficiency based on assessments administered in the 2010–2011 school year in reading/language arts and mathematics for the "all students" group and all subgroups? (Attachment 8)

➢ *Are these AMOs similarly ambitious to the AMOs that would result from using Option A or B above?*

➢ *Are these AMOs ambitious but achievable given the State's existing proficiency rates and any other relevant circumstances in the State?*

➢ *Will these AMOs result in a significant number of children being on track to be college- and career-ready?*

2.B AND 2.B, OPTION C **(INCLUDING QUESTIONS i–iv)** **PANEL RESPONSE** Tally of Peer Responses: *0 Yes, 7 No*	
Rationale	The system of accountability given in the SEA's request does not meet the requirements of the Flexibility for reasons noted below.
Strengths	A system for school accountability was presented in the SEA's application.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	The system of accountability that is described in the SEA's request does not indicate achievement AMOs for subgroups at all, other than the "bottom quartile" group. (Such AMO's are not provided for the ESEA subgroups.) Thus, peers felt that the system of accountability described is not as rigorous as Options A or B. Schools would have a ten-year timeframe to meet targets. In addition, peers were not certain whether results will be reported for ESEA subgroups.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text
☐ Not applicable because the SEA selected 2.B, Option A or Option B	

2.C   Reward Schools

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

2.C.iii   Did the SEA describe how the SEA will publicly recognize and, if possible, reward highest-performing and high-progress schools?

> *Has the SEA provided a reasonable explanation of why its proposed recognition and, where applicable, rewards are likely to be considered meaningful by schools? For example, has the SEA consulted with LEAs and schools in designing its recognition and, where applicable, rewards?*

2.C.iii PANEL RESPONSE Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 7 No	
Rationale	While a plan to publicly recognize and, if possible, reward highest-performing and high-progress schools is present, the plan is not adequate to serve as motivational to schools.
Strengths	The SEA indicates that it will recognize schools for both high-performance and high-growth.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	Peers are concerned that in the SEA's plan, there is no check on widening gaps. Peers also have concerns about use of conditional performance measures in determining school grades. The SEA indicates that press releases and letters of commendation will be used, and that it will consider doing more than that (if resources are available to do so). Peers believe that does this is not sufficient to reward improved school performance. Incidentally, using Title 1003(a) funds to provide monetary rewards to reward schools is not allowable.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text

2.D   Priority Schools

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

2.D.iii Are the interventions that the SEA described aligned with the turnaround principles and are they likely to result in dramatic, systemic change in priority schools?

    a.   Do the SEA's interventions include all of the following?

       (i) providing strong leadership by: (1) reviewing the performance of the current principal; (2) either replacing the principal if such a change is necessary to ensure strong and effective leadership, or demonstrating to the SEA that the current principal has a track record in improving achievement and has the ability to lead the turnaround effort; and (3) providing the principal with operational flexibility in the areas of scheduling, staff, curriculum, and budget;

       (ii) ensuring that teachers are effective and able to improve instruction by: (1) reviewing the quality of all staff and retaining only those who are determined to be effective and have the ability to be successful in the turnaround effort; (2) preventing ineffective teachers from transferring to these schools; and (3) providing job-embedded, ongoing professional development informed by the teacher evaluation and support systems and tied to teacher and student needs;

       (iii) redesigning the school day, week, or year to include additional time for student learning and teacher collaboration;

       (iv) strengthening the school's instructional program based on student needs and ensuring that the instructional program is research-based, rigorous, and aligned with State academic content standards;

       (v) using data to inform instruction and for continuous improvement, including by providing time for collaboration on the use of data;

       (vi) establishing a school environment that improves school safety and discipline and addressing other non-academic factors that impact student achievement, such as students' social, emotional, and health needs; and

       (vii) providing ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement?

2.D.iii.a (INCLUDING QUESTIONS (i)-(vii)) PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* *1 Yes, 6 No*	
Rationale	Only the steps in the process of intervention, not the specific interventions to be offered for different types of needs (and how these would be used in schools needing assistance) are described. The SEA's interventions do not include activities to address each of the above-listed turn-around principles.
Strengths	Requiring formative/benchmark assessments and data-driven instruction in all schools were seen as positive by the peers. The SEA has identified a research base that supports a framework for turnaround principles. However, the SEA has not yet put in place a plan to use this body of research in turnaround activities with LEAs and schools.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	Peers aren't clear if the system proposed by the state would actually capture the lowest achieving 5% of students. With multiple measures used in A-F grading system, peers cannot confirm that the lowest achieving 5% of Title I schools have been/will be captured as priority schools. What the State has identified as interventions for the priority schools does not align to the USED turnaround principles and are not a comprehensive or coherent set of intervention strategies. There is no structure in place for interventions in priority schools. Only multiple lists of activities, not a strong or coherent framework for intervening in priority schools, have been provided by the State. The budget review process is not sufficient as a capacity-building activity.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	The SEA may wish to examine the Center for Innovation and Improvement (CII) tools around its School Improvement Grant. In addition, the SEA may wish to consider the role of the LEA in school improvement activities.

b. Has the SEA identified practices to be implemented that meet the turnaround principles and are likely to —

(i) increase the quality of instruction in priority schools;

(ii) improve the effectiveness of the leadership and the teaching in these schools; and

(iii) improve student achievement and, where applicable, graduation rates for all students, including English Learners, students with disabilities, and the lowest-achieving students?

2.D.iii.b (INCLUDING QUESTIONS (i)-(iii)) PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* *0 Yes, 7 No*	
Rationale	The SEA does not appear to be far enough in the planning process for peers to comment on the plans that were provided by the SEA.
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	Only the steps in the process were described. Details on which practices will be employed to increase the quality of instruction, to improve the effectiveness of leadership and teaching in these schools, to improve student achievement and, where applicable, graduation rates for all students, including English Learners, students with disabilities, and the lowest-achieving students are not provided. Although the State's request lists a number of potential practices, how these would be deployed is not described. A list of potential practices is a start, but it is not adequate by itself.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text

c.   Has the SEA indicated that it will ensure that each of its priority schools implements the selected intervention for at least three years?

2.D.iii.c PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* *0 Yes,7 No*	
Rationale	The SEA does not appear to be far enough in the planning process for peers to comment on the plans that were provided by the SEA.
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	There is not an assurance that interventions will be used for at least three years, since the SEA indicates that schools can exit from Priority status in two years. In addition, peers were not certain that Priority schools will implement any intervention for at least 3 years on their own.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text

2.D.iv Is the SEA's proposed timeline for ensuring that LEAs that have one or more priority schools implement meaningful interventions aligned with the turnaround principles in each priority school no later than the 2014–2015 school year reasonable and likely to result in implementation of the interventions in these schools?

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

2.D.iv PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* 0 Yes, 7 No	
Rationale	The SEA does not appear to be far enough in the planning process for peers to comment on the plans that were provided by the SEA. While lists of potentially meaningful interventions are listed in the State's request, peers are not certain that the lists will lead to implementation of the interventions in the affected schools by the deadline.
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	Peers were unable to tell if meaningful interventions will be offered to LEAs and schools, and if so, whether these will be implemented by the identified schools.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text

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

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

2.D.v and 2.D.v.a PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* 0 Yes, 7 No	
Rationale	Peers felt that because schools can be placed into priority status because they received D/F or F/D grades, but these same grades can permit schools to exit priority status, it is unclear how to tell if these schools have made significant progress.
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	Using the same grades for entry and exit from priority status may be confusing to schools and may not encourage significant change on their part. Peers were not certain that significant change is required of schools to exit priority status.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text

2.E   Focus Schools

2.E.i   Did the SEA describe its methodology for identifying a number of low-performing schools equal to at least 10 percent of the State's Title I schools as focus schools?

2.E.i PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* *7 Yes, 0 No*	
Rationale	The SEA describes a methodology that does result in the identification of a number of low-performing schools that equals at least 10 percent of the state's Title I schools as focus schools.
Strengths	The SEA described how it selected 10 percent of its schools as focus schools.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	No text
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text

2.E.ii   Did the SEA include a list of its focus schools?

a.   Did the SEA identify a number of focus schools equal to at least 10 percent of the State's Title I schools?

b.   In identifying focus schools, was the SEA's methodology based on the achievement and lack of progress over a number of years of one or more subgroups of students identified under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) in terms of proficiency on the statewide assessments that are part of the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system or, at the high school level, graduation rates for one or more subgroups?

c.   Did the SEA's methodology result in the identification of focus schools that have —

(i)   the largest within-school gaps between the highest-achieving subgroup or subgroups and the lowest-achieving subgroup or subgroups or, at the high school level, the largest within-school gaps in the graduation rate; or

(ii)   a subgroup or subgroups with low achievement or, at the high school level, a low graduation rate?

2.E.ii (INCLUDING QUESTIONS a-c) **PANEL RESPONSE** *Tally of Peer Responses:* *0 Yes,7 No*	
Rationale	Peers believe that although a list of focus schools were presented by the SEA in its request, they are unsure whether the SEA's methodology results in the identification of focus schools by either i) the largest within-school gaps between the highest-achieving subgroup or subgroups and the lowest-achieving subgroup or subgroups or, at the high school level, the largest within-school gaps in the graduation rate; or ii) a subgroup or subgroups with low achievement or, at the high school level, a low graduation rate.
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	The SEA's methodology described is not built on finding the largest gaps between subgroups, the lowest achieving subgroups, or the largest graduation rate gaps. It is unclear how A-F grading system ties to identification of these types of focus schools.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text

2.E.iii   Did the SEA describe the process and timeline it will use to ensure that each LEA identifies the needs of its focus schools and their students and provide examples of and justifications for the interventions the SEA will require its focus schools to implement to improve the performance of students who are furthest behind?

> *Has the SEA demonstrated that the interventions it has identified are effective at increasing student achievement in schools with similar characteristics, needs, and challenges as the schools the SEA has identified as focus schools?*

> *Has the SEA identified interventions that are appropriate for different levels of schools (elementary, middle, high) and that address different types of school needs (e.g., all-students, targeted at the lowest-achieving students)?*

2.E.iii PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* *0 Yes, 7 No*	
Rationale	The SEA did not describe the process and timeline it will use to ensure that each LEA identifies the needs of its focus schools and their students. It also did not provide examples of and justifications for the interventions the SEA will require its focus schools to implement to improve the performance of students who are furthest behind.
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	While they require and identified turnaround principles, by allowing LEAs to select four of seven gives too much discretion. It is not clear that the turnaround principles selected by schools will be those that have been shown to help meet the needs of sub-group(s) of students who need assistance. This passive approach to assistance to LEAs may not help them improve student achievement for student groups who need such assistance.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	Key in focus schools is to use a robust diagnostic tool or tools that would permit schools in conjunction with their LEAs to pin point the interventions most useful in addressing the needs of the particular sub-groups of students in their school. Peers suggest the SEA look to CII SIG for models and tools that it could use with LEAs and that they can use with their schools. This suggestion applies to several of the areas where SEA or LEA interventions are required.

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

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

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

2.E.iv and 2.E.iv.a PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* 0 Yes, 7 No	
Rationale	Peers believe that the SEA's criteria used for schools to exit focus status do not represent having to make significant progress in improving student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps.
Strengths	The SEA has described exit criteria in its request.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	Peers could not tell from the SEA's request how much progress is required to exit focus status, due to issues with the grading system. Criteria used seem to set low expectations of school change.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text

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

2.F   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? Are those incentives and supports likely to improve student achievement, close achievement gaps, and increase the quality of instruction for students?

2.F PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* *0 Yes, 7 No*	
Rationale	Peers believe that nothing in the overall system provides confidence that schools will be addressing low subgroup performance. Thus, gaps in sub-group performance may not be addressed in focus or priority schools.
Strengths	The SEA has also identified a set of schools, that it has named "strategic schools," for assistance.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	The SEA does not have approved AMOs. The several interventions described in the SEA's request evidence a lack of a school-level needs assessment, interventions around needs shown by such an assessment, and interventions that have been shown to be effective in meeting identified needs. There did not appear to be any differentiation of supports provided across types of schools.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	The SEA needs to organize the several school improvement frameworks provided in its request and determine a set of interventions to be provided to LEAs and schools.

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?*

2.G.i PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* *0 Yes, 7 No*	
Rationale	Peers do not believe that the SEA's process for ensuring timely and comprehensive monitoring of, and technical assistance for, LEA implementation of interventions in priority and focus schools will likely result in successful implementation of these interventions and in progress on leading indicators and student outcomes in these schools.
Strengths	Peers believe that it is a good idea to assess conditions at the LEA level, as well as the school level, using an audit focused at each level.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	The SEA has identified a number of audit tools. However, it has not identified how they would be helpful to schools. The SEA needs to work with LEAs to help build their capacity to assist their schools.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	Crosswalk school improvement frameworks, then consolidate to build coherence. Link frameworks to the Common Core State Standards, the PARCC assessment system, and teacher evaluation. The SEA should also build curriculum and instructional models for use by LEAs, perhaps by joining in collaborative efforts to develop such curriculum materials.

ii.   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.ii PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* *0 Yes, 7 No*	
Rationale	The SEA has not indicated how it will hold LEAs accountable for schools' implementation of appropriate interventions that lead to improved student achievement.
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	The SEA's request evidences a lack of attention to its LEAs. Interventions appear to flow from the SEA to individual schools that seems to show little systematic effort to build LEA capacity. In the work with priority schools, in particular, LEAs seems to be an afterthought.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text

iii.   Is the SEA's process for ensuring sufficient support for implementation in priority schools, focus schools, and other Title I schools identified 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?

2.G.iii PANEL RESPONSE Tally of Peer Responses: *0 Yes, 7 No*	
Rationale	Peers do not believe that the SEA adequately addressed how it will use the flexibility it is requesting and this will result in the successful implementation of interventions that lead to improved student achievement.
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	No information is provided in the SEA request about how the SEA will use the funding flexibilities it is seeking. As noted earlier, use of Title I, Section 1003(a) funds for school commendation is not permitted.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text

Principle 2 Overall Review

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

PRINCIPLE 2 OVERALL REVIEW PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* 0 Yes, 7 No	
Rationale	The A-F grading system as designed does not meet the Flexibility guidelines, nor does it seem likely to improve student achievement or school performance for all sub-groups of New Mexico's students.
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	ESEA subgroups are not utilized either in accountability or support. The use of conditioned status calculations provides adjustments to student performance due to demographic characteristics, rather than addressing the discrepancies through improved instruction and learning opportunities for affected students. Peers believe that the assumptions in the model run counter to treating all children the same in the model, plus the system is not transparent to parents or educators. The A-F grading system as designed does not meet all of the Flexibility guidelines. A more detailed technical assistance plan from the SEA to LEAs and from LEAs to schools is needed. The SEA needs to describe in much greater detail how it will assist LEAs to help their schools. More substantial change should be required of schools to exit priority or focus school status than the SEA has proposed.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	The SEA should seek assistance to revise and improve its grading system and systems of support to improve student achievement for all groups of students.

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 three options below?

<u>If the SEA selected Option A:</u>
If the SEA has not already developed any guidelines consistent with Principle 3:

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

3.A.i, OPTION A.i PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* *0 Yes, 5 No*	
Rationale	Peers are unable to make a determination; there is not enough information to determine if it is likely that New Mexico will be able to successfully adopt guidelines by the end of the 2011-2012 school year.
Strengths	New Mexico has provided draft legislation, as of January 27, 2012.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	No text
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text
☐ *Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option B or Option C*	

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

3.A.i, OPTION A.ii PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* *3 Yes, 2 No*	
Rationale	Based on what peer reviewers heard in the call with New Mexico, peers feel there was sufficient involvement of teachers and principals in the development of these guidelines.
Strengths	• New Mexico indicated that the legislation was based on Task Force recommendations • Teachers, Principals and NEA members were on the task force • Technical Assistance Council and a Statewide Advisory Council will be included in development of the guidelines. • Call with New Mexico indicated that there was engagement with principals and principals
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• Peers would have liked to have seen evidence of communication/collaboration with the Union • While legislation is very detailed, involvement comes during implementation
Technical Assistance Suggestions	Would be helpful to have letters of support or endorsement from stakeholder groups.
☐ *Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option B or Option C*	

Note to Peers: Staff will review iii.

If the SEA selected Option B:
    If the SEA has already developed and adopted one or more, but not all, guidelines consistent with Principle 3:

Note to Peers: Staff will review i and iii.

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

3.A.i, OPTION B.ii PANEL RESPONSE	
Tally of Peer Responses:	
NA	
Rationale	No text
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	No text
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text
☒ *Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A or Option C*	

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

3.A.i OPTION B.iv PANEL RESPONSE	
Tally of Peer Responses:	
NA	
Rationale	No text
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	No text
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text
☒ *Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A or Option C*	

v.   Did the SEA have sufficient involvement of teachers and principals in the development of these guidelines? Does the SEA's plan include sufficient involvement of teachers and principals in the development of the remaining guidelines?

3.A.i OPTION B.v PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* NA	
Rationale	No text
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	No text
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text
☒ *Not Applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A or Option C*	

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

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

3.A.i, OPTION C.i **PANEL RESPONSE** *Tally of Peer Responses:* NA	
Rationale	No text
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	No text
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text
☒ *Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A or Option B*	

Note to Peers: Staff will review ii.

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

3.A.i OPTION C.iii **PANEL RESPONSE** *Tally of Peer Responses:* *NA*	
Rationale	No text
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	No text
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text
☒ *Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A or Option B*	

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

3.A.ii For any teacher and principal evaluation and support systems for which the SEA has developed and adopted guidelines, consistent with Principle 3, are they systems that:

a. Will be used for continual improvement of instruction?

➤ *Are the SEA's guidelines likely to result in support for teachers that will enable them to improve their instructional practice?*

3.A.ii.a PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* *NA*	
Rationale	No text
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	No text
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text
☒ *Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option C*	

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

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

3.A.ii.b PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* *2 Yes, 5 No*	
Rationale	No text
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	No text
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text
☒ *Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option C*	

c. Use multiple valid measures in determining performance levels, including as a significant factor data on student growth for all students (including English Learners and students with disabilities), and other measures of professional practice (which may be gathered through multiple formats and sources, such as observations based on rigorous teacher performance standards, teacher portfolios, and student and parent surveys)?

(i) Does the SEA have a process for ensuring that all measures that are included in determining performance levels are valid measures, meaning measures that are clearly related to increasing student academic achievement and school performance, and are implemented in a consistent and high-quality manner across schools within an LEA?

3.A.ii.c and 3.A.ii.c(i) PANEL RESPONSE Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 7 No	
Rationale	No text
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	No text
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text
☒ Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option C	

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

3.A.ii.c(ii) PANEL RESPONSE Tally of Peer Responses: NA	
Rationale	No text
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	No text
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text
☒ Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option C	

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

3.A.ii.c(iii) PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* *NA*	
Rationale	No text
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	No text
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text
☒ *Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option C*	

d. Evaluate teachers and principals on a regular basis?

3.A.ii.d PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* *NA*	
Rationale	No text
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	No text
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text
☒ *Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option C*	

e. Provide clear, timely, and useful feedback, including feedback that identifies needs and guides professional development?
   ➢ *Will the SEA's guidelines ensure that evaluations occur with a frequency sufficient to ensure that feedback is provided in a timely manner to inform effective practice?*

   ➢ *Are the SEA's guidelines likely to result in differentiated professional development that meets the needs of teachers?*

3.A.ii.e PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* *NA*	
Rationale	No text
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	No text
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text
☒ *Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option C*	

f.   Will be used to inform personnel decisions?

3.A.ii.f PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* *NA*	No text
Rationale	
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	No text
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text
☒ *Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option C*	

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

3.B   Is the SEA's process for ensuring that each LEA develops, adopts, pilots, and implements, with the involvement of teachers and principals, evaluation and support systems consistent with the SEA's adopted guidelines likely to lead to high-quality local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems?

➢ *Does the SEA have a process for reviewing and approving an LEA's teacher and principal evaluation and support systems to ensure that they are consistent with the SEA's guidelines and will result in the successful implementation of such systems?*

➢ *Does the SEA have a process for ensuring that an LEA develops, adopts, pilots, and implements its teacher and principal evaluation and support systems with the involvement of teachers and principals?*

➢ *Did the SEA describe the process it will use to ensure that all measures used in an LEA's evaluation and support systems are valid, meaning measures that are clearly related to increasing student academic achievement and school performance, and are implemented in a consistent and high-quality manner across schools within an LEA?*

➢ *Is the SEA's plan likely to be successful in ensuring that LEAs meet the timeline requirements by either (1) piloting evaluation and support systems no later than the 2013−2014 school year and implementing evaluation and support systems consistent with the requirements described above no later than the 2014−2015 school year; or (2) implementing these systems no later than the 2013−2014 school year?*

➢ *Do timelines reflect a clear understanding of what steps will be necessary and reflect a logical sequencing and spacing of the key steps necessary to implement evaluation and support systems consistent with the required timelines?*

➢ *Is the SEA plan for providing adequate guidance and other technical assistance to LEAs in developing and implementing teacher and principal evaluation and support systems likely to lead to successful implementation?*

➢ *Is the pilot broad enough to gain sufficient feedback from a variety of types of educators, schools, and classrooms to inform full implementation of the LEA's evaluation and support systems?*

3.B PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* *0 Yes, 5 No*	No text
Rationale	No new information was provided following the first peer review process. Peers are still not confident that LEAs will develop, adopt, pilot, and implement, 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.
Strengths	No text
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	If the legislation is adopted, the rollout activities for implementation of the plan are not described. Given that NM needs legislative approval for the budget, it is uncertain whether SEA will have capacity to implement the plan. The request from the SEA provides little information on the evaluation process of plans developed by LEAs, except for the timeline for implementation.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	- The SEA should describe in greater details the steps the SEA will need to take to implement the changes in teacher and principal evaluation systems - Provide details about when work committees will be convened, which groups will be involved - Pilot guidelines pre-legislation

Principle 3 Overall Review

Is the SEA's plan for the SEA's and LEAs' development and implementation of teacher and principal evaluation and support systems comprehensive, coherent, and likely to increase the quality of instruction for students and improve student achievement? If not, what aspects are not addressed or need to be improved upon?

PRINCIPLE 3 OVERALL REVIEW PANEL RESPONSE *Tally of Peer Responses:* *0 Yes, 5 No*	No text
Rationale	New Mexico's request does not contain a comprehensive plan for development and implementation of a teacher and principal evaluation and support system that will result in an increase in the quality of instruction for students and improve student achievement.
Strengths	• Submitted draft legislation • Forming the technical advisory council
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	No text
Technical Assistance Suggestions	• In the phone call New Mexico mentioned many things they were doing to assist in implementation; however this information was missing from the written submission. • New Mexico needs a detailed implementation plan that meets the criteria in the Principle. • New Mexico needs to provide more details on who will do the training, who will train the observers and trainers, what kind of TA will the SEA provide as LEAs develop and implement.

Overall Request Evaluation

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

OVERALL REQUEST EVALUATION PANEL RESPONSE	
Rationale	In the case of Principles 1 and 3, it is too early to tell whether the initial directions described in the SEA's request will result in plans and activities that meet the principles of the waiver request. The early direction for Principle 3 seems promising. For Principle 2, the A-F grading system as designed does not meet the Flexibility guidelines, nor does it seem likely to improve student achievement or school performance for all sub-groups of New Mexico's students.
Strengths	No text

Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	Principle 1: Several shortcomings and missing components were noted by the peers. The plan provided by the SEA is not a high quality plan, as required for this waiver request. Several deficiencies were especially noted in Section I.B. The involvement of educators, as well as their representatives, and diverse community groups, such as community-based organizations, civil rights organizations, organizations representing students with disabilities and English Learners, and Indian tribes did not appear to be substantial. Peers were not sure that educators and community groups will support the plan or the steps needed to implement it, since they were not included in the planning process. Principle 2: The A-F grading system as designed does not meet all of the Flexibility guidelines. ESEA subgroups are not utilized in either accountability or support. The use of conditioned status calculations provides adjustments to student performance due to demographic characteristics, rather than addressing the discrepancies through improved instruction and learning opportunities for affected students. Peers believe that the assumptions in the model run counter to treating all children the same in the model, plus the system is not transparent to parents or educators. A more detailed technical assistance plan from the SEA to LEAs and from LEAs to schools is needed. The SEA needs to describe in much greater detail how it will assist LEAs to help their schools. More substantial change should be required of schools to exit priority or focus school status than the SEA has proposed. Principle 3: There is not an evaluation plan that can be evaluated by the peer reviewers. The details (e.g., anticipated activities and schedule) needed to assure that the evaluation system will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve student achievement was not included in the SEA request. There has been insufficient engagement of teachers and principals to date. Without teacher, principal, or professional group involvement, the whole-hearted implementation of the evaluation system may be compromised. The evaluation of educational personnel who work with English learners and students with disabilities can be especially challenging to consider within an educator evaluation system, yet these students are explicitly excluded from consideration by state statute. This does not bode well for assuring that the educators who work with these students are of the highest level of competency.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	No text