

# ESEA Flexibility

## Request Review Form



**State Request:** Wisconsin

**Date:** March 21, 2012

## REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF REQUESTS

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

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

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

Review Guidance

Consultation

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

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

**Consultation Question 1 Peer Panel Response**

**Tally of Peer Responses: 4 Yes, 1 No**

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI) meaningfully engaged and solicited input on its request from teachers and their representatives.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DPI met with and solicited consultation from the States’ two major teachers unions, educators of students with disabilities, and educators of English Learners.</li> <li>• The statewide American Federation of Teachers-Wisconsin (AFT-Wisconsin) and Wisconsin Education Association Council (WEAC) hosted eight listening sessions during the Fall 2011 which were all attended by state superintendent. Additional input was gathered through a Facebook page.</li> <li>• DPI posted the flexibility request draft for a two week public comment period. Of 700 respondents to the survey, 50% were teachers.</li> <li>• Follow-up meetings with teachers led to commitments to examine potential unintended consequences, a commitment for more complete report cards, and more rigorous high school graduation requirements that also honor the role of electives (requiring 6.5 elective requirements to graduate).</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some panel members believe there was insufficient evidence that DPI modified the request based on input from teachers, as opposed to teachers unions.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explain how teachers will continue to stay engaged and provide feedback to the accountability system as it is being implemented.</li> </ul>

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 Peer Panel Response**

*Tally of Peer Responses: 4 Yes, 1 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The SEA meaningfully engaged and solicited input on its request from a variety of stakeholders including administrators, parents, community-based organizations, legislators, and organizations representing students with disabilities and English Learners.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The School and District Accountability Design Team allowed for in-depth analysis and specific feedback to inform the proposed accountability system.</li> <li>• Based on feedback from disability advocacy groups, the cell size used for accountability calculations was changed from 40 to 20 and a new, combined subgroup was included in the request.</li> <li>• Based on feedback from stakeholders, DPI will raise cut scores on current assessments to reflect higher expectations for students during the two-year transition between current and next-generation assessments.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many of the consultations were in the form of briefings, in which plans were presented to stakeholders, rather than allowing stakeholders to participate in the creation of proposals.</li> <li>• One member of the panel believed that there was insufficient engagement with English learner stakeholders and cultural and linguistically diverse communities.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider ways to continue to involve a diverse set of stakeholders in the implementation of the proposal.</li> </ul>

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

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

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

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

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

**1.B Peer Panel Response, Part A**

*Tally of Peer Responses: 1 Yes, 4 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	While DPI’s plan to transition to and implement college and career-ready standards complies with the ESEA flexibility deadlines, and includes some promising strategies, the panel is not sufficiently confident that all teachers will be prepared to teach CCSS by the 2013-2014 school year.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wisconsin was the first State to adopt the Common Core standards following work with Achieve and the Partnership for 21st Century Skills, and has created an active college and career ready standards (CCSS) implementation workgroup that is intended to create consistent language, materials, and presentations to connect key statewide initiatives around the CCSS.</li> <li>• The CCSS implementation team has convened a statewide literacy team to incorporate CCSS literacy standards across contents and subject areas. Members of the Disciplinary Literacy Team are in the process of creating materials for all subject matters and subgroups of educators are developed literacy-related Google sites to share resources with other educators.</li> <li>• DPI’s proposal to establish a statewide Standards, Instruction and Assessment Center (SIA), to centralize expertise and resources, is a promising strategy for preventing duplication of efforts in each district and school (pg. 22); the design model for this office is built on the successful RTI model in Wisconsin of successful professional learning communities, regional coaches, and trainers.</li> <li>• The panel applauds the state’s efforts to roll-out classroom level data and an educator resource portal to connect teachers practitioners across the state and provide common resources.</li> </ul>

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While the proposal for the roll-out of the SIA center (Appendix 4, 4a, and 4b) provides some elements of a plan, it would be strengthened with additional details on key milestones, parties responsible, resources and significant obstacles. The current plan leaves the panel unsure about the likelihood of successful implementation at the district and school level in time for the new CCSS assessments.</li> <li>• The proposal does not sufficiently describe how the state, through the SIA, will ensure the development of interim assessments, and formative tools aligned to the CCCSS, in order to monitor progress towards meeting new, higher standards and to support interventions in priority and focus schools (Principle 2) as well as address the need for assessments for educator evaluation (Principle 3).</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a plan for implementation with key milestones, parties responsible, resources, and significant obstacles especially in regard to the roll-out of interim assessments, formative tools, instructional data, and teacher portals.</li> </ul>

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

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

*Tally of Peer Responses: 3 Yes; 2 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The SEA’s plan holds promise that all students, including English Learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students, will gain access to and learning content aligned with the college- and career-ready standards.

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DPI is discussing ways to increase the rigor for its alternative assessment based on alternate achievement standards.</li> <li>• Being built on the model of professional learning communities, coaching and training employed by the successful RTI Center, the Center for Standards, Instruction and Assessment holds great promise for providing meaningful support for educators to make the common core accessible to students with disabilities and English Learners.</li> <li>• Wisconsin is the lead state for World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) to build the next generation of English proficiency exams.</li> <li>• DPI is working with Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs) to prepare materials to support college and career readiness for students with disabilities and English Learners.</li> <li>• Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles will be employed in developing resources through the SIA Center.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While many promising practices have been described, the proposal required additional specificity, particularly in regard to how each of the proposed strategies will be implemented in districts and schools.</li> <li>• In the absence of robust screening and data-monitoring systems (aligned to CCSS), it will prove difficult for teachers to target interventions for specific students and sub-groups.</li> <li>• The proposal does not detail, in great specificity, what types of professional development teachers will receive and the evidence the state has that the professional development will result in more effective teaching.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporate into the more detailed plan recommended above, more explicit activities related to supporting districts and schools and all educators to develop greater capacity to make the common core accessible to students with disabilities and English Learners.</li> <li>• Develop a transition plan for the new assessments (Smarter Balance, Dynamic Learning Maps, ASSETS) and a plan for developing aligned formative assessments that can include English Learners and students with disabilities.</li> <li>• As discussed above, ensure the development of interim assessments and formative tools aligned to CCSS in order to support interventions and monitor progress for sub-group populations.</li> </ul>

**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 Peer Panel Response**

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

*Tally of Peer Responses: NA*

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



**Principle 1 Overall Review**

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

**Principle 1 Overall Review Peer Panel Response**

*Tally of Peer Responses: 3 Yes, 2 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	DPI has proposed a thoughtful approach to preparing educators to implement the common core effectively in all of its schools. The panel believes the development of one statewide resource center built on the design of the successful RTI Center holds much promise. That said, the panel is concerned that DPI has not yet developed a comprehensive plan for implementation.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establishing the Standards, Instruction and Assessment Center (SIA) to centralize expertise and resources is a promising strategy for preventing duplication of efforts in each district/school. The panel applauds DPI’s efforts to coordinate and streamline curricular efforts and professional development.</li> <li>Wisconsin is the lead state for WIDA, the new English Learners assessment being designed to align with the common core standards.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The peers do not see evidence of deliberate action of DPI to coordinate and integrate across the SEA the activities across the respective principles. This may lead to undue burden, confusion, and multiple initiatives at the school level.</li> <li>The absence of a detailed plan for developing, implementing and assessing key components of the strategy such as the Center for Standards, Instruction and Assessment with key activities, timelines, benchmarks, persons responsible, resources, etc. leaves the panel unsure about the likelihood of successful implementation at the district and school level.</li> <li>The proposal does not sufficiently describe how DPI, through the SIA, will ensure the development of interim assessments, and formative tools aligned to the CCCSS, in order to monitor progress towards meeting new, higher standards, and to support interventions in priority and focus schools (Principle 2), as well as address the need for assessments for educator evaluation (Principle 3).</li> </ul>

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a plan for implementation with key activities, timelines, benchmarks, etc. with attention to developing educator interest in using and applying the rich resources DPI is intending to make available and the development of interim assessments and tools</li> <li>• Incorporate into the more detailed plan recommended above, more explicit activities related to supporting districts and schools and all educators, to develop greater capacity to make the common core accessible to students with disabilities and English Learners.</li> <li>• Be more deliberate in integrating and coordinating the activities described in Principle 1 with other activities described elsewhere in the proposal (Principles 2 and 3).</li> </ul>

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

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

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

#### 2.A.i Peer Panel Response

Tally of Peer Responses: 1 Yes; 5 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	DPI proposes a differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system, and a plan to implement this system no later than the 2012–2013 school year; however the panel is concerned about the plan’s likely impact on student achievement.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DPI has created an index to recognize and differentiate schools based on four subscales of: achievement, growth, closing gaps, and students on track to graduation/postsecondary readiness.</li> <li>• DPI has proposed multiple promising programs, assistance mechanisms, and interventions to reward high-performing schools and address achievement and gaps in low-performing schools.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While the index contains multiple measures, including subgroup gaps, it does not make achievement gaps among student sub-groups sufficiently visible.</li> <li>• The interventions and supports proposed, while promising, do not sufficiently instill confidence in the panel that they will lead to dramatic, rapid improvements in student achievements.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider mechanisms to make subgroup achievement gaps in the state’s index more visible.</li> <li>• Detail and align supports for priority and focus schools to ensure increases in student achievement; provide more rigor to exit criteria.</li> <li>• Coordinate efforts to ensure that all subgroups have access to high quality instruction and needed supports.</li> </ul>

- 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 Peer Panel Response**

*Tally of Peer Responses: 4 Yes; 2 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
Rationale	DPI has proposed an accountability system that provides differentiated recognition, accountability and support for all LEAs in the State and for all Title I schools, however, the system could be strengthened.
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state's accountability index, the core of the system, provides multiple measures for school differentiation.</li> <li>• The index prioritizes both graduation rates and “on-track to graduation” measures for all students and subgroups.</li> <li>• The system takes into account several other important factors including test participation, absenteeism and drop-out rate by using a Red Flag system.</li> <li>• The system has an index structure for districts as well, one that is based on the performance of all schools, and all subgroups, but ensures that districts do not escape a Red Flag if they have a single school in the lowest category.</li> <li>• Some panel members believe that it is a strength that the system relies on expertise developed by the Colorado model of “Catch up, keep up, move up”.</li> </ul>

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DPI’s plan does not describe a fully integrated system that provides the interventions, supports, and monitoring systems needed to ensure that English Learners and students with disabilities will have meaningful access to high quality instruction aligned to College and Career Ready Standards.</li> <li>• It is not clear how data for students who participate in alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards will be included in the system, especially the computation of the accountability index.</li> <li>• The index system may prove complex for school personnel or the public to understand.</li> <li>• DPI has clarified the use of high need combined subgroups. If two or all three of these subgroups have less than 20 students tested, then a combined subgroup will be formed by combining the two/three subgroups with less than 20 students. It appears that if only one subgroup has less than 20 students tested, the results for that subgroup will not be included in the accountability index.</li> </ul>
Technical Assistance Suggestions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a plan for explaining the index system to educators, parents, and the general public.</li> <li>• Clarify how students who participate in the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards will be included in the system.</li> <li>• Unpack the numbers behind the index in order to demonstrate that schools that qualify for the “Meeting Expectations” label, do in fact have most of their students at a high level of performance and growth.</li> <li>• When only one subgroup has less than 20 students tested, DPI should combine that group with one of the other subgroups so that the results of all subgroups are included in the accountability index.</li> </ul>

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

**2.A.i.b Peer Panel Response**

*Tally of Peer Responses: 1 Yes, 5 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	DPI’s differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system creates incentives and provides support, however, the panel is not sufficiently confident that the supports will be effective in closing achievement gaps.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DPI has developed a system that will identify schools with serious needs.</li> <li>• The SIA will provide a strong organizational structure for providing resources related to the Common Core State Standards.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal provides less detail on supports than on incentives. A coordinated support system that would close the gaps for all subgroups was not well articulated.</li> <li>• There was an inadequate description of how the results will be monitored, and services targeted, to ensure that gap reducing goals are met.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify how the results will be monitored, and services provided, to ensure that gap reducing goals for all subgroups are met.</li> </ul>

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

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

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

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

- c. Note to Peers: Staff will review 2.A.ii.c

**2.A.ii.b PEER PANEL RESPONSE**

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

*Tally of Peer Responses: NA*

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

**2.B Set Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives**

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

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

**If the SEA selected Option C:**

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

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

- *Are these AMOs ambitious but achievable given the State’s existing proficiency rates and any other relevant circumstances in the State?*
- *Will these AMOs result in a significant number of children being on track to be college- and career-ready?*

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

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

*Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes; 6 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The panel is unable to assess the validity of the AMOs because they do not yet exist.
<i>Strengths</i>	None.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	None.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Endeavor to develop methods for displaying the progress of all students and subgroups in attaining the AMOs ( <i>e.g.</i> , on the State report card).



**2.C Reward Schools**

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

**2.C.i Reward School methodology**

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	None provided.
<i>Strengths</i>	None.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	The panel is concerned about the potential of rewarding schools that have significant subgroup gaps.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Provide additional detail in the methodology to ensure that the method proposed does not reward schools with large achievement gaps.

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

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

**2.C.iii PEER PANEL RESPONSE**

*Tally of Peer Responses: 6 Yes; 0 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The recognition and, if applicable rewards, proposed by DPI for its highest-performing and high-progress schools is likely to be considered meaningful by the schools.</li> </ul>
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPI has built upon a long history of recognizing outstanding schools, and has consulted a wide variety of stakeholders in improving its quite elaborate reward and recognition program.</li> <li>The teacher fellowship programs will be particularly attractive for teachers.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPI does not define what “significant” means when it uses the term (e.g., significant gaps between subgroups), and some members of the panel are concerned that DPI may reward schools with subgroup gaps.</li> <li>DPI insufficiently attends to the magnitude of the achievement, progress, gaps of subgroups in its highest performing and high progress schools.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider using methods of identifying high progress schools that do not reward schools with subgroup gaps.</li> <li>Consider rewarding high performing charter schools with replication and expansion</li> </ul>

**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)) Peer Panel Response***Tally of Peer Responses: 3 Yes, 3 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The request and addendum documents provide sufficient, albeit not detailed, documentation of DPI's plan to incorporate all turnaround principles into efforts on behalf of priority schools.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DPI will require the Districts who wish to retain current principals in priority schools to provide data on effectiveness of principal.</li> <li>• DPI will require all priority schools to add an additional 300 hours of instructional time.</li> <li>• DPI will require priority schools to implement RtI models for behavior and academics and use of data.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DPI does not operationalize turnaround principles in sufficient detail (e.g., what kind of data, and what progress will be required of principals retained in priority schools, how will DPI mandate 300 hours of instructional time on the local level and what authorities it has to do so.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a detailed plan for how DPI will specifically ensure that each of the proposals identified for priority schools are of the highest-quality and likely to be implemented. Include in the plan, specific milestones, parties responsible, resources provides, and statewide authorities to ensure that the local districts and schools in fact, implement the turnaround principles.</li> </ul>

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

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

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	There is insufficient evidence provided that the interventions identified for priority schools will increase the quality of instruction in priority schools, improve the effectiveness of leadership and teaching in these schools, and improve student achievement.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DPI will require an additional 300 hours of instruction for all students in priority schools (extended learning time).</li> <li>• Based on feedback from stakeholders, DPI is not requiring Supplemental Educational Services (SES).</li> <li>• DPI is leveraging its historic success with the RtI model and a statewide system of RtI to support priority schools.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Absent language describing closure, state takeover, or comparably strong consequences for priority school's failure to significantly improve student achievement after three years, the panel is very concerned that neither districts nor the priority schools will implement turnaround strategies with the urgency that the schools' low performance demands. Upon review, the panel did not find Wisconsin's Act 215 to require sufficiently strong interventions in low-performing schools and districts.</li> <li>• It is unclear how DPI will truly monitor and ensure that districts place highly-skilled leaders and teachers in priority schools aligned to effective systems of evaluation (Principle 3).</li> <li>• It is unclear how DPI will truly ensure that all turnaround principles outlined in the addendum are, in fact, implemented in priority schools.</li> <li>• It is unclear how DPI plans to align other initiatives described in its proposal (Principle 1 and 3) with efforts on behalf of priority schools in order to ensure consistency for school practitioners.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mandate closure, state takeover, or comparably strong consequences for a priority school's failure to significantly improve student achievement after three years.</li> <li>• Consider using the State's statutory authority to provide options or accountabilities for priority schools not making progress.</li> <li>• Consider including ambitious benchmarks in turnaround plans; DPI must provide evidence that it has the will and the capacity to hold priority schools accountable for such benchmarks.</li> </ul>

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

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

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

**2.D.iv Peer Panel Response**

*Tally of Peer Responses: 6 Yes; 0 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The SEA’s proposed timeline (chart on p. 68) ensures that LEAs with one or more priority schools will implement meaningful interventions no later than 2014-2015 school year.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA’s proposed timeline (chart on p. 68) ensures that LEAs with one or more priority schools will implement meaningful interventions no later than 2014-2015 school year.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	No weaknesses noted.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	No technical assistance suggestions provided.

**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 PEER PANEL RESPONSE**

*Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes; 6 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	DPI’s exit criteria do not ensure that schools have made significant progress in improving student achievement..
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The panel found no strengths in this area.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under the proposed criteria, a school can attain marginal improvements and still exit priority status</li> <li>• The proposed criteria do not address the need to ensure sustained improvement or evidence of capacity to continue improvements past the three years.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consult original diagnostics, needs assessments and benchmarks to create, meaningful, targeted benchmarks for exit that ensure sustained growth. Include implementation, leading, and lagging indicators such as leadership capacity, evidence of teaching effectiveness, etc.</li> <li>• As noted above, require meaningful consequences for schools that do not make progress after three years. (e.g., closure, State takeover, restart, etc)</li> </ul>

**2.E Focus Schools**

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

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

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

**2.E.i.b Peer Panel Response**

*Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 6 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The panel was unable to reach a conclusion on this question at this time.
<i>Strengths</i>	None.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	None.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Run scenarios to ensure that in various methods of identifying focus schools DPI does not mask or dilute individual subgroup performance.

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



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

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

**2.E.iii Peer Panel Response**

*Tally of Peer Responses: 3 Yes, 3 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	DPI will identify and implement interventions in its focus schools by the 2012-2013 school year. DPI provides examples and a justification for promising intervention strategies centered on RtI.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DPI proposes coordinating initiatives through statewide RtI center.</li> <li>• DPI proposes additional interventions including Positive Behavior Intervention Schools (PBIS), an early warning system, and professional development.</li> <li>• Some panel members believe that the interventions described, such as the RtI intervention, are likely to improve the performance of low-performing students and reduce achievement gaps.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some panel members believe that the proposal would be strengthened with more explicit linkage to DPI’s efforts to ensure all students have access to CCSS in Principle 1.</li> <li>• DPI does not provide a high quality plan to ensure that proposed interventions will be implemented effectively in the schools and classrooms.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include explicit linkage to DPI’s efforts to ensure all students have access to CCSS in Principle 1.</li> <li>• Provide a detailed, high-quality plan to ensure that proposed interventions will be implemented effectively in schools and classrooms.</li> <li>• Consider aligning and coordinating strategies and timelines for priority and focus schools to ensure that if a focus school becomes a priority school (or vice versa, the interventions, frameworks, benchmarks, are not entirely new).</li> </ul>

**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 PEER PANEL RESPONSE**

Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 6 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	DPI’s exit criteria for focus schools do not ensure that schools have made significant progress.
<i>Strengths</i>	No strengths noted.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under the proposed criteria, a school can attain marginal improvements and still exit focus status.</li> <li>• The proposed criteria do not address the need to ensure sustained improvement or evidence of capacity to continue improvements past the three years.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consult original diagnostics, original benchmarks to meaningful, targeted benchmarks for exit that ensure sustain growth. Include both implementation, leading, and lagging indicators. Develop benchmarks that more specifically address the sub-group gaps. For example, if a school is identified as a focus school as a result of low performance of English Learners, create specific metrics related to the quality of English Learner instruction in that school as an exit criteria.</li> <li>• Ensure that schools and districts have sufficient incentives to address the needs of subgroups with urgency.</li> <li>• Create meaningful consequences for focus schools that do not make progress after three years such as closure, State takeover, restart, etc. Consider how to involve parents and stakeholders of communities representing specific sub-group populations.</li> </ul>

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

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

**2.F.i Peer Panel Response**

*Tally of Peer Responses: 4 Yes; 2 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	DPI’s differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system provides incentives and supports for other Title I schools that, based on the SEA’s new AMOs, are not making progress in improving student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal describes a variety of supports, primarily in the form of networks and centers, to provide support services to the other Title I schools.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal is almost silent on the types of incentives that would encourage schools to join the networks or use the support services, or that would encourage them to apply the strategies and expertise they would gain from these services.</li> <li>• The services and supports are promising, but there is no monitoring of the impact of the programs and services. Additionally, there is no evidence of alignment, coordination, or monitoring of the impact of the programs and services.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider ways to align supports for Title I schools with other supports described for priority, focus and other categories of schools so that there is consistent criteria for school excellence. Additionally, some of the supports and evidence of success of support to Title I schools might be consider in supporting priority schools.</li> </ul>

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

**2.F.ii Peer Panel Response**

*Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 6 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The incentives and supports, as described in the proposal are not likely to improve student achievement, close achievement gaps, and increase the quality of instruction for all students, including English Learners and students with disabilities.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RtI, if accompanied by a proper data-based progress monitoring system that ensures teacher access to timely data, might help improve the achievement for students targeted for intervention.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DPI does not adequately describe how RtI efforts will be coordinated.</li> <li>• DPI does not provide sufficient information regarding how instructional practices other than RtI will be used to improve the quality of instruction for English Learners and students with disabilities.</li> <li>• DPI does not provide detail on how supports for students will be coordinated with efforts described in Principle 1 and 3 of the flexibility request.</li> <li>• Some panel members believe that the proposal would be strengthened with more explicit linkages to DPI's efforts to ensure all students have access to CCSS (see Principle 1).</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide additional information regarding how RtI efforts will be coordinated and schools will have access to progress monitoring data.</li> <li>• Provide information about how other instructional practices (accommodations, universal design, etc.) will be used to improve the quality of instruction for English Learners and students with disabilities.</li> <li>• Provide information on how supports for students in Title I schools will be coordinated and aligned with supports for students in focus, priority and other schools and will be coordinated with other statewide initiatives described in Principles 1 and 3.</li> </ul>

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

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

**2.G (including i, ii, and iii) Peer Panel Response***Tally of Peer Responses: 2 Yes; 4 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
Rationale	DPI's process for ensuring timely and comprehensive monitoring of, and technical assistance for, LEA implementation of interventions in priority and focus schools is not likely to result in successful implementation of these interventions. While DPI provides some supports and capacity-building for LEAs, it does not sufficiently hold LEAs accountable for achieving urgent, dramatic improvement in priority, focus, and other Title I schools.
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DPI wisely recognizes the critical role LEAs play in school improvement.</li> <li>• DPI proposes a variety of methods of training and monitoring the work of LEAs in carrying out their work, including the Indistar online system, the requirement of Diagnostic Reviews and Turnaround Partners, and the assignment of department liaisons and regular school visits.</li> <li>• DPI will be working with districts in need of improvement. It also has a statutory requirement to provide special support services to the largest urban district, Milwaukee Public Schools.</li> <li>• Funding flexibility has the potential to support school wide reforms.</li> </ul>
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Without strong consequences for districts and schools who fail to improve, there is less likelihood districts and schools to take bold, urgent, and courageous measures to ensure dramatic increases in student achievement.</li> <li>• Some panel members believe that there is insufficient evidence that interventions are targeted to the specific, intensive needs of Title I schools.</li> <li>• DPI did not articulate a systemic process for helping LEAs build capacity to improve the instruction and achievement of English Learners and students with disabilities.</li> </ul>
Technical Assistance Suggestions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DPI must develop a more robust mechanism to monitor LEA and school progress towards achieving many of the praiseworthy goals set forth in this proposal (in Principles 1, 2, and 3).</li> <li>• State lawmakers should consider strengthening the statutory authority provided to DPI in the case of districts and schools who are persistently low-performing.</li> <li>• Some panel members believe that much can be learned from Milwaukee's experiences mandating RtI and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS); and that the SEA should consider how something similar may apply to other schools and district.</li> </ul>

## 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 PEER PANEL RESPONSE

Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 6 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	While DPI has proposed a strong mechanism to differentiate and identify various performance levels of schools, the panel is not confident that the supports, interventions, and accountabilities described are likely to result in improved academic performance and close achievement gaps for students.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The index, report card, and flagging system are a promising model to fairly identify schools at different levels of achievement.</li> <li>• Some of the interventions described, especially the recognitions for Reward schools, are promising.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DPI’s AMOs have not yet been modeled or developed.</li> <li>• The exit criteria for focus and priority schools are insufficiently rigorous.</li> <li>• The panel remains unconvinced that DPI will strongly intervene in cases of persistent school failure.</li> <li>• The panel remains unconvinced that any of the supports described to address achievement gaps will, in fact, improve outcomes for special populations.</li> <li>• Many of the organizational structures, supports, and interventions are “light touch” technical assistance efforts that have not historically led to dramatic increases in student achievement and local-level buy-in. There is little evidence provided that these approaches will work this time around.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seek additional statutory and regulatory authority to intervene strongly in persistently low-performing districts and schools.</li> <li>• Develop a plan for assessing the efficacy of the tools, resources, supports, and interventions in order to prioritize strategies and align resources. Rely on data-based evidence of past success. Consider how multiple supports, monitors, diagnostics are experienced at the school level at attempt to streamline and coordinate all state-wide interventions.</li> <li>• Consider how to better integrate DPI’s proposal related to CCSS and the educator evaluation model with interventions described in Principle 2 for priority and focus schools.</li> </ul>

### Principle 3: Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership

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

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

If the SEA selected **Option A**:

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

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

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

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

*Tally of Peer Responses: NA*

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

- 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 Peer Panel Response**

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

*Tally of Peer Responses: NA*

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

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



**If the SEA selected Option B:**

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

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

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

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

*Tally of Peer Responses: 1 Yes; 5 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Overall, the guidelines proposed by the DPI are coherent, comprehensive, and based on multiple measures and are on the right track. However, there are some significant areas of the plan that have not been developed in a substantive way.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DPI has identified the need to base educator evaluation on both measures of educator practice and measures of student achievement.</li> <li>• Multiple observations are required, in order to provide educators with both formative and summative feedback.</li> <li>• The Charlotte Danielson Framework (with modifications) has been selected to be used as the basis for rubrics for observation, which are required under the SEA’s system, which is an educationally sound model.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50% of the educator evaluation is based on student outcomes is a high percentage for the population of teachers that only have one measure of student achievement to base individual scores on. (Attachment, pg 520)</li> <li>• There is a lack of information regarding how evaluators will be trained.</li> <li>• The panel has a concern that all evaluations will be done by the teachers’ and principals’ direct supervisors without additional observers to providing a check. Further, there is no discussion of how to ensure inter-rater reliability and ensuring that evaluators have grade-level and subject area expertise and qualifications.</li> <li>• The intervention and appeals processes for teachers rated “developing” are referred to, but are not fleshed out in any detail. As this will be the process by which ineffective educators are identified, supported, and potentially exited from the system, further thought and detail is required here.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	See below suggestions in 3.A.ii

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

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

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

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

*Tally of Peer Responses: 3 Yes; 2 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Although there was substantial involvement of representatives of administrator and teacher organizations, DPI provided no evidence of considerable involvement of other teachers and principals in the design process.
<i>Strengths</i>	The Educator Effectiveness Design Team included union representatives of teachers.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	There was no method of directly engaging Wisconsin educators in the creation of these guidelines (ie. a survey, focus groups, etc.)
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	As DPI seeks continuous feedback, ensure that DPI is reaching out to teachers and administrators directly (ie: through surveys, focus groups, listening sessions, etc)

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

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

a. Will be used for continual improvement of instruction?

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

**3.A.ii.a Peer Panel Response**

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

*Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 5 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The guidelines reference the importance of continual formative feedback for educators, but little detail on what this should look like in practice and because veteran teachers are only evaluated once every three years, there is a lapse in cycle of feedback. Further, there is little discussion of how to provide targeted professional development based on teachers’ individual strengths and weaknesses.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multiple observations are required each year, providing educators with formative feedback in addition to summative evaluations.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Veteran teachers are only evaluated once every three years, providing a lapse in the cycle of summative feedback and evaluation. (p. 97)</li> <li>• There is no discussion of how evaluation results will inform targeted and meaningful professional development for teachers in order to encourage continuous improvement at all levels of performance.</li> <li>• Some peers felt that under the Value-Added Research Center (VARC) model, expectations may be lower for students with disabilities and English Learners because of the use of background variables. As a result, expectations for their teachers may be lowered, and those teachers may not get information that they need to improve instruction for students in those subgroups.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider annual evaluation for veteran teachers.</li> <li>• Provide a plan for tying evaluation results to individual, targeted, job-embedded professional development.</li> </ul>

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 Peer Panel Response**

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

*Tally of Peer Responses: 5 Yes, 0 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The framework establishes three performance levels, which will allow differentiation amongst educators. Student growth is incorporated at a significant level for all teachers and principals.
<i>Strengths</i>	Three performance levels have been established – developing, effective, and exemplary – which will allow differentiation among educators.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	The intervention and appeals processes for educators rated “developing” have not been described in considerable detail.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Consider expanding performance levels from three to four , which would allow for further differentiation, and even more opportunities for targeted professional development, as well as acknowledgement for Wisconsin’s highest performers.

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

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

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

Tally of Peer Responses: 4 Yes, 1 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The evaluation process requires measures of performance in two categories, educator practice, and student achievement. These measures are being developed to ensure they are valid and directly related to increasing student academic achievement and school performance.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some panel members believe that it is a strength that teacher effects on student learning outcomes in the statewide standardized tested grades and subjects will be measured using a value-added model, currently being developed by the VARC at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.</li> <li>• A Educator Effectiveness System Metric will be used to identify a mismatch between educator’s practice performance and student outcomes, in which case a focused review will determine why the mismatch is occurring, ensuring credibility of measures.</li> <li>• The workgroup determining guidelines for creating student learning objectives (SLOs) measures is connecting with experts. Special education teachers and English Learners teachers are on the workgroup for SLOs, which will help ensure that educator impact on student learning is meaningfully assessed for teachers of low incidence populations and subjects.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SLOs need further development and processes to ensure they are valid, meaningful measures that clearly relate to increasing student academic achievement and school performance.</li> <li>• Some panel members believe that, under the VARC model, expectations may be lower for students with disabilities and English Learners because of the use of background variables.</li> <li>• Insufficient detail was provided regarding how teachers of students with disabilities will be included in the system.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Provide additional information about how special education teachers and students will be included in the system.

- (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) Peer Panel Response**

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

*Tally of Peer Responses: 5 Yes, 0 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	For grades and subjects in which assessments are required, the DPI defined a statewide approach for measuring student growth, using the value-added model developed by the VARC at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.
<i>Strengths</i>	No strengths noted.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	No weaknesses noted.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	No Technical Assistance Suggestions noted.

(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) Peer Panel Response**

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

*Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 5 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	For grades and subjects in which assessments are not required, DPI references using local standardized assessments and student learning objectives as measures of student growth. However, these are not described in detail, nor is there a system described that will ensure that LEAs use valid measures.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Using multiple measures of student growth will ensure a system that is credible, which DPI is attempting to do through the use of local assessments and student learning objectives.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DPI did not provide a plan to ensure that local assessments will be credible measures.</li> <li>• SLOs have not yet been developed.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Describe a process for ensuring that local assessments (including SLOs) will be reliable. DPI should have a role in monitoring appropriateness.

d. Evaluate teachers and principals on a regular basis?

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

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

*Tally of Peer Responses: 2 Yes, 3 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Although there is an emphasis on providing formative and summative feedback through regular observations, once veteran teachers are rated “effective” or “exemplary”, they are no longer required to be evaluated annually.
<i>Strengths</i>	Multiple observations are required for each evaluation in order to provide consistent and regular feedback.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	Veteran teachers (>3 years in the district) will only be evaluated every three years, creating a lapse in the feedback cycle to encourage continual professional growth and development.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Consider annual evaluation for veteran teachers.



- 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 Peer Panel Response**

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

*Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 5 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Professional development is mentioned, but no clear plan is outlined to guide targeted, meaningful professional support to individual educators that is differentiated based on evaluation results.
<i>Strengths</i>	Multiple observations will provide consistent and timely feedback to teachers.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of required observations is not clearly defined, although multiple observations are specified.</li> <li>• Little discussion of professional development is included in the plan. Although the attached draft guidelines (p. 512) reference that evaluations will be used to inform appropriate professional development, this component of the plan lacks specificity and clarity.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Create a high-quality plan to tie evaluation results to targeted, job-embedded professional development.

f. Will be used to inform personnel decisions?

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

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

*Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 5 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The guidelines reference using evaluation to support a full range of human resource decisions (p. 533), but little clarity is provided to determine what this will look like in practice. While DPI is right to be cautious about moving forward with personnel decisions before the model is fully developed and evaluated, a plan should be in place that will guide how these decisions progress.
<i>Strengths</i>	The guidelines acknowledge that this framework will provide rich information about educator effectiveness that will allow schools and districts to make informed human resource decisions, such as recruitment, hiring, induction, retention, compensation, and promotion.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	No plan is outlined for how the evaluation system will be used to inform personnel decisions.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Provide a timeline for how decisions will be made, including parties responsible, and guidelines for rolling out personnel decisions.

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

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

**3.B Peer Panel Response***Tally of Peer Responses: 2 Yes, 3 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	While the overall plan is thoughtful, and outlines a meaningful educator and principal evaluation and support system in theory, more details need to be provided to ensure a robust system will be implemented in practice.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Districts will have flexibility to develop their own rubrics, in accordance with the Danielson framework and InTASC standards, and will have to apply to the State Superintendent and go through an equivalency review process to ensure statewide alignment. (p. 546)</li> <li>• Rollout of the educator effectiveness system happens in three stages: developing, piloting, and implementing. This staged rollout will create opportunities to continuously improve the system, involve stakeholders, adequately train teachers, principals, and evaluators, and evaluate the State model for fidelity of implementation and impact on practice and student outcomes.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although DPI has significant authority to create statewide guidelines, monitor district implementation, and require corrective action, there is insufficient description of how DPI will exercise such authority and what will be left to district discretion.</li> <li>• The guidelines reference the need to revise the evaluation system accordingly and continuously improving the system, however, there is no discussion of how teachers and principals will be directly involved in the revision processes during the piloting stage. (p. 554)</li> <li>• There is no discussion of local collective bargaining agreements or State law statutes that need to be adjusted to ensure that districts develop, adopt, pilot, and implement these guidelines under the proposed timelines and as required by ESEA waiver requirements.</li> <li>• An important caveat mentioned in the guidelines is that the entire evaluation system is contingent upon funding. DPI has not outlined what needs to happen at the State and local level to ensure sufficient funding for high-quality implementation.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As DPI develops its implementation phase, it should pay attention to engaging stakeholders, to ensure that they are embracing the change and that their voices have been heard in the process.</li> <li>• Ensure that DPI has sufficient authority and a robust plan for feedback, monitoring the quality of implementation and requiring corrective action when districts are not implementing with fidelity. At a minimum, DPI needs to develop a thoughtful system for review and public reporting.</li> </ul>

### Principle 3 Overall Review

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

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

### Principle 3 Overall Review Peer Panel Response

*Tally of Peer Responses: 2 Yes; 3 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Overall, the plan is thoughtful and headed in the right direction to create a meaningful multi-measure educator evaluation and support system, but certain aspects of the plan need to be improved upon considerably.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Charlotte Danielson Framework has been selected as the basis for rubrics to determine educator practice which is an educationally sound rubric (if teachers and observers have been properly trained on its use.)</li> <li>• DPI proposes a roll-out of the educator effectiveness system happens in three stages: developing, piloting, and implementing. This staged rollout will create opportunities to continuously improve the system, involve stakeholders, adequately train teachers, principals, and evaluators, and evaluate the State model for fidelity of implementation and impact on practice and student outcomes. There is a commitment to continuous improvement as DPI moves to statewide implementation in 2014-2015.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop processes to ensure that the system results in meaningful targeted professional development for all teachers. Consider successful professional development with evidence of outcomes.</li> <li>• Measures of student growth for non-tested grades and subjects need to be determined and a process for ensuring they are valid measures needs to be described in more detail.</li> <li>• Although DPI has significant authority to create statewide guidelines, monitor district implementation, and require corrective action, there is insufficient description of how DPI will exercise such authority and what will be left to district discretion.</li> </ul>

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Create a high-quality plan to tie evaluation results to targeted, job-embedded professional development.</li><li>• Consider four performance levels, which would allow for further differentiation, and even more opportunities for targeted professional development as well as acknowledgement for Wisconsin’s highest performers.</li><li>• Consider annual evaluation for veteran teachers.</li></ul>

### 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 Peer Panel Response

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
Rationale	DPI does not yet have a comprehensive and coherent approach for implementing the waivers and principles in its request for the flexibility. Overall, as the proposal stands now, the panel has serious concerns about whether the implementation of DPI's approach is likely to increase the quality of instruction for students and improve student achievement. The panel encourages DPI to leverage existing strengths and address aforementioned weaknesses.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DPI's proposal to create one statewide center for the dissemination of curricular resources related to CCSS has the potential to coordinate and streamline supports to schools.</li> <li>• The index system, with four subscale components, as well as additional red flags, is a thoughtful, multi-measured approach to measuring school performance.</li> <li>• The framework for teacher evaluation is based on a sound model with a three-stage roll-out plan.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statewide initiatives described in each Principle are not sufficiently coordinated and streamlined. The panel is concerned that, as a result, schools will be inundated by statewide programs, professional developments, trainings, and resources.</li> <li>• While DPI's plan to transition to and implement college and career-ready standards includes some promising strategies, the panel is not sufficiently confident that all teachers will be prepared to teach CCSS by the 2013-2014 school year with necessary tools such as interim assessments, classroom data, etc.</li> <li>• The panel remains unconvinced that DPI has either sufficient authority or sufficient structures in place to strongly intervene in cases of persistent school failure.</li> <li>• Many of the organizational structures, supports, and interventions represent "light touch" technical assistance efforts that have not historically led to dramatic increases in student achievement and local-level buy-in. There is little evidence provided that these approaches will work this time around.</li> <li>• Although DPI has significant authority to create statewide evaluation guidelines, monitor district implementation of evaluation, and require corrective action, there is insufficient description of how DPI will exercise such authority and what will be left to district discretion.</li> </ul>

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seek additional statutory and regulatory authority to intervene strongly in persistently low-performing districts and schools. Develop clear mechanisms of State intervention.</li> <li>• Develop a plan for assessing the efficacy of the tools, resources, supports, and interventions for priority, focus, Title I and all schools in order to prioritize strategies and align resources across all three Principles. Rely on data-based evidence of past success. Consider how multiple supports, monitors, diagnostics are experienced at the school level at attempt to streamline and coordinate all state-wide interventions.</li> <li>• Consider how to better integrate DPI's proposal related to CCSS and the educator evaluation model with interventions described in Principle 2 for priority and focus schools.</li> <li>• Ensure that all proposals across all three Principles include elements of a high-quality plan including parties responsible, objectives, resources allocated, and potential obstacles to implementation.</li> </ul>