



# EVERY STUDENT SUCCEEDS ACT CONSOLIDATED STATE PLAN GUIDANCE

---

January 2017

## INTRODUCTION

Section 8302 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA),<sup>1</sup> permits the Secretary to establish procedures and criteria in order to simplify the application requirements across various ESEA programs and reduce burden for each State educational agency (SEA) that submits a consolidated State plan, after consultation with the Governor. The Secretary must establish, for each covered program under section 8302 of the ESEA, and additional programs designated by the Secretary, the descriptions, information, assurances, and other material required to be included in a consolidated State plan.

When each SEA develops its consolidated State plan, the U.S. Department of Education (Department) encourages it to think comprehensively about implementation of programs across the ESEA and to leverage funding to ensure a focus on equity and excellence for all students. An SEA should consider, when developing its plan, how to collaborate across all programs to build a more cohesive, coherent, and efficient plan in order to improve the educational opportunities for all children and close achievement gaps.

The Department identified five overarching components and corresponding elements that integrate the included programs<sup>2</sup> and that each SEA electing to submit a consolidated State plan must address. These components are intended to help the SEA plan and implement its included programs in a comprehensive way to support local educational agencies (LEAs), schools, and all subgroups of students. The required consolidated State plan template, available at: <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/index.html>, includes a section for each of the overarching components as well as a section for the long-term goals required under the statewide accountability system in ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(a) and 34 C.F.R. § 299.17(a).

The sections are as follows:

1. Long-Term Goals
2. Consultation and Performance Management
3. Academic Assessments
4. Accountability, Support, and Improvement for Schools
5. Supporting Excellent Educators
6. Supporting All Students

This guidance serves two purposes: (1) to support SEAs in developing a consolidated State plan that will be peer reviewed; and (2) to guide peer reviewers who will evaluate the consolidated State plans submitted by each SEA.

---

<sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, citations to the ESEA refer to the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA.

<sup>2</sup> Included program are Title I, Part A (Improving Basic Programs Operated by State and Local Educational Agencies); Title I, Part C (Education of Migratory Children); Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk; Title II, Part A (Supporting Effective Instruction); Title III, Part A (Language Instruction for English Learners and Immigrant Students); Title IV, Part A (Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants); Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers; Title V, Part B, Subpart 2 (Rural and Low-Income School Program); and the Education for Homeless Children and Youths program under Subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended by the ESSA.

The Department has determined that this guidance is significant guidance under the Office of Management and Budget's Final Bulletin for Agency Good Guidance Practices, 72 Fed. Reg. 3432 (January 25, 2007). See [www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/memoranda/fy2007/m07-07.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/memoranda/fy2007/m07-07.pdf). Significant guidance is non-binding and does not create or impose new legal requirements. The Department is issuing this guidance to provide SEAs and consolidated State plan peer reviewers with information to assist them in meeting their obligations under the ESEA and the implementing regulations in 34 C.F.R. §§ 299.13-19 that it enforces.

If you are interested in commenting on this guidance, please email us your comment at [OESE.Guidance@ed.gov](mailto:OESE.Guidance@ed.gov) or write to us at the following address:

U.S. Department of Education  
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education  
400 Maryland Ave, SW  
Washington, DC 20202

For further information about the Department's guidance processes, please visit [www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/significant-guidance.html](http://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/significant-guidance.html).

### Peer Review Process

Consistent with ESEA sections 1111(a)(4) and 8451(d), the Department will conduct a peer review of each SEA's plan to facilitate the review and approval of consolidated State plans. This review process will help ensure that each consolidated State plan (1) fully addresses the applicable statutory and regulatory requirements, which are designed to support SEA efforts to improve student academic achievement and increase the quality of instruction, and (2) is both educationally and technically sound.

**Selection of peer reviewers.** ESEA Section 1111(a)(4)(A)(ii) requires that the Department establish multidisciplinary peer-review teams with members that represent:

1. Parents, teachers, principals, other schools leaders, specialized instructional support personnel, State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and the community (including the business community); and
2. Researchers who are familiar with the implementation of academic standards, assessments, or accountability systems and how to meet the needs of disadvantaged students, children with disabilities, and English learners, the needs of low-performing schools, and other educational needs of students.

The peer review panels must also include, to the extent practicable, majority representation of individuals who, in the most recent two years, have had practical experience in the classroom, school administration, or State or local government (such as direct employees of a school, LEA, or SEA) and must represent a regionally diverse cross-section of States.

**Role of peer reviewers.** Peer reviewers apply their professional judgment and experiences when responding to the questions and considerations in this guidance to evaluate (1) whether each State plan meets statutory and regulatory requirements and (2) the degree to which each State plan will support a comprehensive and coherent set of improvements in the areas of: consultation and performance management; academic assessments; accountability, support, and improvement for schools; supporting excellent educators; and supporting all students. Their responses to the questions and considerations inform the final determination of the Secretary to approve the consolidated State plan.

Peer reviewers work in teams to review the consolidated State plan submitted by an SEA. To protect the integrity of the peer review process, the identity of the peer review team for a specific State will remain anonymous.

During the peer review, reviewers will first independently review the consolidated State plan submitted by an SEA and record their responses to the questions and considerations on a consolidated State plan peer review notes template. Next, a team of peer reviewers will discuss the SEA’s plan to strengthen their understanding and inform their individual evaluations. Based upon each peer reviewer’s review of the SEA’s plan, he or she will note where changes may be necessary for the SEA to fully address statutory and regulatory requirements; peer reviewers may also present suggestions for improving the plan or highlight best practices in their notes. Although the peer reviewers on a team are expected to generate one set of peer review notes that reflects their review and evaluation of the SEA’s consolidated State plan, they are not expected to reach consensus.

The Department will provide training to all peer reviewers based on this guidance, as well as other supporting documents, including program-specific guidance.

**Outcomes of Peer Review Process.** After the peer review is completed, an SEA will receive the peer review notes that include the peer reviewers’ responses to the questions and considerations and any recommendations to improve its consolidated State plan. The peer review notes serve two purposes: (1) the record of the peer review team’s responses to questions on how an SEA’s State plan addresses the statutory and regulatory requirements; and (2) technical assistance to the SEA on how to improve its plan. Based on these notes, the Secretary will make a preliminary written determination that outlines the areas each SEA must address, if any, prior to the Secretary approving its consolidated State plan.

Upon receiving the Department’s preliminary determination and peer review notes, each SEA will have up to 45 days to make the necessary revisions and resubmit its consolidated State plan to the Department consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(e). The Secretary will issue a final determination based on the SEA’s revised plan.

## How to Use This Document

This guidance is for: 1) peer review teams as they evaluate each consolidated State plan during the peer review portion of the consolidated State plan review process; and 2) each SEA as it develops its State plan. This document includes two key components:

1. **REQUIRED ELEMENTS.** Questions in **bold** text in this guidance represent required elements that an SEA must address in its consolidated State plan template. In order to fully address the statutory and regulatory requirements, an SEA must respond to all **bold** questions. Indented **bold** questions include the specific data and information each SEA must provide to fully address the applicable statutory and regulatory requirement. If an SEA has provided insufficient information for peer reviewers to determine whether any **bold** question is fully addressed, peer reviewers should determine that the SEA has not fully addressed that requirement. Note that, some **bold** questions are required only if the specific circumstances are applicable to that SEA (e.g., if the SEA chooses to use funds for a specific purpose such as in section 5.1 below or chooses to implement an optional procedure in its system of annual meaningful differentiation such as a uniform procedure for averaging data in section 4.1.F below).
2. **CONSIDERATIONS.** Questions that are in *italicized text* in this guidance reflect guiding questions that the Department encourages peers to consider when evaluating the quality and

sufficiency of the SEA's plan. The questions for consideration should be used by an SEA as a resource to improve the quality of their responses in the consolidated State plan template. An SEA is not required to specifically address *questions in italicized text* in its consolidated State plan.

**Use for Peer Reviewers.** Peer reviewers will respond to the questions and considerations when assessing how an SEA's consolidated State plan addresses the statutory and regulatory requirements and providing technical assistance to each SEA to improve the quality of its plan. An SEA must fully address all questions in **bold text** to meet the statutory and regulatory requirements. If an SEA does not fully address one or more of the questions in **bold text**, peer reviewers should determine that the SEA has not fully addressed that requirement.

Questions in *italicized text* should be used to assess the quality of an SEA's response. Peer reviewers should use these questions to identify strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement in each SEA's consolidated State plan. These questions will not be used to assess whether an SEA meets the required statutory and regulatory provisions.

**Use for SEAs.** Each SEA should use this document when developing its response to each of the requirements in the consolidated State plan template. Each SEA must address each question in this guidance in **bold** to fully address all applicable statutory and regulatory requirements. An SEA should use the **bold** questions in this guidance as a checklist to ensure it has provided all required information.

An SEA may use the questions in *italicized text* to improve the quality of its responses in the consolidated State plan template. Although not required, the considerations are helpful tools to develop and successfully implement the strategies and systems outlined in the consolidated State plan.

## SECTION 1: LONG-TERM GOALS

**NOTE:** Each SEA will include its baseline and long-term goals in Section 1 of its consolidated State plan. Please refer to Appendix A in each consolidated State plan to review the measurements of interim progress.

### 1.1.A: Academic Achievement (34 C.F.R. § 299.17(a))

#### 1.1.A.i Description of Academic Achievement Goals and Measurements of Interim Progress

- **Does the SEA describe how it established its ambitious long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for improved academic achievement, including how the SEA established its State-determined timeline for attaining such goals? (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i); 34 C.F.R. § 200.13(a)(1)(ii)).**
  - Are the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress measured by the percentage of students attaining grade-level proficiency on the State’s annual reading/ language arts and mathematics assessments<sup>3</sup> (i.e., in each of grades three through eight and once in high school), for all students and separately for each subgroup of students (economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners)? (34 C.F.R. §§ 200.13(a)(1)(i) and 200.16(a)(2)<sup>4</sup>).
  - Does the SEA’s description indicate that it applied the same academic achievement standards to all public school students in the State, except as provided for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities? (34 C.F.R. § 200.13(a)(2)(i)).
  - *Does the SEA provide an educationally sound rationale for the pattern of academic progress reflected in the goals and measurements of interim progress, including the frequency of the measurements of interim progress and amount of progress expected between each interim measure to close statewide proficiency gaps?*

#### 1.1.A.ii Identification of Academic Achievement Goals and Measurements of Interim Progress

- **Does the SEA identify its ambitious State-designed long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for improved academic achievement for all students and separately for each subgroup of students? (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i); 34 C.F.R. § 200.13(a)(1)(i))**
  - Does the SEA measure achievement separately for reading/language arts and mathematics? (34 C.F.R. § 200.13(a)(2)(ii)).
  - Does the SEA set the same multi-year timeline to achieve the State’s long-term goals for all students and for each subgroup (economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners)? (34 C.F.R. § 200.13).
  - Does the SEA include long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for all public school students and each subgroup of students (economically disadvantaged students,

<sup>3</sup>Except where otherwise noted, references to a State’s annual reading/language arts and mathematics assessments mean those assessments required under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) to be administered once in each of grades three through eight and once in high school.

<sup>4</sup> 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(a)(2) lists the subgroups that must be included in long-term goals and measurements of interim progress, performance on each accountability indicator, annual meaningful differentiation of schools, and identification of schools for support and improvement. The subgroups are: (1) economically disadvantaged students, (2) students from each major racial and ethnic group, (3) children with disabilities, as defined in section 8101(4) of the ESEA, and (4) English learners, as defined in section 8101(20) of the ESEA. Throughout this guidance, a reference to “subgroup of students” is a reference to these required subgroups under 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(a)(2) as listed above.

students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners)? (34 C.F.R. § 200.13(a)(1)(i)).

- Does the SEA take into account the improvement necessary for each subgroup of students (economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners) to make significant progress in closing statewide proficiency gaps, such that the measurements of interim progress require greater rates of improvement for subgroups of students that are lower-achieving? (34 C.F.R. § 200.13(a)(2)(iii)).
- *Do the goals and measurements of interim progress provide meaningful and actionable information to educators and school leaders, families, public officials, and other stakeholders to ensure all students are college- and career-ready by the time they graduate from high school?*

### 1.1.B: Graduation Rate(s) (34 C.F.R. § 299.17(a))

#### 1.1.B.i. Description of Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate

- **Does the SEA describe how it established its ambitious long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, including how the SEA established its State-determined timeline for attaining such goals? (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(bb)(AA); 34 C.F.R. § 200.13(b)(1)(ii)).**
  - *Does the SEA provide an educationally sound rationale for the pattern of progress reflected in the graduation rate goals and measurements of interim progress, including the frequency of the measurements of interim progress and amount of progress expected between each interim measure in order to close statewide graduation rate gaps?*
  - *Do the goals and measurements of interim progress provide meaningful and actionable information to educators, families, public officials, school leaders, and other stakeholders to ensure all students graduate from high school on time and college- and career-ready?*

#### 1.1.B.ii. Identification of Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate

- **Does the SEA identify its ambitious State-designed long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for improved four-year adjusted cohort graduation rates for all students and separately for each subgroup of students (economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners)? (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(bb)(AA); 34 C.F.R. § 200.13(b)(1)(i)).**
  - **Does the SEA set the same multi-year timeline to achieve the State’s long-term goals related to the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and for each subgroup of students? (34 C.F.R. § 200.13).**
  - **Does the SEA include long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for all public school students and each subgroup of students (economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners)? (34 C.F.R. § 200.13(b)(1)(i)).**
  - **Does the SEA take into account the improvement necessary for each subgroup of students (economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners) to make significant progress in closing statewide graduation rate gaps, such that a State’s measurements of interim progress require greater rates of improvement for subgroups that graduate from high school at lower rates? (34 C.F.R. § 200.13(b)(3)).**

#### 1.1.B.iii Description of Extended-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (s)

- **If the SEA uses an extended-year rate as part of its Graduation Rate indicator, does the SEA describe how it established its ambitious long-term goals(s) and measurements of interim progress for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (e.g., five-year, six-year,**

seven-year), including how the SEA established its State-determined timeline for attaining such goals? (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(bb)(BB); 34 C.F.R. § 200.13(b)(1)(ii)).

- Does the SEA provide an educationally sound rationale for the pattern of progress reflected in the graduation rate goals and measurements of interim progress, including the frequency of the measurements of interim progress and amount of progress expected between each interim measure in order to close statewide graduation rate gaps?
- Do the goals and measurements of interim progress provide meaningful and actionable information to educators and school leaders, families, public officials, and other stakeholders to ensure all students graduate from high school and will be prepared for college and career?

#### 1.1.B.iv Identification of Extended-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate

- **If applicable, does the SEA identify its ambitious State-designed long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for improved extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate or rate(s) for all students and separately for each subgroup of students (economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners)? (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(bb)(BB); 34 C.F.R. § 200.13(b)(1)(i) and (b)(2)(ii)).**
  - Does the SEA set the same multi-year timeline to achieve the State’s long-term goals related to the extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate or rates for all students and for each subgroup of students? (34 C.F.R. § 200.13).
  - Are the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate more rigorous as compared to the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for the four-year graduation rate? (34 C.F.R. § 200.13(b)(2)(ii)).
  - Does the SEA take into account the improvement necessary for each subgroup of students (economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners) to make significant progress in closing statewide graduation rate gaps, such that a State’s measurements of interim progress require greater rates of improvement for subgroups that graduate from high school at lower rates? (34 C.F.R. § 200.13(b)(3)).

#### 1.1.C: English Language Proficiency (34 C.F.R. § 299.17(a))

##### 1.1.C.i English Language Proficiency (ELP) Student-level Targets

- **Does the SEA describe a uniform procedure, applied to all English learners in the State in a consistent manner, to establish research-based student-level targets on which the progress towards ELP goals and measurements of interim progress are based? (34 C.F.R. § 200.13(c)(2)).**
  - Does the SEA describe how the uniform procedure takes into consideration, at the time of a student’s identification as an English learner, the student’s ELP level? (34 C.F.R. § 200.13(c)(2)(i)).
  - If applicable, does the SEA describe additional student characteristics that it takes into consideration in its uniform procedure? Note that these additional characteristics may only include one or more of the following: time in language instruction educational programs, grade level, age, native language proficiency level, or limited or interrupted formal education. (34 C.F.R. § 200.13(c)(2)(i)).
  - Does the uniform procedure determine applicable timelines, up to a State-determined maximum number of years, over which English learners sharing the SEA’s selected characteristics would be expected to attain ELP? (34 C.F.R. § 200.13(c)(2)(ii)).
  - Does the SEA describe how the uniform procedure establishes student-level targets, based on the applicable timelines, that set the expectation for all English learners to make annual



**progress toward attaining ELP within the applicable timelines for such students? (34 C.F.R. § 200.13(c)(2)(iii)).**

- **Does the SEA describe a rationale for how it determined the overall maximum number of years for English learners to attain ELP in its uniform procedure for setting research-based student level targets, as well as the applicable timelines over which English learners sharing particular characteristics would be expected to attain ELP within such maximum? (34 C.F.R. § 200.13(c)(3)).**
- *Does the SEA cite to relevant research and data to support its State-determined maximum number of years and the applicable timelines for English learners sharing particular characteristics to attain ELP so that the student-level targets are both rigorous and attainable for English learners?*

1.1.C.ii Description of State-level ELP Goals

- **Does the SEA describe how it established ambitious State-designed long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for increases in the percentage of all English learners in the State making annual progress toward attaining ELP, including how the SEA established its timeline for attaining such goals? (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii); 34 C.F.R. § 200.13(c)(1)(ii)).**
  - **Are the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress based on increases in the percentage of all English learners in the State making annual progress toward attaining English language proficiency, as measured by the State’s ELP assessment? (34 C.F.R. § 200.13(c)(1)(i)).**
  - **Are the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress based on the uniform procedure that establishes research-based student-level targets, as described above in 1.C.i? (34 C.F.R. § 200.13(c)(2)).**
  - *Does the SEA provide an educationally sound rationale for the pattern of progress reflected in the ELP goals and measurements of interim progress, including the frequency of the measurements of interim progress and amount of progress expected between each interim measure?*

1.1.C.iii Identification of ELP State-level Goal

- **Does the SEA identify its ambitious State-designed long-term goal and measurements of interim progress for progress towards ELP? (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii); 34 C.F.R. § 200.13(c)(1)(i)).**
  - *Do the goals and measurements of interim progress provide meaningful and actionable information to educators, families, public officials, and other stakeholders to ensure all English learners make sufficient progress toward achieving ELP?*

## SECTION 2: PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION

### 2.1: Consultation (34 C.F.R. § 299.15(a))

#### 2.1.A: Public Notice

- **Did the SEA provide evidence that it met the public notice requirements<sup>5</sup> relating to its processes and procedures for developing and adopting its consolidated State plan or individual program State plans? (34 C.F.R. § 299.13(b)(1)).**

#### 2.1.B.i: Outreach and Input

- **For each component of the consolidated State plan, including Academic Assessment; Accountability, Support, and Improvement for Schools; Supporting Excellent Educators; and Supporting All Students, does the SEA describe how it conducted outreach to and solicited input from the required stakeholders during the design and development of the SEA’s plans to implement the programs included in the consolidated State Plan?**
- **Does the description include a discussion of how the SEA conducted outreach to, and solicited input from, each of the following stakeholders:**
  - ❖ **Governor or appropriate officials from the Governor’s office;**
  - ❖ **members of the State Legislature;**
  - ❖ **members of the State Board of Education (if applicable);**
  - ❖ **LEAs;**
  - ❖ **Representatives of Indian tribes;**
  - ❖ **Teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized instructional support personnel, and organizations representing such individuals;**
  - ❖ **Charter school leaders (if applicable);**
  - ❖ **Parents and families;**
  - ❖ **Community-based and civil rights organizations, including those representing students with disabilities, English learners, and other historically underserved students;**
  - ❖ **Higher education institutions;**
  - ❖ **Employers;**
  - ❖ **Representatives of private school students;**
  - ❖ **Early childhood educators and leaders; and**
  - ❖ **The public.**
- **Does the description include a discussion of how the SEA conducted outreach to, and solicited input from, a geographically diverse set of stakeholders?**
- **Does the SEA’s description, which may include evidence, indicate the timeframe during which the SEA made its consolidated State plan available for public comment that demonstrates that it was available for public comment for a period of not less than 30 days prior to submitting it to the Secretary for initial review and approval?**
  - *Does the SEA describe strategies that would ensure meetings or hearings are accessible (e.g., hold meetings or hearings at varying times of day and in varying locations across the State,*

---

<sup>5</sup> Each SEA must meet the requirements in 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(b)(1)-(3) to provide information that is: (1) In an understandable and uniform format; (2) To the extent practicable, written in a language that parents can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent with limited English proficiency, be orally translated for such parent; and (3) Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. 12102, provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.

*provide accommodations and supports to those who need them, and offer child care so that families could attend)?*

- *Does the SEA describe how its process was transparent, including allowing stakeholders the opportunity to engage at different times and levels of policy development?*
- *Did the SEA target the outreach so that it was responsive to the specific needs of the State?*
- *Does the SEA describe how it solicited input from a wide range of educators, both teachers and principals, at all levels of experience?*
- *Did the SEA schedule meetings and other opportunities for input in such a way that practicing teachers have opportunities to participate?*
- *Does the SEA describe how it consulted with stakeholders who have expertise specific to each of the components of the consolidated State plan and to educators of students with disabilities and English Learners?*

2.1.B.ii: Outreach and Input

- **For each component of the consolidated State plan (including Academic Assessments; Accountability, Support, and Improvement for Schools; Supporting Excellent Educators; and Supporting All Students) does the SEA describe how it took into account the input obtained through the timely and meaningful consultation and public comment?**
  - **Does the SEA describe how it addressed issues and concerns raised through the timely and meaningful consultation and public comment for all components of the consolidated State plan?**
  - **Does the description include the changes the SEA made to the plan as a result of consultation and public comment for all components of the consolidated State plan?**
    - *Does the SEA provide a sufficient description of how it addressed each of the issues and concerns raised through consultation?*

2.1.C: Governor’s Consultation

- **Does the SEA describe how it consulted in a timely and meaningful manner with the Governor, or with appropriate officials from the Governor’s office?**
- **Does the description include whether consultation between the SEA and the Governor’s Office occurred both during the development of the consolidated State plan and prior to the submission of the plan?**
- **Does the SEA provide the Governor 30 days to sign the consolidated State plan that it intends to submit to the Secretary for initial review and approval?**
  - *Does the description include processes and procedures that are likely to lead to timely and meaningful consultation with the Governor or appropriate officials from the Governor’s office?*

2.2: Performance Management (34 C.F.R. § 299.15(b))

2.2.A: Review and Approval of LEA Plans

- **Does the SEA describe a process for supporting the development, review, and approval of the activities in LEA plans?<sup>6</sup>**
  - *Does the SEA describe how it will determine if LEA activities are aligned with the specific needs of the LEA?*
  - *Does the SEA describe how it will determine if LEA activities are aligned with the SEA’s strategies described in its consolidated State plan?*

---

<sup>6</sup> In developing their processes, each SEA must ensure that the LEA plan(s) comply with statutory and regulatory requirements such as ESEA sections 1112, 8305, and 8306.

- *Does the SEA’s process include collecting and using data and information to assess the proposed activities in LEA plans?*
- *Does the SEA’s process include a reasonable timeline by which the SEA will provide LEAs with resources for plan development, review LEA plans, and approve or deny LEA plans?*
- *Does the SEA differentiate how it reviews and approves activities in LEA plans based on statutory and regulatory requirements and the unique needs that LEA?*
- *Does the SEA describe how it will determine whether affected LEAs have complied with the tribal consultation requirements? (ESEA section 8538).<sup>7</sup>*

### 2.2.B: Monitoring

- **Does the SEA describe a plan to monitor SEA and LEA implementation of included programs to ensure compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements?**
- **Does the SEA’s plan include collecting and using data and information to assess the quality of SEA and LEA implementation of strategies and progress toward improving student outcomes and meeting the desired program outcomes?**
  - *Does the SEA describe the data it will use to monitor including whether it will use input from stakeholders and data collected and reported on State and LEA report cards?*
  - *Is the SEA’s monitoring plan likely to support effective and meaningful implementation of LEA plans?*
  - *Does the SEA’s plan include a timeline for monitoring that is ambitious, practicable, and actionable based upon the anticipated availability of the data and information the SEA proposes to collect?*
  - *Is the SEA’s monitoring plan responsive to the context of the State (e.g., the academic calendar, number of LEAs, and geography of the State)?*
  - *Does the SEA differentiate how it monitors based on LEA-specific factors (e.g., performance, history of non-compliance, size, Federal allocation)?*

### 2.2.C: Continuous Improvement

- **Does the SEA describe a plan to continuously review, evaluate, and improve both the SEA and LEA plans and implementation of those plans?**
- **Does the SEA describe how it will collect and use data and information to assess the quality of SEA and LEA implementation of strategies and progress toward meeting the desired program outcomes?**
  - *Does the SEA describe the data it will use to continuously review, evaluate, and improve both the SEA and LEA plans and implementation of those plans including whether it will use input from stakeholders and data collected and reported on State and LEA report cards?*
  - *Does the SEA’s plan include strategies that draw from best practices for promoting continuous improvement, such as feedback loops, collection of information about implementation and steps to implement necessary changes, methods of analysis to examine effectiveness and reflect on outcomes, and the identification of challenges and potential solutions?*
  - *Does the SEA’s plan include a timeline for continuous improvement activities at the SEA and LEA level that is ambitious, practicable, and actionable?*
  - *Does the SEA’s plan differentiate continuous improvement strategies and timelines based on statutory and regulatory requirements and the unique needs of LEAs in differing circumstances?*
  - *Does the SEA describe a plan to continuously engage relevant stakeholders to solicit feedback to improve implementation?*

<sup>7</sup> This question for consideration includes a citation to the statute because it is a requirement. However, an SEA’s response to the requirement is not a required description in an SEA’s consolidated State plan.

- *Does the SEA describe how it will evaluate the consolidated State plan’s effectiveness on an ongoing basis?*

2.2.D: Differentiated Technical Assistance

- **Does the SEA describe a plan to provide differentiated technical assistance to LEAs and schools to support effective implementation of SEA, LEA, and other subgrantee strategies?**
  - *Does the SEA’s technical assistance plan support effective and meaningful implementation of LEA plans in order to improve teaching and learning in all schools served by the LEA?*
  - *Does the SEA identify differences among LEAs and schools to inform a differentiated approach to technical assistance support (e.g., based on LEA size, geography, demographics, performance metrics, identification of schools for support and improvement) and describe how strategies to provide technical assistance will be differentiated to meet specific LEA needs?*
  - *Does the SEA’s plan specify the supports that will be provided or the range of supports that are available, based on the needs and context of the LEAs in its State?*
  - *Does the SEA’s plan include a timeline for providing technical assistance that is timely, tailored to the needs of the LEAs or schools in its State, and likely to result in improved academic performance?*
  - *Does the SEA’s plan differentiate technical assistance strategies and timelines based on statutory and regulatory requirements and the unique needs of LEAs in differing circumstances?*
  - *Does the SEA describe how it will provide assistance to LEAs and individual elementary schools choosing to use funds under this part to support early childhood education programs?<sup>8</sup> (ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(A)).*

---

<sup>8</sup>This question for consideration includes a citation to the statute because it is a requirement. However, an SEA’s response to the requirement is not a required description in an SEA’s consolidated State plan.

## SECTION 3: ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS

**NOTE:** The Department will continue to conduct assessment peer review as a distinct process from its peer review of State plans.

### 3.1.A: Advanced Mathematics Coursework (34 C.F.R. § 299.16(a))

**NOTE:** Section 3.A is only applicable if the SEA: (1) administers an end-of-course mathematics assessment to high school students and (2) uses the exception for students in eighth grade to take that assessment in place of the State’s eighth grade assessment. (ESEA sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) and 1111(b)(2)(C); 34 C.F.R. § 200.5(b)).

- **If applicable, does the SEA describe its strategies to provide all students in the State the opportunity to be prepared for and to take advanced mathematics coursework in middle school? (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C); 34 C.F.R. § 200.5(b)(4)).**
  - *Does the SEA provide data or other evidence to support the rationale of its described strategies?*
  - *Are the strategies that the SEA describes likely to provide all students in the State the opportunity to be prepared for and to take advanced mathematics coursework in middle school (34 C.F.R. § 200.5(b)(4))? That is, not all students need to take the advanced coursework in middle school but how is the SEA ensuring that advanced coursework is available to students in middle school?*

### 3.1.B: Languages other than English (34 C.F.R. § 299.16(b))

#### 3.1.B.i: Definition

- **Does the SEA (1) provide its definition of “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population” and (2) identify the specific languages that meet that definition? (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(F)(i); 34 C.F.R. § 200.6(f)(2)(ii)(A) and (f)(4)).**
  - **Does the State’s definition of “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population” include at least the most populous language other than English spoken by the State’s participating student population? (34 C.F.R. § 200.6(f)(4)(i)).**
  - **In determining which languages are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, did the State describe how it considered languages other than English that are spoken by distinct populations of English learners, including English learners who are migratory, English learners who were not born in the United States, and English learners who are Native Americans? (34 C.F.R. § 200.6(f)(4)(ii)).**
  - **In determining which languages are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, did the State describe how it considered languages other than English that are spoken by a significant portion of the participating student population in one or more of the State’s LEAs, as well as languages spoken by a significant portion of the participating student population across grade levels? (34 C.F.R. § 200.6(f)(4)(iii)).**

#### 3.1.B.ii: Existing Assessments in Languages other than English

- **Does the SEA identify any existing assessments that it makes available in languages other than English, and specify for which grades and content areas those assessments are available? (34 C.F.R. § 200.6(f)(2)(ii)(B)).**

3.1.B.iii: Assessments not Available and Needed

- **Does the SEA indicate the languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, as defined by the State, for which yearly student academic assessments are not available and are needed? (34 C.F.R. § 200.6(f)(2)(ii)(C)).**
  - *Does the SEA’s response include languages identified in 3.B.i?*

3.1.B.iv: Efforts to Develop Assessments

- **Does the SEA describe how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population? (34 C.F.R. § 200.6(f)(2)(ii)(D)).**
  - *Does the SEA’s description include the languages identified in 3.B.i for which the State does not already have assessments?*
  - *Has the SEA considered leveraging existing assessments in other languages, including those that other States have developed?*

3.1.B.iv.a: Plan and Timeline to Develop Assessments

- **Does the SEA’s description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population include the State’s plan and timeline for developing such assessments? (34 C.F.R. §§ 200.6(f)(2)(ii)(D)(I) and 200.6(f)(4)).**
  - *Does the State plan to use assessment funds available under ESEA section 1201, or other funds from included programs, to develop content assessments in languages other than English? Is the State’s timeline for developing such assessments ambitious, practicable, and actionable?*

3.1.B.iv.b: Consultation on the Need for Assessments

- **Does the SEA’s description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population include a description of the process the State used to (1) gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English; (2) collect and respond to public comment; and (3) consult with educators, parents and families of English learners, students (as appropriate), and other stakeholders? (34 C.F.R. § 200.6(f)(2)(ii)(D)(2)).**
  - *Does the description include how the State ensured that its process to gather meaningful input was accessible to an appropriate range of stakeholders?*
  - *Does the description include how the State took into account the stakeholder input?*
  - *Is the SEA’s process likely to result in timely and meaningful input?*

3.1.B.iv.c: Reasons Assessments Have Not Been Developed

- **Does the SEA’s description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population include, as applicable, an explanation of the reasons the State has not been able to complete the development of such assessments despite making every effort? (34 C.F.R. § 200.6(f)(2)(ii)(D)(3)).**
  - *Does the SEA describe the effort made to develop such assessments? Does it appear that the SEA has made sufficient effort?*
  - *Does the SEA provide sufficient explanation as to why such assessments are not available?*
  - *Does the SEA describe the barriers it has faced to develop such assessments and its attempts to overcome them?*

## SECTION 4: ACCOUNTABILITY, SUPPORT, AND IMPROVEMENT FOR SCHOOLS

### 4.1 Accountability System

#### 4.1.A: Indicators (34 C.F.R. § 299.17(b)(1))

##### 4.1.A.i: Measures for the Academic Achievement Indicator

- **Does the SEA describe the measures used for the Academic Achievement indicator in its statewide accountability system? (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i); 34 C.F.R. § 200.14(b)(1)).**
  - **Does the SEA use the same measures and calculate them in the same way for all schools, in all LEAs, across the State?<sup>9</sup> (34 C.F.R. § 200.14(a)(2) and (c)(2)).**
  - **Is each measure valid, reliable, and comparable across all LEAs in the State? (34 C.F.R. § 200.14(c)(1)).**
  - **Can each measure be disaggregated for each subgroup of students (economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners)? (34 C.F.R. § 200.14(a)(1) and (c)(3)).**
  - **Is the indicator based on the SEA’s long-term goals? (34 C.F.R. § 200.14(b)(1)).**
  - **Does the indicator include a measure of student performance on the State’s annual reading/language arts and mathematics assessments at or above the proficient level on the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards, except that students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may be assessed in those subjects against alternate academic achievement standards? (34 C.F.R. § 200.14(b)(1)(i)(A)).**
    - *If the SEA weights measures of reading/language arts achievement differently from mathematics achievement within the indicator, does the SEA provide a technically and educationally sound rationale for doing so?*
  - **Does each measure in the indicator measure the performance of at least 95 percent of all students and 95 percent of all students in each subgroup? (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(ii); 34 C.F.R. §§ 200.14(b)(1)(i)(B) and 200.15(b)(1)).**
  - **As applicable, are additional measures the SEA includes in its Academic Achievement indicator (besides student performance at the proficient level on the State’s annual reading/language arts and mathematics assessments) limited to measures of student performance on such assessments above or below the proficient level on the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards calculated so that a school:**
    - **Receives less credit for the performance of a student who is not yet proficient than for the performance of a student who has reached or exceeded proficiency; and**
    - **Does not receive credit for a student exceeding proficiency in a manner that fully compensates for the performance of a student who is not yet proficient? (34 C.F.R. § 200.14(b)(1)(ii)(A)).**
    - *Does the SEA provide a technically and educationally sound rationale for using a performance index and demonstrate how the credit awarded at each achievement level*

<sup>9</sup> See description 4.1.G, where an SEA may propose an alternate methodology for annual meaningful differentiation of schools for certain kinds of schools where flexibility in measuring the indicator(s) may be needed, such as schools in which no grade level is assessed; schools with variant grade configurations; small schools in which the total number of students who can be included in any indicator is less than the State’s minimum number of students; newly opened schools; and schools designed to serve special populations (e.g., students receiving alternative programming in alternative educational settings, students living in local institutions for neglected or delinquent children, including juvenile justice facilities, students enrolled in State public schools for the deaf or blind; and recently arrived English learners enrolled in public schools for newcomer students).



*ensures that the performance of a student above the proficient level does not fully compensate for the performance of a student who is not yet proficient?*

- **If applicable, does the SEA include for high schools, in addition to the measure of achievement, a measure of student growth based on the State’s annual reading/language arts and mathematics assessments? (34 C.F.R. § 200.14(b)(1)(ii)(B)).**
  - *If an SEA includes a measure of student growth based on the State’s reading/language arts and mathematics assessments, is the SEA’s use of student growth in the indicator technically and educationally sound?*

4.1.A.ii: Measure(s) for the Academic Progress Indicator

- **For elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools, does the SEA describe the measure(s) used for the Academic Progress indicator in its statewide accountability system, including either (1) a measure of student growth based on the State’s annual reading/language arts and mathematics assessments or (2) another academic measure? (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(ii); 34 C.F.R. § 200.14(b)(2)).**
  - **Does the SEA use the same measure(s) and calculate the measure(s) in the same way for all elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools, in all LEAs, across the State, except that the measures within the indicator may vary by each grade span (e.g., elementary vs. middle schools)? (34 C.F.R. § 200.14(a)(2) and (c)(2)).**
  - **Is each measure valid, reliable, and comparable across all LEAs in the State? (34 C.F.R. § 200.14(c)(1)).**
  - **Can each measure be disaggregated for each subgroup of students (economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners)? (34 C.F.R. § 200.14(a)(1) and (c)(3)).**
  - **Does the SEA demonstrate that each measure included in the Academic Progress indicator is supported by research that high performance or improvement on such a measure is likely to increase student learning (e.g., grade point average, credit accumulation, performance in advanced coursework)? (34 C.F.R. § 200.14(d)).**
    - *Does the SEA cite a body of research or provide evidence or simulation data to support its demonstration that the measure is likely to increase student learning, such as by demonstrating a positive and statistically significant relationship with academic achievement, student growth, grade point average, credit accumulation, performance in advanced coursework, or another positive academic outcome?*
  - **Does the SEA demonstrate that each measure included in the Academic Progress indicator aids in the meaningful differentiation of schools by producing varied results across schools in the State? (34 C.F.R. § 200.14(e)).**
    - *Does the SEA cite a body of research or provide evidence or simulation data to support its demonstration that the measures in the Academic Progress indicator result in a distribution of data across schools in the State to distinguish high- and low-performing schools on this indicator?*
    - *Is the SEA’s research or data compelling and does the SEA provide sufficient rationale to support this measure?*

4.1.A.iii: Measure(s) for the Graduation Rate Indicator

- **Does the SEA describe the measure(s) used for the Graduation Rate indicator in its statewide accountability system, including, at a minimum, the four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate? (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(iii); 34 C.F.R. §§ 200.14(b)(3) and 200.34(a)).**
  - **Does the SEA use the same measure(s) and calculate the measure(s) in the same way for all high schools, in all LEAs, across the State? (34 C.F.R. § 200.14(a)(2) and (c)(2)).**
  - **Is each measure valid, reliable, and comparable across all LEAs in the State? (34 C.F.R. § 200.14(c)(1)).**

- Can each measure be disaggregated for each subgroup of students (economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners)? (34 C.F.R. § 200.14(a)(1) and (c)(3)).
- Is the indicator based on the SEA’s long-term goals? (34 C.F.R. § 200.14(b)(3)).
- If applicable, does the SEA include the extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate(s) and no other additional measures? (34 C.F.R. §§ 200.14(b)(3)(ii) and 200.34(d)).
  - *If the SEA gives equal or less weight to the four-year adjusted cohort graduate rate compared to the extended-year graduation rate(s), does the SEA provide a technically and educationally sound rationale for doing so?*

4.1.A.iv: Measure(s) for the Progress in Achieving ELP Indicator

- Does the SEA describe the measure(s) used for the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator in its statewide accountability system? (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(iv); 34 C.F.R. § 200.14(b)(4)).
  - Does the SEA use the same measure(s) and calculate the measure(s) in the same way for all schools, in all LEAs, across the State? (34 C.F.R. § 200.14(a)(2) and (c)(2)).
  - Is each measure valid, reliable, and comparable across all LEAs in the State? (34 C.F.R. § 200.14(c)(1)).
  - Is each measure based on English learner performance on the State’s annual ELP assessment<sup>10</sup> in at least each of grades three through eight and in grades for which English learners are otherwise assessed on the State’s annual reading/language arts and mathematics assessments in high school? (34 C.F.R. § 200.14(b)(4)).
    - *Does the SEA include the performance of English learners in preschool, where applicable, grades K-2, or in all high school grades (in addition to the grade in which the State administers its statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessment in high school)?*
  - Is each measure an objective and valid metric of student progress on the State’s annual ELP assessment, comparing results from the current school year to results from the previous school year, such as student growth percentiles? (34 C.F.R. § 200.14(b)(4)(i)).
  - Is each measure aligned with the applicable timelines, within the State-determined maximum number of years, established for each English learner to attain ELP after the student’s identification as an English learner, as described above in 1.C of the consolidated State plan? (34 C.F.R. §§ 200.14(b)(4)(ii) and 200.13(c)(2)).
    - *Are the measures designed to ensure that all English learners make sufficient progress or growth each year such that students will attain proficiency on the State’s ELP assessment within the State-determined timeline?*
  - If applicable, does the SEA include a measure of proficiency (e.g., an increase in the percentage of English learners scoring proficient on the State’s annual ELP assessment) in the indicator? (34 C.F.R. § 200.14(b)(4)(iii)).

4.1.A.v: Measure(s) for School Quality or Student Success Indicator(s)

**NOTE:** Peer reviewers must separately review each School Quality or Student Success indicator that an SEA submits. For example, if an SEA submits one School Quality or Student Success indicator for high schools and a different School Quality or Student Success indicator for elementary and middle schools, then peer reviewers will provide feedback, using the below guidance, separately for each indicator.

- Does the SEA describe the measure(s) used for the School Quality or Student Success indicator in its statewide accountability system? (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(v); 34 C.F.R. § 200.14(b)(5)).

<sup>10</sup> References to a State’s annual ELP assessment mean the assessment required under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(G).

- Does the SEA use the same indicator(s) of School Quality or Student Success in all schools, in all LEAs, except that the indicators may vary by each grade span (i.e., elementary vs. middle vs. high schools)? (34 C.F.R. 200.14(b)(5)).
- Does the SEA use the same measure(s) and calculate the measure(s) in the same way for all schools, in all LEAs, across the State, except that the measures within the indicator may vary by each grade span (e.g., elementary vs. middle vs. high schools)? (34 C.F.R. § 200.14(a)(2) and (c)(2)).
- Is each measure valid, reliable, and comparable across all LEAs in the State? (34 C.F.R. § 200.14(c)(1)).
- Is each measure able to be disaggregated for each subgroup of students (economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners)? (34 C.F.R. §§ 200.14(a)(1) and (c)(3)).
- Does the SEA demonstrate that each measure included in a School Quality or Student Success indicator is supported by research that high performance or improvement on such a measure is likely to increase student learning (e.g., grade point average, credit accumulation, performance in advanced coursework) or, for measures within indicators used for accountability at the high school level, is likely to increase graduation rates, postsecondary enrollment, postsecondary persistence or completion, or career readiness? (34 C.F.R. § 200.14(d)).
  - *Does the SEA cite a body of research or provide evidence or simulation data to support its demonstration that the measure is likely to increase student learning (such as by demonstrating a positive and statistically significant relationship with academic achievement, student growth, grade point average, credit accumulation, performance in advanced coursework, or another positive academic outcome), or for high schools, likely to increase students' college and career readiness (such as by demonstrating a positive and statistically significant relationship with graduation rates, postsecondary enrollment, postsecondary persistence or completion, career readiness, or another positive academic outcome)?*
- Does the SEA demonstrate that each measure it includes in the School Quality or Student Success indicator aids in the meaningful differentiation of schools by producing varied results across schools in the State? (34 C.F.R. § 200.14(e)).
  - *Does the SEA cite provide evidence or simulation data to support its demonstration that the measures in the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s) result in a distribution of data across schools in the State to distinguish high- and low-performing schools on this indicator?*
  - *Is the SEA's data compelling and does the SEA provide sufficient rationale to support this measure?*

4.1.B: Subgroups (34 C.F.R. § 299.17(b)(2)-(3))

4.1.B.i: Subgroups of Students

- Does the SEA describe the subgroups of students from each major racial and ethnic group it uses in its accountability system? (ESEA section 1111(c)(2); 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(a)(2)(ii))
- If applicable, does the SEA describe any subgroups it uses in its accountability system in addition to economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners? (34 C.F.R. § 200.16(e)(2)).
  - *If the SEA includes additional subgroups for accountability purposes, does the SEA provide a technically and educationally sound rationale for doing so?*

4.1.B.ii: Statewide Uniform Procedure Including Former Children with Disabilities

- If applicable, does the SEA describe its statewide uniform procedure for including the performance of former children with disabilities in the children with disabilities subgroup for not more than two years after such students cease to be identified as children with disabilities

for the purposes of calculating any indicator that uses data from State’s annual reading/language arts and mathematics assessments? (34 C.F.R. § 200.16(b)).

- Does the uniform statewide procedure apply to all students who have been former children with disabilities for a State-determined period of time (not more than two years)? (34 C.F.R. § 200.16(b)).
- Does the State include all former children with disabilities for the same period of time (i.e., one or two years)? (34 C.F.R. § 200.16(b)(1)).
- Does the State count all such former children with disabilities within a school towards meeting the State’s minimum number of students for the children with disabilities subgroup for purposes of calculating any indicator that uses data from State’s annual reading/language arts and mathematics assessments? (34 C.F.R. § 200.16(b)(2)).

4.1.B.iii: Statewide Uniform Procedure for Including Former English Learners

- **If applicable, does the SEA describe its statewide uniform procedure for including the performance of former English learners in the English learner subgroup for not more than four years after such students cease to be identified as English learners for the purposes of calculating any indicator that uses data from State’s annual reading/language arts and mathematics assessments? (ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(B); 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(c)(1)).**
  - Does the uniform statewide procedure apply to all students who have been former English learners for a State-determined period of time (not more than four years)? (34 C.F.R. § 200.16(c)(1)).
  - Does the State include all former English learners for the same period of time (i.e., for one, two, three, or four years)? (34 C.F.R. § 200.16(c)(1)(i)).
  - Does the State count all such former English learners within a school towards meeting the State’s minimum number of students for the English learner subgroup for purposes of calculating any indicator that uses data from State’s annual reading/language arts and mathematics assessments? (34 C.F.R. § 200.16(c)(1)(ii)).

4.1.B.iv: (If Applicable) Statewide Uniform Procedure for Recently Arrived English Learners

- **If the SEA chooses to apply the same exception to all recently arrived English learners in the State, does the SEA describe which exception it is using to hold schools accountable for the performance of recently arrived English learners? (ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A); 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(c)(3) and (c)(4)(i)(A)).**
- **If the SEA chooses to develop and consistently implement a uniform statewide procedure for all recently arrived English learners to determine whether one of the two exceptions is appropriate, does the SEA describe a uniform procedure that considers each such student’s ELP level at the time of their identification as an English learner, in addition to any other permissible student characteristics (i.e., grade level; age; native language proficiency level; limited or interrupted formal education, if any) that an SEA selects? (ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A); 34 C.F.R. §§ 200.13(c)(2)(i)(B)-(E), 200.16(c)(3) and (c)(4)(i)(B)).**
  - Under the State’s uniform procedure for English learners sharing particular characteristics, what, if any, student characteristics (i.e., grade level; age; native language proficiency level; limited or interrupted formal education, if any), in addition to the student’s initial ELP level, did the State propose to use when deciding which exception to apply? (34 C.F.R. §§ 200.13(c)(2)(i)(B)-(E) and 200.16(c)(4)(i)(B)).
  - *Did the State provide a rationale for the student characteristics selected for consideration in addition to initial ELP level?*
  - *Taken together, does the SEA’s uniform procedure for including recently arrived English learners meaningfully and appropriately include these students in school accountability decisions to improve the academic and ELP performance of these students?*
  - *Is the State’s uniform procedure educationally sound?*

4.1.C: Minimum Number of Students (34 C.F.R. § 299.17(b)(4))

4.1.C.i: Minimum Number of Students

- **Does the SEA provide its minimum number of students for accountability and, if the State uses a different minimum number of students for reporting, its minimum number of students for reporting? (ESEA section 1111(c)(3); 34 C.F.R. § 200.17(a)(1) and (a)(2)(iv)).**
  - **Is the minimum number of students the same number for all students and for each subgroup of students (economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners)? (34 C.F.R. § 200.17(a)(2)(i)).**
  - **Is the minimum number of students the same number for all purposes of the statewide accountability system, including measuring school performance for each indicator? (34 C.F.R. § 200.17(a)(2)(ii)).**

4.1.C.ii: Method for Determining Minimum Number of Students

- **Does the SEA describe a sound statistical methodology used to determine its minimum number of students? (ESEA section 1111(c)(3); 34 C.F.R. § 200.17(a)(1) and (a)(3)(i)).**
  - **Is the minimum number of students sufficient to yield statistically reliable information for each purpose for which the State uses disaggregated data, including for purposes of reporting information and for purposes of the statewide accountability system? (34 C.F.R. § 200.17(a)(1)(i)).**
  - **Is the minimum number of students sufficient to ensure that, to the maximum extent practicable, the State includes each student subgroup, including economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners, at the school level for annual meaningful differentiation and identification? (34 C.F.R. § 200.17(a)(1)(ii)).**
    - *Does the methodology that the State describes reflect consideration of the extent that each student subgroup in 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(a)(2) will be included in school-level accountability determinations?*

4.1.C.iii: Interaction of Minimum Number of Students with Other Components of Accountability System

- **Does the SEA explain how other components of the statewide accountability system, such as the State’s uniform procedure for averaging data, as described in element 4.1.F of the State plan, interact with the minimum number of students to (1) affect the statistical reliability and soundness of accountability data and (2) ensure the maximum inclusion of all students and each student subgroup, including economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners? (34 C.F.R. § 200.17(a)(3)(ii)).**
  - *Does the SEA’s uniform averaging procedure and/or other components of the statewide accountability system interact with the SEA’s proposed minimum number of students such that, taken together, they impact the statistical reliability and soundness of the accountability data?*
  - *Does the combination of the SEA’s uniform averaging procedure and/or other components of the statewide accountability system and the SEA’s proposed minimum number of students ensure that the accountability system includes all students and each subgroup of students?*

4.1.C.iv: Privacy Protections for Individual Students

- **Does the SEA describe the strategies used to protect the privacy of individual students for each purpose for which disaggregated data are required, including reporting and the State accountability system? (34 C.F.R. § 200.17(a)(3)(iii) and (b)).**
  - *Are the strategies described likely to ensure protection for the privacy of individual students when used for reporting and accountability purposes? (ESEA sections 1111(h) and 1111(c)).*

- *Does the SEA’s strategy for protecting student privacy appropriately balance the need to protect the privacy of individual students with the need to provide transparent data on subgroup performance?*

4.1.C.v: Students Not Included in Accountability Determinations

- **Does the SEA provide information regarding the number and percentage of all students and students in each subgroup (economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners) whose results would not be included in the State accountability system for annual meaningful differentiation? (34 C.F.R. § 200.17(a)(3)(iv)).**
  - *Does the SEA’s data demonstrate it has balanced the need for sound and reliable school accountability determinations with the need to maximize the number of students in each subgroup included for accountability purposes?*
  - *Does the SEA provide information about how it calculated the number and percentage of all students and students in each subgroup whose results would not be included?*

4.1.C.vi: Justification for Proposing Minimum Number of Students Greater Than 30

- **For an SEA that proposes a minimum number of students exceeding 30, does the SEA provide a justification that explains how such a minimum number of students promotes sound, reliable accountability determinations? (34 C.F.R. § 200.17(a)(3)(v)).**
- **Does the SEA’s justification include data on the number and percentage of schools that would not be held accountable for the results of students in each subgroup, including economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners, in the accountability system under the SEA’s proposed minimum number of students compared to data on the number and percentage of schools that would not be held accountable for the results of students in each subgroup if the minimum number of students were 30? (34 C.F.R. § 200.17(a)(3)(v)).**
  - *Is the SEA’s justification reasonable given the State context, such as the type and size of schools and LEAs in the State?*
  - *Does the SEA provide information about how it calculated the number and percentage of all schools that would not be held accountable for the results of students in each subgroup?*
  - *Does the SEA’s data demonstrate its proposed minimum number of students balances the need for sound and reliable school accountability determinations with the need to maximize the number of schools held accountable for the performance of subgroups of students?*

4.1.D: Annual Meaningful Differentiation (34 C.F.R. § 299.17(b)(5))

4.1.D.i: System for Meaningful Differentiation

**NOTE:** State responses must provide an overview of the SEA’s system for annual meaningful differentiation that reflects the descriptions and demonstrations in sub-sections 4.1.D.i-iv to show compliance with the ESEA and the applicable regulations.

- **Does the SEA describe its system for annual meaningful differentiation of all public schools in the State, including public charter schools? (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C); 34 C.F.R. § 200.12(a)).**
- **Does the SEA’s description include how the State takes into account the performance of all students on the State’s annual reading/language arts and mathematics assessments? (34 C.F.R. § 200.12(b)(4)).**
- **Does the SEA’s description include how the system is informed by the State’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress and includes all required indicators to (1) identify schools for support and improvement and (2) support effective development and**

**implementation of support and improvement plans, including evidence-based interventions? (34 C.F.R. § 200.12(b)(2), (b)(3), (b)(5), and (b)(6)).**

- *Does the SEA describe its theory of action for a system for annual meaningful differentiation that will support continuous improvement of all public schools in the State?*
- *Does its theory of action include strategies for taking into account the performance of subgroups of students?*
- *Is the SEA's system for meaningful differentiation likely to result in identifying the schools for comprehensive and targeted interventions that have the greatest needs?*

4.1.D.ii: Distinct and Discrete Levels of School Performance for Each Indicator

- **Does the SEA describe the levels of school performance, and how they are calculated, for each indicator in the statewide accountability system? (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C)(i); 34 C.F.R. § 200.18(a)(2) and (d)(1)(i)).**
  - **Does the SEA's system for meaningful differentiation include, for each indicator, at least three distinct and discrete levels of school performance that are, for the Academic Achievement, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving ELP indicators, consistent with attainment of the State's long-term goals and measurements of interim progress? (34 C.F.R. §§ 200.18(a)(2) and 200.13).**
  - **Are the SEA's levels of school performance on each indicator clear and understandable to the public? (34 C.F.R. § 200.18(a)(2)).**
  - *Is the SEA's system for meaningful differentiation based on clear and technically sound distinctions (e.g., are there valid and reliable differences between the levels of performance for each indicator)?*
  - *Do the performance levels on each indicator, including how they are reported on LEA report cards, provide contextual information to families and the public about school performance on each indicator (e.g., as compared to State averages, the long-term goals, performance quartiles, or another standard)?*

4.1.D.iii: Weighting of Indicators

- **Is the SEA's weighting of each indicator, including how certain indicators receive substantial weight individually and much greater weight in the aggregate, consistent with the applicable requirements? (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C)(ii); 34 C.F.R. § 200.18(b)).**
  - **Does the SEA afford substantial weight to each of the Academic Achievement, Academic Progress, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving ELP indicators? (34 C.F.R. § 200.18(b)(1)).**
  - **In the aggregate, does the SEA afford much greater weight to the substantially weighted indicators (i.e., Academic Achievement, Academic Progress, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving ELP) than to the School Quality or Student Success indicator or indicators? (34 C.F.R. § 200.18(b)(2)).**
  - **Does the SEA afford the same relative weight to each indicator among all schools within the same grade span? (34 C.F.R. § 200.18(b)(3)).**
  - **In schools that do not meet the minimum number of students for the English learner subgroup, and therefore do not have sufficient data to calculate the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator, does the SEA afford the same relative weight to the remaining three indicators (i.e., Academic Achievement, Academic Progress or Graduation Rate, and School Quality or Student Success) as it affords to those indicators in schools where annual meaningful differentiation also includes the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator? (34 C.F.R. § 200.18(d)(3)).**
  - *Is the SEA's approach to weighting of each indicator clear and understandable to the public?*
  - *Does the SEA use the same approach to weighting of indicators, and measures within those indicators, for all public schools in the State within a particular grade span?*

- *Does the SEA’s approach to weighting of each indicator provide for fair, valid, and uniform annual meaningful differentiation across schools and LEAs?*
- *Does the SEA’s approach to weighting of each indicator provide sufficient emphasis on the indicators that must each be substantially weighted and provide a clear signal to educators, families, and the public regarding indicators where strong performance is particularly critical to improve or sustain positive student academic outcomes in the school?*
- **Does the SEA’s weighting approach meet the applicable requirements related to School Quality or Student Success indicator(s)? (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C)(ii); 34 C.F.R. § 200.18(c)(1)-(2)).**
  - **Does the SEA demonstrate that performance on its indicator(s) of School Quality or Student Success does not change the identity of schools that would otherwise be identified for comprehensive support and improvement without such indicator(s), unless the school has made significant progress in the prior year, as determined by the State, for all students on at least one of the other indicators that are measured for all students: Academic Achievement, Academic Progress, or Graduation Rate? (34 C.F.R. § 200.18(c)(1)).**
  - **Does the SEA demonstrate that performance on its indicator(s) of School Quality or Student Success does not change the identity of schools that would otherwise be identified for targeted support and improvement without such indicator(s), unless the school has made significant progress in the prior year, as determined by the State, for each consistently underperforming or low-performing subgroup of students on at least one of the following indicators: Academic Achievement, Academic Progress, Graduation Rate, or Progress in Achieving ELP (if the low-performing or consistently underperforming subgroup in the school is the English learner subgroup)? (34 C.F.R. § 200.18(c)(2)).**

4.1.D.iv: Summative Determination

- **Does the SEA describe (1) the summative determination that it provides to each school and (2) how it is calculated? (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C) and (D); 34 C.F.R. § 200.18(a)(4)).**
  - **Does the SEA provide each school with a single summative determination from among at least three distinct categories that meaningfully differentiates between schools based on differing levels of performance on the indicators and that may the two categories of identified schools (i.e., comprehensive and targeted support and improvement schools)? (34 C.F.R. §§ 200.18(a)(4) and 200.19(a)-(b)).**
  - **Does the summative determination describe a school’s overall performance in a clear and understandable manner as part of the description of the State’s system for annual meaningful differentiation on LEA report cards? (34 C.F.R. § 200.18(a)(4)).**
  - *Are the SEA’s summative determinations (e.g., categories or overall designations for schools) clear and understandable to educators, families, public officials, school leaders, and other stakeholders?*
  - *Do the SEA’s summative determinations (e.g., categories or overall designations for schools) support meaningful differentiation by providing clear, valid, and technically sound distinctions between schools each year based on their performance across all of the accountability indicators?*
  - *Does the SEA’s approach to summative determinations support LEA and school staff in continuous efforts to improve student outcomes?*

4.1.D.v: Ensuring Schools with Low Performance Are Identified

- **Do the SEA’s system for annual meaningful differentiation and its methodology for school identification ensure that schools with low performance on substantially weighted indicators (i.e., Academic Achievement, Academic Progress, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving ELP) are more likely to be identified for comprehensive support and improvement or targeted support and improvement? (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C)(ii)-(iii) and (D); 34 C.F.R. § 200.18(d)(1)(ii)).**



- **Does the SEA demonstrate that a school identified for targeted support and improvement because it has a consistently underperforming subgroup of students receives a lower summative determination than it would have otherwise received if it did not have any consistently underperforming subgroups of students? (34 C.F.R. § 200.18(c)(3)).**
- *Does the SEA’s methodology distinguish each school with one or more consistently underperforming subgroups of students by providing the school with a summative determination that is meaningfully different than those schools would otherwise receive if they did not have one or more consistently underperforming subgroups of students?*

4.1.E: Participation Rate (34 C.F.R. § 299.17(b)(6))

- **Does the SEA factor into its system for annual meaningful differentiation the achievement of at least 95 percent of all students and 95 percent of all students in each subgroup of students (economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners) on its annual reading/language arts and mathematics assessments? (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(iii); 34 C.F.R. §§ 200.15(a)(2) and 200.18(a)(5)).**
  - **Does the State describe the action that it will take for a school that fails to assess at least 95 percent of all students or 95 percent of any subgroup of students in the school in reading/language arts or mathematics, including at least one of the following: lowering the summative determination, assigning the school the lowest performance level on the Academic Achievement indicator, identifying the school for targeted support and improvement, or another State-determined action or set of actions? (34 C.F.R. § 200.15(b)(2)).**
  - **If the SEA intends to use a State-determined action or set of actions, is that action or set of actions sufficiently rigorous to improve the school’s participation rate so that the school meets the 95 percent participation requirement in subsequent years? (34 C.F.R. § 200.15(b)(2)(iv)).**
  - *If the SEA differentiates the response it takes to a school missing the 95 percent participation requirement as part of its State-determined action or set of actions, do the factors the SEA considers in determining the appropriate response result in an action that is both tailored to the needs of the school and also sufficiently rigorous to address the problem?*
  - *If the SEA differentiates the response it takes to a school missing the 95 percent participation requirement, do the factors the SEA considers in determining the appropriate response include the number of subgroups in the school missing the requirement, the length of time over which the school has missed the requirement, or the degree to which the school missed the requirement (i.e., 92 percent participation rate vs. 70 percent participation)?*
  - *Does the SEA describe its process for ensuring that each LEA will review, approve, and monitor an improvement plan for each school that misses the 95 percent participation rate requirement in reading/language arts or mathematics, for all students or for any subgroup of students, which must be developed and implemented in partnership with stakeholders in the school and include strategies to address the reason or reasons for low participation rates in the school in order to improve participation rates? (34 C.F.R. § 200.15(c)(1)).<sup>11</sup>*
  - *Does the SEA describe (1) how it will identify an LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools that fail to meet the 95 participation rate requirement and (2) its process for reviewing and approving an improvement plan for each such LEA that includes additional actions that the*

<sup>11</sup> This question for consideration includes a citation to the regulation because it is a requirement. However, an SEA’s response to the requirement is not a required description in an SEA’s consolidated State plan.

*LEA will take to support effective implementation of school-level plans? (34 C.F.R. § 200.15(c)(2)).<sup>12</sup>*

4.1.F: Data Procedures (34 C.F.R. § 299.17(b)(7))

- **If applicable, does the SEA describe its uniform procedure for averaging data, including (1) combining data across school years and/or (2) combining data across grades in a school? (34 C.F.R. § 200.20(a)).**
  - Does the SEA only combine data for (1) calculating the accountability system indicators that it uses for annual meaningful differentiation of schools, (2) meeting the requirement for the State to factor 95 percent participation rates for all students and 95 percent of each subgroup of students in State’s system of annual meaningful differentiation, and/or (3) identifying high schools with low graduation rates as comprehensive support and improvement schools? (34 C.F.R. §§ 200.20(a), 200.14, 200.15(b)(2), and 200.19(a)(2)).
  - Does the SEA use the same uniform procedure for combining data from the school year for which the identification is made with data from one or two school years immediately preceding that school year for all public schools? (34 C.F.R. § 200.20(a)(1)(ii)(A)).
  - Does the SEA’s uniform procedure combine data over two or three years (including the current year data)? (34 C.F.R. § 200.20(a)(1)(i)).
  - Does the SEA use the same uniform procedure for combining data across grade spans for all public schools? (34 C.F.R. § 200.20(a)(2)(ii)(A)).
  - When combining data across school years, does the SEA sum the total number of students in each subgroup of students, including economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners, across all school years when determining whether a subgroup meets the State’s minimum number of students? (34 C.F.R. § 200.20(a)(1)(ii)(A)).
  - Does the SEA describe how it will specify the procedure it uses to combine data in its description of the indicators used for meaningful differentiation on the State report card? (34 C.F.R. § 200.20(a)(1)(ii)(C) and (a)(2)(ii)(C)).
  - *Are the State’s uniform procedures for averaging data technically sound?*

4.1.G: Including All Public Schools in a State’s Accountability System (34 C.F.R. § 299.17(b)(7))

- **If the State uses a different methodology in its system of meaningful differentiation than the one described above in 4.1.D and 4.1.D.i-iii for certain schools, does the SEA describe its different methodology or methodologies for inclusion of such schools, including the schools listed below? (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C); 34 C.F.R. § 200.18(d)(1)(iii))**
  - **(4.1.G.i) In which no grade level is assessed under the State’s academic assessment system (e.g., P-2 schools in which no formal assessments are required)? (34 C.F.R. § 200.18(d)(1)(iii)(A)).**
  - **(4.1.G.ii) With variant grade configurations (e.g., P-12 schools)? (34 C.F.R. § 200.18(d)(1)(iii)(B)).**
    - *Does the SEA identify the typical grade configurations, the range of variant configurations possible, and the methodology used for each configuration?*
  - **(4.1.G.iii) In which the total number of students that can be included on any indicator is less than the minimum number of students established by the State, consistent with a State’s uniform procedure for averaging data described above in 4.1.F (i.e., small schools)? (34 C.F.R. § 200.18(d)(1)(iii)(C)).**
  - **(4.1.G.iv) That are designed to serve special populations (e.g., students receiving alternative programming in alternative educational settings, students living in local institutions for**

<sup>12</sup> See footnote 11.

neglected or delinquent children, including juvenile justice facilities, students enrolled in State public schools for the deaf or blind, recently arrived English learners enrolled in public schools for newcomer students)? (34 C.F.R. § 200.18(d)(1)(iii)(D)).

- *Does the SEA identify each type of school that is not being included in the system of meaningful differentiation typically used, its rationale for using an alternative methodology for such schools, and the particular methodology used for each type of school?*
- **(4.1.G.v) That are newly opened and thus do not have multiple years of data, consistent with a State’s uniform procedure for averaging data described above in 4.1.F, if applicable, for at least one indicator (e.g., a newly opened high school that has not yet graduated its first cohort of students)? (34 C.F.R. § 200.18(d)(1)(iii)(E)).**
- *Does the methodology or methodologies result in annual meaningful differentiation for these categories of schools, including the requirements for performance levels on indicators and a summative determination?*
- *Does the SEA describe how the methodology or methodologies are used to identify whether these categories of schools require comprehensive or targeted support and improvement so that students in these schools receive supports and interventions when necessary?*
- *Is the alternate methodology or methodologies technically and educationally sound?*

## 4.2: Identification of Schools

### 4.2.A: Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools (34 C.F.R. § 299.17(c)(1)-(2))

#### 4.2.A.i: Identifying Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools

- **Does the SEA describe the methodology by which the State identifies schools for comprehensive support and improvement? (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i) and 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(II); 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(a)).**
  - **Does the SEA describe its methodology, based on its system for annual meaningful differentiation, for identifying not less than the lowest-performing five percent of Title I schools no later than the 2018-2019 school year and at least once every three years thereafter? (34 C.F.R. § 200.19(a)(1) and (d)(1)(i)).**
    - **Are the lowest-performing five percent of Title I schools identified consistent with the requirements for summative determinations as described above in 4.1.D.iii? (34 C.F.R. §§ 200.18(a)(4) and 200.19(a)(1)).**
    - *Is the SEA’s methodology technically and educationally sound?*
  - **For identifying all public schools with a low high school graduation rate, are schools identified based on a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students at or below 67 percent or, if the State chooses, below a higher percentage selected by the State, no later than the 2018-2019 school year and at least once every three years thereafter? (34 C.F.R. § 200.19(a)(2) and (d)(1)(i)).**
  - **Does the SEA describe its methodology, based on its system for annual meaningful differentiation, for identifying Title I schools with a chronically low-performing subgroup (see 4.2.B.ii for a description of how these schools were initially identified for targeted support and improvement)? (34 C.F.R. § 200.19(a)(3)).**
    - **Will Title I schools with a chronically low-performing subgroup be identified for comprehensive support and improvement after implementing a targeted support and improvement plan over a State-determined number of years? (34 C.F.R. § 200.19(a)(3)).**
    - **Does the SEA describe the timeline on which Title I schools with a chronically low-performing subgroup of students will be identified, including the year of initial identification and identification at least once every three years thereafter? (34 C.F.R. § 200.19(d)(1)(i)).**

- *Is the SEA’s timeline for identifying schools with chronically low-performing subgroups of students ambitious, practicable, and actionable?*

4.2.A.ii: Statewide Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools

- **Does the SEA describe the uniform statewide exit criteria, established by the State, for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria? (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(I); 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(f)(1))**
- **Do the SEA’s exit criteria, at a minimum, require that the school (1) improve student outcomes and (2) no longer meets the criteria under which the school was identified for comprehensive support and improvement within a State-determined number of years (not to exceed four years)? (34 C.F.R. § 200.21(f)(1)(i)-(ii))**
  - *Is the level of progress required by the SEA to exit from comprehensive support and improvement status sufficient to result in continued student academic achievement and school success in the school?*
  - *Does the State provide past performance data for low-performing schools in the State that have improved or other evidence to demonstrate that improvement within the State-determined number of years and the exit criteria are rigorous and attainable?*

4.2.B: Targeted Support and Improvement Schools (34 C.F.R. § 299.17(c)(3)-(5))

4.2.B.i: Targeted Support and Improvement Schools-Consistently Underperforming Subgroups

- **Does the SEA describe its methodology for annually identifying any school with a “consistently underperforming” subgroup of students, including the time period used by the State to determine consistent underperformance? (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C)(iii) and 1111(d)(2)(A)(i); 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)(1) and (c)).**
  - **Does the SEA demonstrate that its methodology for identification, beginning with identification for the 2019-2020 school year, considers each school’s performance among each subgroup of students (economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners) in the school over no more than two years? (34 C.F.R. § 200.19(c)(1) and (d)(1)(ii)).**
  - **If an SEA proposes a timeframe longer than two years for considering a school’s performance to identify a “consistently underperforming” subgroup, does the SEA demonstrate that the longer timeframe will better support low-performing subgroups of students to make significant progress in achieving the State’s long-term goals and measurement of interim progress in order to close statewide proficiency and graduation rate gaps? (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(III); 34 C.F.R. §§ 200.19(c)(1) and 200.13(a)-(b)).**
    - *If the SEA is proposing to define a consistently underperforming subgroup over a period of time that is greater than two years, does the SEA describe how it will ensure LEAs are supporting any school at risk of being identified as having a “consistently underperforming” subgroup of students because of underperformance for a period of time greater than two years but less than the SEA’s timeframe?*
  - **Is the SEA’s methodology to identify a school with a “consistently underperforming” subgroup of students based on all accountability system indicators used for annual meaningful differentiation of schools consistent with the requirements for weighting of indicators? (34 C.F.R. §§ 200.19(c)(2) and 200.18(b)).**
  - **Does the SEA define a “consistently underperforming” subgroup of students in a uniform manner across all LEAs in the State based on one of the following:**
    - **A subgroup of students that is not meeting at least one of the State’s measurements of interim progress or is not on track to meet at least one of the State-designed long-term goals, or is performing below a State-determined threshold on at least one indicator for**

which the State is not required to establish long-term goals? (34 C.F.R. § 200.19(c)(3)(i)).

- **Another State-determined definition that the State provides?** (34 C.F.R. § 200.19(c)(3)(ii)).
- *Is the SEA’s definition of a “consistently underperforming” subgroup of students likely to identify schools that are not making progress towards meeting the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for each subgroup and closing statewide gaps in achievement, graduation rates, or other outcomes?*

4.2.B.ii: Targeted Support and Improvement Schools— Low-Performing Subgroups of Students

- **Does the SEA describe its methodology for identifying any school with a low-performing subgroup of students that must receive additional targeted support no later than the 2018-2019 school year and at least once every three years thereafter?** (ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(D); 34 C.F.R § 200.19(b)(2) and (d)(1)(iii)).
  - **Does the SEA’s methodology result in the SEA identifying for additional targeted support and improvement any school in which one or more of its subgroups of students is performing at or below the performance of the all students group in any school in the lowest-performing Title I schools in the State identified for comprehensive support and improvement?** (34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)(2)).
  - **Does the SEA’s methodology result in the SEA identifying any school with a low-performing subgroup no later than the 2018-2019 school year and at least once every three years after the first identification?** (34 C.F.R. § 200.19(d)(1)(iii)(A) and (B)).
  - **Does the SEA’s methodology result in the SEA identifying any school with a low-performing subgroup in each year in which the State identifies schools for comprehensive support and improvement?** (34 C.F.R. § 200.19(d)(1)(iii)(C)).
  - *Is the SEA’s methodology educationally and technically sound in how it compares the performance of the low-performing subgroup of students to students in the lowest-performing schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, and does it result in the schools and LEAs receiving the necessary supports?*

4.2.B.iii: Uniform Statewide Exit Criteria for Targeted Support and Improvement Schools

- **Does the SEA describe its uniform statewide exit criteria for schools participating under Title I, Part A with one or more low-performing subgroups of students that must receive additional targeted support, including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria?** (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(II); 34 C.F.R. § 200.22(f)).
  - **Do the SEA’s exit criteria require that each school improve student outcomes for its lowest-performing students, including each subgroup identified as low-performing?** (34 C.F.R. § 200.22(f)(1)(i)).
  - **Do the SEA’s exit criteria require that each school identified no longer meet the criteria for identification?** (34 C.F.R. § 200.22(f)(1)(ii)).
  - *Does the SEA describe how the State-determined number of years in these exit criteria ensures that schools with a low-performing subgroup of students that do not improve after implementation of a targeted support and improvement plan are identified at least once every three years for comprehensive support and improvement (i.e., as a school with a chronically low-performing subgroup under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(a)(3))?*
  - *If achieved, is the level of progress required by the exit criteria meaningful enough so that it is likely to result in sustained student academic achievement and school success for low-performing students, including the subgroup(s) that led to the school’s identification as a targeted support and improvement school (e.g., does the State require the school to meet exit criteria for multiple years)?*

- *Does the State provide past performance data for low-performing schools in the State that have improved or other evidence to demonstrate that its State-determined number of years and exit criteria are rigorous and attainable?*

### 4.3: State Support and Improvement for Low-performing Schools

#### 4.3.A: School Improvement Resources (34 C.F.R. § 299.17(d)(1))

- **Does the SEA describe how it will meet its responsibilities related to funding under section 1003 of the ESEA, including how it will award funds to LEAs, monitor use of funds by LEAs, evaluate the use of funds by LEAs, renew an LEA’s award with respect to a particular school, and reduce barriers and provide, as appropriate, operational flexibility for each school in an LEA receiving funds? (34 C.F.R. § 200.24(c) and (d)).**
  - **Does the SEA describe the method it will use to award school improvement funds to LEAs, such that each award is of sufficient size for each school identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement to be served by such funds to support the LEA to effectively implement all requirements for a comprehensive or targeted support and improvement plan? (34 C.F.R. § 200.24(c)(2) and (d)).<sup>13</sup>**
  - *To what extent is the SEA’s process for determining the size of grants to LEAs under section 1003 of the ESEA likely to ensure that LEAs receiving such grants will have sufficient funds to successfully implement proposed evidence-based interventions in the schools they are serving?*
  - *Does the SEA describe how it will require applicants for funds under section 1003 to describe one or more evidence-based interventions that meet the top three levels of evidence under the ESEA (strong evidence, moderate evidence, or promising evidence)?*
  - **Does the SEA describe how it will make awards to LEAs if the State has insufficient school improvement funds to award grants of sufficient size to each LEA that submits an application, including how it will give priority in funding to an LEA that demonstrates the greatest need for such funds and strongest commitment to use funds to improve academic achievement and student outcomes? (34 C.F.R. § 200.24(c)(4)(ii)-(iii)).<sup>14</sup>**

<sup>13</sup> 34 C.F.R. § 200.24(c)(2)(ii) requires that each State, “Make each award of sufficient size, with a minimum award of \$500,000 per year for each school identified for comprehensive support and improvement to be served and a minimum award of \$50,000 per year for each school identified for targeted support and improvement to be served, to support the LEA to effectively implement all requirements for a support and improvement plan under §§ 200.21 or 200.22, as applicable, including selected evidence-based interventions, except that a State may determine that an award of less than the minimum award amount is appropriate if, based on each school’s enrollment, identified needs, selected evidence-based interventions, and other relevant factors described in the LEA’s application on behalf of the school, such lesser amount will be sufficient to support effective implementation of such plan...”

<sup>14</sup> 34 C.F.R. § 200.24(c)(4) requires that, “If a State has insufficient school improvement funds to award a grant of sufficient size to each LEA that submits an approvable application consistent with paragraph (c)(1) of this section, the State must, whether awarding funds through a formula or competition--(i) Award funds to an LEA to serve a school identified for comprehensive support and improvement before awarding funds to an LEA to serve a school identified for targeted support and improvement; (ii) Give priority in funding to an LEA that demonstrates the greatest need for such funds, as determined by the State, and based, at a minimum, on--(A) The number or percentage of elementary and secondary schools in the LEA implementing plans under §§ 200.21 or 200.22; (B) The State’s review of resources available among and within LEAs under § 200.23(a); and (C) Current academic achievement and student outcomes in the school or schools the LEA is proposing to serve. (iii) Give priority in funding to an LEA that demonstrates the strongest commitment to use such funds to enable the lowest-performing schools to improve academic achievement and student outcomes, taking into consideration, with respect to the school or schools to be served--(A) The proposed use of evidence-based interventions that are supported by the strongest level of evidence available and sufficient to support the school in making progress toward meeting exit criteria under § 200.21 or § 200.22; and (B) Commitment to family and community engagement. (iv) Take into consideration geographic diversity within the State.”

- **Does the SEA describe how it will give priority to an LEA that demonstrates the strongest commitment by proposing the use of evidence-based interventions that are supported by the strongest level of evidence available and sufficient to support the school in making progress toward meeting the applicable exit criteria?** (34 C.F.R. § 200.23(c)(4)(iii)).
- *To what extent are the SEA’s proposed definitions of “greatest need” and “strongest commitment” likely to ensure that section 1003 school improvement funds will support the State in making progress toward its long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for all students and for each subgroup of students?*
- *Does the SEA’s plan for making LEA awards include an evaluation of the LEA’s commitment to family and community engagement?*
- **Does the SEA describe how it will monitor LEAs’ use of school improvement funds?** (34 C.F.R. § 200.24(d)(1)(ii)).
- *To what extent is the SEA’s monitoring process for section 1003 grants likely to ensure effective use of Federal school improvement funds?*
- **Does the SEA describe how it will evaluate the use of school improvement funds by LEAs receiving such funds by, at a minimum, engaging in ongoing efforts to analyze the impact of the evidence-based interventions implemented using funds allocated under ESEA section 1003 on student or other relevant outcomes and disseminating on a regular basis the State’s findings on the impact of the evidence-based interventions to LEAs with identified schools?** (34 C.F.R. § 200.24(d)(1)(iii)).
- *Does the SEA describe the method of delivery for disseminating the SEA’s findings on the impact of the evidence-based interventions funded with school improvement funds?*
- *Does the SEA describe how the results of its ongoing analysis of the impact of evidence-based interventions will support continuous improvement of the SEA and LEAs’ system of school improvement?*
- **Prior to renewing an LEA’s award of school improvement funds with respect to a particular school each year, does the SEA describe how it will determine that the school is (1) making progress on the State’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress and accountability indicators; and (2) implementing evidence-based interventions with fidelity to the LEA’s application and the requirements for schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement?** (34 C.F.R. §§ 200.24(d)(1)(iv), 200.13, 200.14, and 200.21 or 200.22).
- *To what extent is the SEA’s renewal process for section 1003 grants likely to ensure effective use of Federal school improvement funds?*
- **Does the SEA describe how it will, as appropriate, reduce barriers and provide operational flexibility for each school in an LEA receiving funds under ESEA section 1003, including flexibility around school budgeting and staffing?** (34 C.F.R. § 200.24(d)(1)(v)).

4.3.B: Technical Assistance Regarding Evidence-Based Interventions (34 C.F.R. § 299.17(d)(2))

- **Does the SEA describe the technical assistance that it will provide to each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement, including how it will provide technical assistance to LEAs to ensure the effective implementation of evidence-based interventions?** (34 C.F.R. § 200.23(b)).
  - **Does the SEA’s description include how it will increase LEA capacity to develop or use tools related to: (1) conducting a school-level needs assessment; (2) selecting evidence-based interventions as part of each comprehensive and targeted support and improvement plan;**

**and (3) reviewing resource allocation and identifying strategies for addressing any identified resource inequities? (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(iii); 34 C.F.R. § 200.23(b)(3)).**

- *Is the SEA’s plan for providing technical assistance likely to improve LEA capacity to develop and implement, or ensure that schools develop and implement, support and improvement plans that meet all statutory and regulatory requirements and result in improved academic achievement and school success?*
- *Does the SEA describe how it will identify an LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement?*
- *Does the SEA describe how it will prioritize or differentiate technical assistance to LEAs with a significant number or percentage of schools identified for support and improvement or increase its own capacity to serve its LEAs?*
- *Does the SEA have a plan to develop or disseminate tools that LEAs may use in order to meet requirements related to schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement?*
- *Does the SEA’s plan for providing support for all LEAs with schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support appear educationally sound and likely to result in increased LEA capacity and improved student achievement?*
- **If applicable, does the SEA provide its process for establishing and approving a list of evidence-based interventions for use in schools implementing comprehensive or targeted support and improvement plans? (34 C.F.R § 200.23(c)(2)).**
  - *Will the SEA’s process result in an exhaustive list of evidence-based interventions from which LEAs and schools must choose, or a non-exhaustive list of evidence-based interventions from which LEAs and schools may choose?*
  - *If applicable, does the SEA describe the criteria it will use to review and approve evidence-based interventions to ensure that the listed interventions meet the definition of “evidence-based” under section 8101(21) of the ESEA and to assist LEAs and schools in meeting the requirements for use of evidence-based interventions under 34 C.F.R. §§ 200.21(d)(3) and 200.22(c)(4) regarding overlap with the population or setting of the school to be served and support by the strongest level of evidence available and appropriate?*
- **If applicable, does the SEA describe one or more evidence-based, State-determined interventions that the SEA has developed for LEAs to use in schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, such as whole-school reform models? (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(B)(ii); 34 C.F.R. § 200.23(c)(3)).**
- *Is the description of the SEA’s technical assistance likely to lead to increased overall performance in comprehensive support and improvement schools and targeted support and improvement schools within LEAs with a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement?*

4.3.C: More Rigorous Interventions (34 C.F.R. § 299.17(d)(3))

- **Does the SEA describe how it will determine more rigorous interventions for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the State’s exit criteria within a State-determined number of years (not to exceed four years)? (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i); 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(f)(3)(iii)).**
  - **What additional, more rigorous interventions does the SEA require of such comprehensive support and improvement schools? (34 C.F.R. § 200.21(f)(3)(iii)).**
  - **Does the SEA require that the interventions in such a school’s amended comprehensive support and improvement plan be more rigorous than those in the original plan, including one or more evidence-based interventions that are supported by strong or moderate evidence? (ESEA section 8101(21)(A); 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(f)(3)(iii)(B)).**
  - **Are the required interventions supported, to the extent practicable, by evidence from a sample population or setting that overlaps with the population or setting of the school to be**



served? (34 C.F.R. § 200.21(f)(3)(iii)(C)).

- Does the SEA require that the LEA include in the amended plans actions that address school-level operations, such as changes in school staffing and budgeting, or the school day and year, or require an intervention that is a State-determined, evidence-based intervention or that is from a State-approved list of evidence-based interventions?
- Does the SEA describe how it will differentiate support to schools in comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the exit criteria, in addition to determining a more rigorous intervention?
- Are the State-determined, more rigorous interventions likely to be effective in addressing the reason or reasons the school failed to meet the exit criteria?

4.3.D: Periodic Review of Resources (34 C.F.R. § 299.17(d)(4))

- **Does the SEA describe how it will periodically review resources, including the resources listed in 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(d)(4)(i)(A)-(E),<sup>15</sup> and, to the extent practicable, address any inequities in resources with respect to each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement? (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(ii); 34 C.F.R. § 200.23(a)).**
  - **Does the SEA consider inequities in resources available in LEAs with a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement as compared to all other LEAs in the State, and in schools in those LEAs as compared to all other schools in the State? (34 C.F.R § 200.23(a)).**
  - **Does the SEA consider and, to the extent practicable, address any inequities identified under 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(d)(4) in schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement in its review? (34 C.F.R. 200. 23(a)).**
  - **Does the SEA consider and, to the extent practicable, address any inequities identified under 34 C.F.R. § 200.22(c)(7)<sup>16</sup> in schools identified for targeted support and improvement in its review? (34 C.F.R § 200. 23(a)).**
  - *Does the SEA describe how it will identify an LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement?*

<sup>15</sup> 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(d)(4)(i) requires an LEA with a comprehensive support and improvement school to identify and address resource inequities by including a review of LEA and school-level resources among schools and, as applicable, A) differences in rates at which low-income and minority students are taught by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers identified by the State and LEA under sections 1111(g)(1)(B) and 1112(b)(2) of the ESEA; (B) access to advanced coursework, including accelerated coursework as reported under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii); (C) access in elementary schools to full-day kindergarten programs and to preschool programs as reported under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii); (D) access to specialized instructional support personnel, as defined in section 8101(47), including school counselors, school social workers, school psychologists, other qualified professional personnel, and school librarians; within schools with respect to: (and (E) per-pupil expenditures of Federal, State, and local funds required to be reported under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(x).

<sup>16</sup> 34 C.F.R. § 200.22(c)(7)(i)-(ii) requires a school identified for additional targeted support due to low-performing subgroups to identify and address resource inequities by including a review of LEA and school-level resources among schools and, as applicable, within schools with respect to: (A) differences in rates at which low-income and minority students are taught by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers identified by the State and LEA under sections 1111(g)(1)(B) and 1112(b)(2) of the ESEA; (B) per-pupil expenditures of Federal, State, and local funds required to be reported under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(x); (C) access to advanced coursework, including accelerated coursework as reported under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii); (D) access to full-day kindergarten programs and to preschool programs as reported under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii); and (E) access to specialized instructional support personnel, as defined in section 8101(47), including school counselors, school social workers, and school psychologists, other qualified professional personnel, and school librarians; and including, at the school's discretion, a review of LEA and school-level budgeting and resource allocation with respect to resources and the availability and access to any other resource provided by the LEA or school, such as instructional materials and technology.

- *Does the SEA describe how frequently it will review resources available among its LEAs, and how it will make up-to-date data on resource inequities in identified schools (as described in 34 C.F.R. §§ 200.21(d)(4) and 200.22(c)(7)) available at such time to inform the SEA's review and enable the SEA to address any identified inequities?*
- *Does the SEA describe strategies it will use to address any identified resource inequities between LEAs and between schools?*

## SECTION 5: SUPPORTING EXCELLENT EDUCATORS

### 5.1: Educator Development, Retention, and Advancement (34 C.F.R. §299.18(a))

**NOTE:** If an SEA intends to use funds under one or more of the included programs for the specific purpose in each question, the SEA must provide a description with the necessary information.

#### 5.1.A: Certification and Licensure Systems

- **If the SEA indicated that it intends to use Title II, Part A funds, or funds from other included programs for certifying and licensing teachers and principals or other school leaders, does the SEA provide a description of its current systems for certification and licensure?**
  - *Do the SEA's certification and licensing requirements for teachers and principals or other school leaders align with the State's challenging academic standards?*
  - *Does the SEA's description of its systems for certification and licensure indicate that it includes opportunities for alternative routes into both teaching and leading in schools, including for individuals with advanced degrees, mid-career professionals from other occupations, paraprofessionals, former military personnel, and recent graduates of institutions of higher education with academic records that demonstrate potential?*
  - *Does the SEA's description include certification and licensing requirements for all teachers, including teachers of core content areas, special education teachers, and teachers of English learners?*
  - *Does the SEA specify the source of funds from included programs that it will use for this purpose?*

#### 5.1.B: Educator Preparation Program Strategies

- **If the SEA indicated that it intends to use Title II, Part A funds, or funds from other included programs to support the State's strategies to improve educator preparation programs, particularly for educators of low-income and minority students, does the SEA provide a description of the strategies to improve educator preparation programs? (ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(M)).**
  - *Are the strategies likely to result in improved educator preparation programs?*
  - *Does the SEA use and present evidence and data to inform its identification of and rationale for the selected strategies?*
  - *Does the SEA describe how its strategies to improve teacher preparation programs will make it more likely that teachers will enter the classroom with the necessary subject-matter knowledge and teaching skills to help students meet challenging State academic standards including special education teachers, and teachers of English learners?*
  - *Does the SEA describe how its strategies to improve principal preparation programs will help ensure that new principals have the instructional leadership skills to support teachers and to help students meet challenging State academic standards?*
  - *Does the SEA specify the source of funds from included programs that it intends to use for this purpose?*

#### 5.1.C: Educator Growth and Development Systems

- **If the SEA indicated that it intends to use Title II, Part A funds, or funds from other included programs, to support the State's system of professional growth and improvement for educators, does the SEA provide a description of its educator growth and development system that addresses: (1) induction; (2) development, consistent with the definition of "professional development" in ESEA section 8101(42); (3) compensation; and (4) advancement?**
  - **If the SEA will use funds to develop a State teacher, principal, or other school leader evaluation and support system or work with LEAs in the State to develop local systems,**

does the SEA describe how the evaluation and support systems are based in part on evidence of student academic achievement, which many include student growth, and must include multiple measures of educator performance and provide clear, timely, and useful feedback to teachers, principals, or other school leaders? (ESEA section 2101(c)(4)(B)(ii)).

- *Does the SEA's system, or the SEA's work to support its LEAs' systems, include a specific focus on how induction, compensation, and advancement strategies that are likely to support the development, support and retention of excellent educators?*
- *Is the SEA's system, or the SEA's work to support its LEAs' systems, of professional growth and improvement likely to support, develop and retain excellent teachers, principals, and other school leaders?*
- *Is the SEA's system, or the SEA's work to support its LEAs' systems, likely to increase diversity in the teacher, principal, and other school leader workforce?*
- *Does the SEA's system, or the SEA's efforts to support its LEA's system, include support for all teachers, including teachers of core content areas, special education teachers, and teachers of English learners?*
- *Does the SEA specify the source of funds from included programs that it intends to use for this purpose?*

## 5.2: Support for Educators (34 C.F.R. §299.18(b))

### 5.2.A: Resources to Support State-level Strategies

- **Does the SEA describe how it will use of Title II, Part A funds and funds from other included programs to support the SEA's State-level strategies designed to:**
  - (i) **Increase student achievement consistent with the challenging State academic standards;**
  - (ii) **Improve the quality and effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other school leaders;**
  - (iii) **Increase the number of teachers, principals, and other school leaders who are effective in improving student academic achievement in schools; and**
  - (iv) **Provide low-income and minority students with greater access to effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders consistent with the provisions described in the SEA's plan for educator equity?**
- *Does the SEA use and present evidence and data to inform its identification of and rationale for the selected strategies?*
- *Does the SEA include a timeline for implementation of its strategies that is ambitious, practicable, and actionable?*
- *Does the SEA include a timeline for implementation of its strategies that reflects a logical sequencing and spacing of the key steps necessary to result in these strategies leading to effective support for educators?*
- *Do the SEA's strategies include support for all teachers, including teachers of core content areas, special education teachers, and teachers of English learners?*

### 5.2.B: Improving the Skills of Educators to Identify and Address Student Learning Needs

- **Does the SEA describe how it will improve the skills of teachers, principals, or other school leaders to identify students with specific learning needs and provide instruction based on these needs?**
  - *Does the SEA identify the specific students its strategies are intended to address, such as low-performing students, English learners, and students with disabilities?*
  - *Does the SEA include a timeline for improving the skills of educators that is ambitious, practicable, and actionable?*
  - *Does the SEA include a timeline that reflects a logical sequencing and spacing of the key steps necessary to result in these strategies leading to effective support for educators?*

### 5.3: Educator Equity

#### 5.3.A: Definitions (34 C.F.R. § 299.18(c)(2))

##### 5.3.A.i: Definition of “Ineffective Teacher”

- **Is the SEA’s definition, or statewide guidelines, for the term “ineffective teacher”:** (1) based on criteria distinct from the criteria used to define the terms “out-of-field teacher” and “inexperienced teacher,” (2) likely to provide useful information about educator equity and the differences in rates at which low-income students and minority students are taught by ineffective teachers as compared to non-low-income and non-minority students, and (3) provide differentiation between categories of teachers?
  - *Is the SEA’s definition, or its statewide guidelines, likely to lead to meaningful differentiation among teachers, such as teachers that make different contributions to student outcomes?*
  - *Is the SEA’s definition, or its statewide guidelines, likely to illuminate differences in the rates at which low-income students and minority students are taught by ineffective teachers as compared to non-low-income and non-minority students in a manner that will support the SEA’s and its LEAs’ efforts to promote educator equity?*

##### 5.3.A.ii: Definition of “Out-of-Field” Teacher

- **Is the SEA’s definition for the term “out-of-field teacher” based on criteria distinct from the criteria used to define the terms “ineffective teacher” and “inexperienced teacher” and likely to provide useful information about educator equity and the differences in rates at which low-income students and minority students are taught by out-of-field teachers as compared to non-low-income and non-minority students?**
  - *Is this definition likely to illuminate differences in rates in a manner that will support the SEA’s and its LEAs’ efforts to promote educator equity?*

##### 5.3.A.iii: Definition of “Inexperienced Teacher”

- **Is the SEA’s definition for the term “inexperienced teacher” based on criteria distinct from the criteria used to define the terms “ineffective teacher” and “out-of-field teacher” and likely to provide useful information about educator equity and the differences in rates at which low-income students and minority students are taught by inexperienced teachers as compared to non-low-income and non-minority students?**
  - *Is this definition likely to illuminate differences in rates in a manner that will support the SEA’s and its LEAs’ efforts to promote educator equity?*

##### 5.3.A.iv. Definition of “Low-Income Student”

- **Is the SEA’s definition for the terms “low-income student” based on criteria distinct from the criteria used to define the term “minority student”?**
  - *Is this definition likely to illuminate differences in rates in a manner that will support the SEA’s and LEAs’ efforts to promote educator equity?*

##### 5.3.A.v. Definition of “Minority Student”

- **Is the SEA’s definition for the term “minority student” based on criteria distinct from the criteria used to define the term “low-income student” and does it include, at a minimum, race, color, and national origin, consistent with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964?**
  - *Is this definition likely to illuminate differences in rates in a manner that will support the SEA’s and its LEAs’ efforts to promote educator equity?*

##### 5.3.A.vi. Definition of Other Key Terms

- **If the SEA elects to use other key terms for purposes of meeting these requirements, does the**

**SEA define the other key terms?**

- *Are these definitions likely to illuminate differences in rates in a manner that will support SEA’s and LEAs’ efforts to promote educator equity?*

**5.3.B: Differences in Rates for Low-income and Minority Students (34 C.F.R. § 299.18(c)(3))**

**NOTE:** The calculation of differences in rates can be found in Appendix B of the consolidated State plan. If the SEA has requested an extension for calculating differences in rates at the student level, school-level data must be used to meet the requirement to calculate and report differences in rates; this information can be found in Appendix C. of the consolidated State plan.

- **Does the SEA provide the differences in rates, using student-level<sup>17</sup> data on a statewide basis, at which low-income and minority students enrolled in schools that receive funds under Title I, Part A are taught by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers compared to non-low-income and non-minority students enrolled in schools not receiving funds under Title I, Part A?**
  - *If the SEA has defined other key terms, has the SEA calculated differences in rates based on these terms?*
  - *If the SEA has not found differences in rates based on student-level data, has the SEA provided data indicating the absence of differences in rates?*

**5.3.C: Public Reporting on Progress (34 C.F.R. § 299.18(c)(4))**

- **Does the SEA provide the Web address, URL, or direct link to where it will publish and annually update the rates and differences in rates?<sup>18</sup>**
  - *Is the location where the SEA publishes and annually updates its progress likely to be maximally accessible to a broad range of stakeholders?*

**5.3.D: Analysis of Likely Causes of Differences in Rates (34 C.F.R. § 299.18(c)(5)(i))**

**NOTE:** If the SEA’s analysis described in section 5.3.B (included in Appendix B or C) does not demonstrate that low-income or minority students enrolled in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A are taught at different rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers compared to non-low-income and non-minority students, the SEA does not need to complete this section.

- **Does the SEA describe its likely causes (e.g., teacher shortages, working conditions, school leadership, compensation, or other causes) of the differences in rates for its most significant statewide differences in rates?**
- **Does the SEA identify whether the differences in rates reflect gaps between districts, within districts, and within schools?**
  - *Does the SEA clearly articulate how it is determining its most significant differences in rates and provide a compelling justification for that determination?*
  - *Does the SEA include a thorough description of its process for conducting its analysis of likely causes of differences in rates?*

<sup>17</sup> Consistent with 34 C.F.R. 299.13(d)(3)(i), if the SEA has requested an extension for calculating differences in rates at the student level, school-level data must be used to meet the requirement to calculate and report differences in rates.

<sup>18</sup> Under 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(c)(1)(iii), each SEA is required to publish and annually report: (i) the rates and differences described in section 5.3.B; (ii) the percentage of teachers categorized in each LEA at each effectiveness level established as part of the definition of “ineffective teacher,” consistent with applicable State privacy policies; (iii) the percentage of teachers categorized as out-of-field teachers; and (iv) the percentage of teachers categorized as inexperienced.

- *Does the SEA examine a wide variety of available information, including: quantitative data or statistics; qualitative data, particularly qualitative data available from stakeholder input; and research or lessons learned from prior work or similar work conducted by other SEAs or LEAs?*
- *Does the SEA consider its local context, as well as the local context of its LEAs, to account for geographic differences and the differing needs of particular schools?*
- *Does the SEA describe the results of its analysis of likely causes?*

5.3.E: Strategies to Eliminate Differences in Rates (34 C.F.R. § 299.18(c)(5)(ii))

**NOTE:** If the SEA’s analysis described in section 5.3.B does not demonstrate that low-income or minority students enrolled in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A are taught at different rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers compared to non-low-income and non-minority students the SEA does not need to complete this section.

- **Does the SEA provide strategies that are designed to address the likely causes of the most significant differences in rates and prioritized to address the most significant differences in rates?**
  - **Does the SEA describe timelines for implementation of its strategies?**
  - **Does the SEA identify Federal or non-Federal funding sources to support its strategies?**
    - *Are the SEA’s timelines ambitious, practicable, and actionable?*
    - *Does the SEA identify sufficient funds from the identified funding sources to enable it to effectively implement its strategies?*
  - **Are the SEA’s strategies based on its analysis of likely causes of differences in rates?**
    - *Does the SEA use and present evidence and data to inform its identification of and rationale for the selected strategies?*
    - *Do the strategies consider the full educator career continuum, including recruitment, retention, and advancement?*
    - *Do the strategies consider innovative compensation and/or incentive systems to reward educators working in low-income and/or high-minority schools who are ensuring that all of their students have an opportunity to succeed?*
    - *Do the strategies consider using Title II, Part A- funds to reduce differences in rates?*
    - *Does the SEA consider exercising its authority, which may include directing a portion of Title II, Part A LEA funds or denying Title II, Part A LEA applications if an LEA fails to describe how it will address differences in rates or fails to meet other local application requirements?*
  - **Does the SEA prioritize those strategies to support schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement that are contributing to those differences in rates?**
    - *Are the strategies likely to address the likely causes the SEA identified?*

5.3.F: Timelines and Interim Targets (34 C.F.R. § 299.18(c)(5)(iii))

- **Does the SEA provide its timelines and interim targets for eliminating all differences in rates described in section 5.3.B?**
  - *Are the SEA’s timelines and interim targets ambitious, practicable, and actionable?*
  - *Do the SEA’s timelines and interim targets reflect a logical pattern of progress based on the strategies the SEA identified above?*

## SECTION 6: SUPPORTING ALL STUDENTS

### 6.1: Well-Rounded and Supportive Education (34 C.F.R. § 299.19(a))

**NOTE:** For each item listed in section 6.1.A-B and, as applicable, 6.1.C-E, each SEA must describe how it will use Title IV, Part A funds, if applicable, and funds from other included programs, consistent with allowable uses of funds provided under those programs, to support State-level strategies and LEA use of funds. The strategies and funds must be designed to ensure that all children have a significant opportunity to meet the challenging State academic standards and career and technical standards, as applicable, and attain, at a minimum, a regular high school diploma.

Each SEA must describe how, when developing its State strategies, it considered the academic and non-academic needs of subgroups of students including:

- Low-income students;
- Lowest-achieving students;
- English learners;
- Children with disabilities;
- Foster care children and youth;
- Migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school;
- Homeless children and youths;
- Neglected, delinquent, and at-risk students identified under Title I, Part D of the ESEA;
- Immigrant children and youth;
- Students in LEAs eligible for grants under the Rural and Low-Income School program under section 5221 of the ESEA; and
- American Indian and Alaska Native students.

When providing this description, an SEA must address the needs of each subgroup but does not have to address the needs of each subgroup individually. For example, it may use a single strategy to address the needs of multiple subgroups.

#### 6.1.A: Supporting Continuum of Student's Education

- **Does the SEA describe its strategies to support the continuum of a student's education from preschool, including transitions from early childhood education to elementary school, elementary school to middle school, middle school to high school, and high school to post-secondary education and careers, in order to support appropriate promotion practices and decrease the risk of students dropping out, including how it will use funds from included programs and if applicable, Title IV, Part A?**
  - *Does the SEA describe differentiated strategies to address the specific needs of students as they transition from early childhood education to elementary school, elementary school to middle school, middle school to high school, and high school to post-secondary education and careers?*
  - *Does the SEA describe implementation timelines that are ambitious, practicable, and actionable?*
  - *Does the SEA identify the sources of funds from included programs it will use to support these strategies?*
  - *Does the SEA use and present evidence and data to inform its identification of and rationale for the selected strategies?*
- **Does the SEA describe how it will support LEAs to support the continuum of a student's education, as described above, in order to support appropriate promotion practices and decrease the risk of students dropping out?**



- *Does the SEA describe strategies to support LEAs that are differentiated to address the specific needs of LEAs and of students in LEAs as they transition from early childhood education to elementary school, elementary school to middle school, middle school to high school, and high school to post-secondary education and careers?*
- *Does the SEA’s description include implementation timelines for strategies to support LEAs that are ambitious, practicable, and actionable?*
- *Does the SEA identify the sources of funds from included programs it will use to support LEAs?*
- **Does the SEA describe how, when developing its State strategies, the SEA considered the academic and non-academic needs of the subgroups of students listed above?**
  - *Does the SEA’s description describe the data it used to consider the needs of these subgroups?*

6.1.B: Equitable Access to a Well-Rounded Education

- **Does the SEA describe its strategies, including how it will use funds from Title IV, Part A and other included programs, to provide equitable access to a well-rounded education and rigorous coursework in subjects<sup>19</sup> in which female students, minority students, English learners, children with disabilities, or low-income students are underrepresented?**
  - *Are the SEA’s strategies likely to provide equitable access to a well-rounded education and rigorous coursework?*
  - *Does the SEA’s description include implementation timelines that are ambitious, practicable, and actionable?*
  - *Does the SEA identify the sources of funds from included programs it will use to support these strategies?*
- **Does the SEA describe how it will support LEAs to provide equitable access to a well-rounded education and rigorous coursework in subjects<sup>20</sup> in which female students, minority students, English learners, children with disabilities, or low-income students are underrepresented?**
  - *Does the SEA’s description include implementation timelines that are ambitious, practicable, and actionable?*
  - *Does the SEA’s description describe how it considered the specific needs of LEAs in the State?*
- **Does the SEA describe how, when developing its State strategies, the SEA considered the academic and non-academic needs of the subgroups of students listed above?**
  - *Does the SEA’s description describe the data it used to consider the needs of these subgroups?*

**NOTE:** An SEA must address sections 6.1.C, 6.1.D, and/or 6.1.E only if the SEA intends to use funds from Title IV, Part A or other included programs to support such strategies.

6.1.C: School Conditions to Improve Student Learning

- **If the SEA indicated that it intends to use funds from Title IV, Part A or other included programs to support strategies to support LEAs to improve school conditions for student learning, including activities that create safe, healthy, and affirming school environments inclusive of all students to reduce incidents of bullying and harassment; the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom, such as out-of-school suspensions and expulsions; and the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety, does the SEA provide a description of this use of funds?**

<sup>19</sup> Subjects may include English, reading/language arts, writing, science, technology, engineering, mathematics, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, art, history, geography, computer science, music, career and technical education, health, physical education, and any other subjects in which female students, minority students, English learners, children with disabilities, and low-income students are underrepresented.

<sup>20</sup> See footnote 19.

- *Does the SEA use and present evidence and data to inform its identification of and rationale for the selected strategies?*
- *Does the SEA’s description include implementation timelines that are ambitious, practicable, and actionable?*
- *Does the SEA include a description of the sources of funds from included programs it will use to support these strategies?*
- **Does the SEA describe how, when developing its State strategies, the SEA considered the academic and non-academic needs of the subgroups of students listed above?**
  - *Does the SEA’s description describe the data it used to consider the needs of these subgroups?*

6.1.D: Effective Use of Technology

- **If the SEA indicated that it intends to use funds from Title IV, Part A or other included programs to support strategies to support LEAs to effectively use technology to improve the academic achievement and digital literacy of all students, does the SEA provide a description of this use of funds?**
  - *Are the SEA’s strategies likely to facilitate personalized learning strategies that address the specific learning needs of all students, including those that have historically not had access to technology, to accelerate and deepen learning?*
  - *Does the SEA describe strategies that will adequately build the capacity of educators to employ technology in coordination with the State’s goals?*
  - *Does the SEA use and present evidence and data to inform its identification of and rationale for the selected strategies?*
  - *Does the SEA’s description include implementation timelines that are ambitious, practicable, and actionable?*
  - *Does the SEA identify the sources of funds from included programs it will use to support these strategies?*
- **Does the SEA describe how, when developing its State strategies, the SEA considered the academic and non-academic needs of the subgroups of students listed above?**
  - *Does the SEA include a description of the data it used to consider the needs of these subgroups?*

6.1.E: Supporting Family and Community Engagement

- **If the SEA indicated that it intends to use funds from Title IV, Part A or other included programs to support strategies to support LEAs to engage parents, families, and communities, does the SEA provide a description of this use of funds?**
  - *Are the SEA’s strategies likely to support increased parent, family, and community engagement?*
  - *Does the SEA present a range of strategies that will assist LEAs and schools to enhance participation of parents, families, and the community from geographically diverse areas who are representative of all students, such as holding meetings and hearings at varying times throughout the day and ensuring they are accessible to all participants (e.g., through the use of translators, interpreters, materials in alternate formats)?*
  - *Does the SEA use and present evidence and data to inform its identification of and rationale for the selected strategies?*
  - *Does the SEA’s description include implementation timelines that are ambitious, practicable, and actionable?*
  - *Does the SEA identify the sources of funds from included programs it will use to support these strategies?*
- **Does the SEA describe how, when developing its State strategies, the SEA considered the academic and non-academic needs of the subgroups of students listed above?**
  - *Does the SEA’s description describe the data it used to consider the needs of these subgroups?*

## 6.2: Program-Specific Requirements

### 6.2.A: Title I, Part A: Improving Basic State and LEA Operated Programs (34 C.F.R. § 299.19(b)(1))

#### 6.2.A: Process for Waiving Poverty Threshold

- **Does the SEA describe the process and criteria it will use to waive the 40 percent schoolwide poverty threshold under ESEA section 1114(a)(1)(B) for an LEA that submits a request on behalf of a school?**
- **Does the description include how the SEA will ensure that the schoolwide program will best serve the needs of the lowest-achieving students in the school?**
  - *Does the SEA's description sufficiently ensure that any school granted a waiver will implement a schoolwide program that best serves the needs of the lowest-achieving students in the school, including those who would otherwise be eligible for targeted assistance under Title I ?*
  - *Does the SEA's process include the timeline for granting waivers for LEAs?*

### 6.2.B: Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children (34 C.F.R. § 299.19(b)(2))

#### 6.2.B.i: Identification and Verification of Migratory Children

- **Does the SEA describe how it and its local operating agencies<sup>21</sup> will establish and implement a system for the proper identification and recruitment of eligible migratory children on a statewide basis?**
  - *Are the SEA's quality control measures (e.g., training for recruiters and other staff involved in making eligibility determinations, supervision and annual review of recruiters, a formal process for resolving eligibility questions, and annual re-interviews) likely to promote the accurate identification and recruitment of eligible migratory children?*
  - *Does the SEA's training for recruiters address strategies for dealing with cultural and linguistic differences that may exist for migratory children and their families, and only collecting information that is necessary for determining eligibility?*
- **Does the SEA's description include the identification and recruitment of preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school?**
  - *Does the SEA's system for identification and recruitment of eligible migratory children include non-school based recruitment strategies?*
- **Does the SEA describe how it and its local operating agencies will verify and document the number of eligible migratory children aged 3 through 21 residing in the State on an annual basis?**
  - *Are the SEA's methods (such as the use of enrollment and withdrawal dates, residency dates, and residency verification dates) likely to be effective in verifying and documenting an unduplicated count of the eligible migratory children residing in the State on an annual basis?*

#### 6.2.B.ii: Identify Unique Needs of Migratory Children

- **Does the SEA describe how it and its local operating agencies will identify the unique educational needs of migratory children that must be met in order for migratory children to participate effectively in school?**
- **Does the SEA's description include preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school?**
- **Does the SEA describe how it and its local operating agencies will identify other needs that must be met in order for migratory children to participate effectively in school?**
  - *Does the SEA's process include consideration of quantitative and qualitative data?*

<sup>21</sup> Throughout section 6.2.B, local operating agencies may include LEAs.

- *Does the SEA use the results of its needs assessment to identify the unique needs of migratory children?*

6.2.B.iii: Ensuring Unique Needs of Migratory Children are Addressed

- **Does the SEA describe how it and its local operating agencies will ensure that the unique educational needs of migratory children and other needs that must be met in order for migratory children to participate effectively in school are addressed through the full range of services that are available for migratory children from appropriate local, State, and Federal educational programs?**
- **Does the SEA's description include preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school?**
  - *Does the SEA's description reflect joint planning among local, State, and Federal (e.g., Title I, Part A; Title II; McKinney-Vento) educational programs serving migratory children?*
  - *Does the SEA's description minimize the time lapse between identifying the needs of migratory children and addressing such needs?*

6.2.B.iv: Coordination of Services for Migratory Children

- **Does the SEA describe how it and its local operating agencies will use funds received under Title I, Part C to promote interstate and intrastate coordination of services for migratory children (i.e., use of the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX), among other vehicles)?**
- **Does the SEA's description include how the State will provide for educational continuity through the timely transfer of pertinent school records, including information on health, when children move from one school to another, whether or not such move occurs during the regular school year?**
  - *Does the SEA encourage LEAs that have migratory children but that do not receive Migrant Education Program funds to use MSIX?*

6.2.B.v: Describe Unique Needs of Migratory Children

- **Does the SEA describe the unique educational needs of the State's migratory children and other needs that must be met in order for migratory children to participate effectively in school, based on the State's most recent comprehensive needs assessment?**
- **Does the SEA's description include preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school?**
  - *Does the SEA's description sufficiently distinguish the unique educational needs of migratory children from other needs?*
  - *Was the SEA's comprehensive needs assessment conducted recently enough to reflect the current needs of the State's migratory children?*
  - *Will the SEA periodically review and revise its needs assessment with sufficient frequency, so as to identify the current needs of the State's migratory children?*

6.2.B.vi: Program Objectives for Title I, Part C and Strategies for Meeting Them

- **Does the SEA describe the current measurable program objectives and outcomes for Title I, Part C?**
- **Does the SEA describe the strategies it will pursue on a statewide basis to achieve such objectives and outcomes?**
  - *Will the SEA's measurable program objectives and outcomes provide a reasonable, objective assessment of the program's effectiveness?*
  - *Is there a reasonable connection between the needs of migratory children described by the SEA in section 6.3.B.iii, and the SEA's statewide strategies?*

- *Does the SEA use and present evidence and data to inform its identification of and rationale for the selected strategies?*
- *Are the SEA's strategies likely to achieve the measurable program objectives and outcomes?*
- *Does the SEA's description include implementation timelines that are ambitious, practicable, and actionable?*

6.2.B.vii: Parental Consultation

- **Does the SEA describe how it will ensure there is consultation with parents of migratory children, including parent advisory councils, at both the State and local levels, in the planning and operation of Title I, Part C programs that span not less than one school year in duration? (ESEA section 1304(c)(3)).**

6.2.B.viii: Prioritizing Services to Migratory Children

- **Does the SEA describe its priorities for use of Title I, Part C funds, specifically related to the needs of migratory children with “priority for services”?**<sup>22</sup>
  - **Does the SEA describe the measures and sources of data the SEA and, if applicable, its local operating agencies will use to identify those migratory children who are priority for services?**
  - **Does the SEA describe when and how the SEA will communicate those determinations to all local operating agencies in the State?**
  - *Does the SEA use reasonable measures and sources of data to determine which migratory children are failing, or most at risk of failing, to meet the State's academic standards, or who have dropped out of school?*
  - *Do the SEA's processes and procedures ensure that local operating agencies will have timely information as to which migratory children should be given priority for services?*
  - *Do the SEA's processes and procedures include sufficient guidance and communication to all local operating agencies to ensure that all such agencies are applying the same measures, using the same sources of data, and documenting determinations and services in the same manner, on the same timeline (unless the operation of those agencies' projects warrant a different timeline)?*

6.2.C: Title I, Part D: (34 C.F.R. § 299.19(b)(3))<sup>23</sup>

6.2.C: Transition Services and Improved Outcomes for Neglected and Delinquent Children and Youth

- **Does the SEA describe its plan for assisting in the transition of children and youth between correctional facilities and locally operated programs?**
  - *Will the SEA's plan likely lead to successful transition of children and youth between correctional facilities and locally operated programs?*
  - *Does the SEA's description include implementation timelines that are ambitious, practicable, and actionable?*
- **Does the SEA describe the program objectives and outcomes established by the State that will be used to assess the effectiveness of the program in improving the academic, career, and technical skills of children in the program?**
- **Does the SEA's description include program objectives and outcomes including the knowledge and skills needed to earn a regular high school diploma and make a successful transition to postsecondary education, career and technical education, or employment?**
  - *Will the SEA's program objectives and outcomes provide a reasonable, objective assessment of the program's effectiveness?*

<sup>22</sup> As defined in ESEA section 1304(d).

<sup>23</sup> Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk

6.2.D: Title III, Part A: English Learners and Immigrant Students (34 C.F.R. § 299.19(b)(4))

6.2.D: Entrance and Exit Procedures for English Learners

- **Does the SEA describe its standardized entrance and exit procedures for English learners?**
- **Do the standardized entrance and exit procedures include valid and reliable, objective criteria that are applied consistently across the State?**
  - **Do the standardized exit criteria include a score of proficient on the State’s annual ELP assessment**
  - **Are the standardized exit criteria the same criteria used for exiting students from the English learner subgroup for Title I reporting and accountability purposes?**
  - **Do the standardized exit criteria exclude performance on an academic content assessment?**
  - *Does the SEA use and present evidence and data that indicate the entrance and exit criteria are research-based and rigorous?*
  - *If the exit criteria include local input, such as teacher input or a portfolio, is the form of local input objective (e.g., is there an observational protocol for teacher input or rubric for evaluating the portfolio) and applied and weighted the same way across the State?*
  - *With respect to exit criteria, is the State's proficient score on the annual ELP assessment set at a level that demonstrates sufficient student performance in all four language domains on the ELP assessment in order to consider an English learner to have attained proficiency in English, and that enables students to effectively participate in grade-level content instruction in English without language services?*

6.2.E: Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers (34 C.F.R. § 299.19(b)(5))

6.2.E: State Activities and Subgrants

- **Does the SEA describe how it will use Title IV, Part B funds and other Federal funds to support State-level strategies consistent with the strategies identified above in section 6.1: Well-Rounded and Supportive Education, to the extent permitted under Title IV Part B, and other applicable law and regulations?**
- **Does the SEA describe the processes, procedures, and priorities for awarding subgrants of Title IV, Part B funds to support the strategies identified above in section 6.1: Well-Rounded and Supportive Education, to the extent permitted under applicable law and regulations?**
  - *Do the processes, procedures, and priorities support implementation of other sections of the consolidated State plan?*

6.2.F: Title V, Part B: Rural and Low-Income School Program (34 C.F.R. §299.19(b)(6))

**NOTE:** An SEA will only complete section 6.2.F.i if it has LEAs eligible to receive funds under Title V, Part B, Subpart 2, as indicated on the Cover Page of its consolidated State plan.

6.2.F: Specific Measureable Program Objectives and Outcomes

- **Does the SEA provide its specific measurable program objectives and outcomes related to activities under the Rural and Low-Income School Program (RLIS)?**
  - *Will the SEA’s measurable program objectives and outcomes provide a reasonable, objective assessment of the program’s effectiveness?*
  - *Are the SEA’s objectives and outcomes aligned to the strategies and timelines proposed in other sections of its consolidated State plan?*
  - *Are the SEA’s measureable program objectives likely to lead to the identified program outcomes?*

6.2.G: McKinney-Vento Education for Homeless Children and Youths Program (34 C.F.R. § 299.19(b)(7))

6.2.G.i: Procedures Used to Identify Homeless Children and Youths

- **Does the SEA describe the procedures that the SEA will use to identify homeless children and youths in the State and assess their needs?**
  - *Are the SEA's procedures likely to result in homeless children and youths being accurately identified?*
  - *Are the SEA's procedures likely to ensure that the needs of homeless children and youths are accurately assessed?*

6.2.G.ii: School Personnel Programs to Heighten Awareness of Homeless Children and Youths Needs

- **Does the SEA describe the SEA's programs for school personnel (including liaisons designated under section 722(g)(1)(J)(ii) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended, principals and other school leaders, attendance officers, teachers, enrollment personnel, and specialized instructional support personnel) to heighten the awareness of such school personnel of the specific needs of homeless children and youths, including such children and youths who are runaway and homeless youths?**
  - *Do the programs' target audiences include liaisons designated under section 722(g)(1)(J)(ii) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, principals and other school leaders, attendance officers, teachers, enrollment personnel, and specialized instructional support personnel?*
  - *Are the SEA's programs likely to ensure that school personnel listed above are more aware of the specific needs of homeless children and youths, including such children and youths who are runaway and homeless youths?*
  - *Are the SEA's programs likely to reach school personnel in LEAs that do not receive McKinney-Vento subgrants?*

6.2.G.iii: Educational Placement of Homeless Children and Youths

- **Does the SEA describe the SEA's procedures to ensure that disputes regarding the educational placement of homeless children and youths are promptly resolved?**
  - *Does the SEA have dispute resolution procedures in place at the SEA level?*
  - *Are these procedures likely to result in prompt resolution of educational placement disputes for homeless children and youths?*

6.2.G.iv: Ensuring Homeless Children and Youths Have Equal Access

- **Does the SEA describe the SEA's procedures to ensure that youths described in section 725(2) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act and youths separated from public schools are identified and accorded equal access to appropriate secondary education and support services, including by identifying and removing barriers that prevent youths described in this paragraph from receiving appropriate credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a prior school, in accordance with State, local, and school policies?**
  - *Will the SEA's procedures likely result in youths described in section 725(2) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act and youths separated from public schools being accurately identified?*
  - *Will the SEA's procedures result in youths described in section 725(2) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act and youths separated from public schools being accorded equal access to appropriate secondary education and support services?*
  - *Do the above-referenced support services include identifying and removing barriers that prevent such youths from receiving appropriate credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a prior school, in accordance with State, local, and school policies?*

6.2.G.v.a: Ensuring Homeless Children and Youths Have Access to Public Preschool

- **Does the SEA describe the SEA’s procedures to ensure that homeless children and youths have access to public preschool programs, administered by the SEA or LEA, as provided to other children in the State?**
  - *Are the SEA’s procedures likely to ensure that homeless children and youths have access to public preschool programs, administered by the SEA or the LEA, as provided to other children in the State?*

6.2.G.v.b: Ensuring Homeless Children and Youths Do Not Have Barriers to Accessing Activities

- **Does the SEA describe the SEA’s procedures to ensure that homeless children and youths who meet the relevant eligibility criteria do not face barriers to accessing academic and extracurricular activities?**
  - *Are the SEA’s procedures likely to ensure that homeless children and youths do not face barriers to accessing academic and extracurricular activities, including magnet school, summer school, career and technical education, advanced placement, online learning, and charter school programs, if such programs are available at the State and local levels?*
  - *Do the SEA’s procedures ensure that lack of transportation is not a barrier to accessing academic and extracurricular activities and that transportation is provided, as needed, consistent with section 722(g)(1)(J)(iii) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act?*

6.2.G.v.c: Ensuring Homeless Children and Youth Can Participate in Local Nutrition Programs

- **Does the SEA describe the SEA’s procedures to ensure that homeless children and youths who meet the relevant eligibility criteria are able to participate in Federal, State, and local nutrition programs?**
  - *Are the SEA’s procedures likely to ensure that homeless children and youths who meet relevant eligibility criteria are able to participate in Federal, State, and local nutrition programs?*

6.2.G.vi: Strategies to Address Problems Regarding the Education of Homeless Children and Youths

- **Does the SEA describe the SEA’s strategies to address problems with respect to the education of homeless children and youths, including problems resulting from enrollment delays and retention, consistent with sections 722(g)(1)(H) and (I) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act?**
  - *Are the SEA’s strategies likely to ensure that homeless children and youths do not encounter problems that disrupt their education resulting from enrollment delays, consistent with sections 722(g)(1)(H) and (I) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act? Examples of barriers to enrollment include immunization requirements and other required health records; residency requirements; lack of birth certificates, school records, or other documentation; guardianship issues; uniform or dress code requirements; outstanding fees or fines; or absences.*
  - *Are the SEA’s strategies likely to ensure that homeless children and youths do not encounter problems that disrupt their education resulting from retention (e.g., poor attendance or chronic absenteeism), consistent with sections 722(g)(1)(H) and (I) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act?*
  - *Does the SEA use and present evidence and data to inform its identification of and rationale for the selected strategies?*