STATE PLAN
PEER REVIEW CRITERIA
Peer Review Panel Notes Template

STATE: Connecticut

U.S. Department of Education
April 5, 2017

SECTION A: TITLE I, PART A: IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LEAS

A.1: Challenging State Academic Standards and Assessments

Note: State Plan template item A.1 is submitted as part of the separate assessment peer review process consistent with ESEA section 1111(b) and 34 CFR § 200.2(d), and thus has no applicable peer review criteria in this document.

A.2: Eighth Grade Math Exception (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C) and 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4))

Note: State Plan template items A.2.i and A.2.ii require binary yes/no responses from SEAs, and thus have no applicable peer review criteria.

A.2.iii: Strategies (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C); 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4))

➢ If applicable,[1] does the SEA describe, regarding the 8th grade math exception, its strategies to provide all students in the State the opportunity to be prepared for and take advanced mathematics coursework in middle school (*e.g.*, appropriate data and evidence that the strategies are likely to provide all students in the State that opportunity)?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT does not require end-of-course exams in high school and, thus, does not seek the 8th grade math exception.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) ☐ No (# peer reviewer(s)) *Not applicable*
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an	

---

[1] In order for an SEA to exempt an 8th grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in 8th grade under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(aa), it must ensure that: a. the student instead takes the end-of-course mathematics assessment the State administers to high school students under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb); b. the student's performance on the high school assessment is used in the year in which the student takes the assessment for purposes of measuring academic achievement under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) and participation in assessments under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E); and c. in high school: (1) the student takes a State-administered end-of-course assessment or nationally recognized high school academic assessment as defined in 34 CFR § 200.3(d) in mathematics that is more advanced than the assessment the State administers for 8th graders under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb); (2) the State provides for appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR § 200.6(b) and (f); and (3) the student's performance on the more advanced mathematics assessment is used for purposes of measuring academic achievement under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) and participation in assessments under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E).

SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

A.3: Native Language Assessments (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(F) and 34 CFR § 200.6(f)(2)(ii) and (f)(4))

A.3.i: Definition

➢ Does the SEA provide its definition of "languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population"?
➢ Does the SEA identify the specific languages that meet that definition?
➢ Does the SEA's definition include at least the most populous language other than English spoken by the State's participating student population?
➢ In determining which languages are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, does the SEA 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?
➢ In determining which languages are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, does the SEA 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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	State assessments are available in English only; however, nearly 10% of the student population's dominant language is Spanish.
	Definition is provided and statistics are included that indicate Spanish is present to a significant extent.
	CT clearly defines the top 10 dominant languages in the state. Other than English, Spanish is the only one present to a significant extent.
	CT defines languages present to a significant extent and identifies the prevalence of languages other than English spoken by K-12 students.
	CT's determination of languages present to a significant extent does NOT take special consideration of students' birth country, Native American status, or migratory status; however, these students' language needs would be captured by CT's definition.

	CT's definition of languages present to a significant extent cites a statewide analysis; there is no evidence CT makes additional supports available in LEAs where more than 1% of students speak a common language other than English.
Strengths	Statistics are clear regarding languages present to a significant extent.
Weaknesses	The dominant language table is clear, but Spanish is not specifically identified in the definition as the most populous language other than English.

CT does not delineate the dominant languages by LEA and by grade spans. Although less than 1% of students may share a dominant language other than English statewide, select LEAs may enroll higher proportions of students who could benefit from language accommodations other than Spanish. |
| *Did the SEA meet all requirements?* | ☐ 0 Yes (0 peer reviewer(s))
☒ No (4 peer reviewer(s)) |
| *If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement* | CT must describe how they consider the dominant languages by LEA and by grade spans. |

A.3.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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	State assessments are available in English only for ELA and available in Spanish translations for math.. Nearly 10% of the student population's dominant language is Spanish.

The SEA cites current resources do not allow for new assessment development in additional languages.

ELA assessments are not available in any language other than English.

CT provides stacked translations for math that are available to some Spanish-speaking students (Smarter Balanced). |
| *Strengths* | CT has other mechanisms in place to assist English learners; i.e. glossaries, dictionaries, and translations. |

	Supports are available for English Learners for science and math assessments, as well as translated test directions for language arts and math items.
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) ☐ No (0 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

A.3.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 SEA and identified under A.3.i of the consolidated State plan, for which yearly student academic assessments are not available and are needed?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT identified Spanish as a dominant language for 9.8% of its student population. CT "considers any language among more than 1 percent of its students to be present to a significant extent". CT does not identify a specific language in which the state has a need for developing assessments. However, based on provided data for the top 10 dominant languages and the one percent criteria for significant extent as defined in CT, the plan infers Spanish, at 9.8% of the student population, would be the leading contender and the next dominant language is Portuguese at 0.6%. CT only provides dominant languages for the entire state across all grades, so it is unclear what significant language needs exist among students required to participate in assessments. CT identifies a significant Spanish language need statewide among students across all grades. CT's assessments are only available in English for ELA, but the state provides stacked math language translations in Spanish.
Strengths	CT will consider, plan for, and develop assessments in other languages if resources increase. CT has other mechanisms in place to assist English learners; i.e. glossaries, dictionaries, and translations.

	Supports are available for English Learners for science and math assessments, as well as translated test directions for language arts and math items.
Weaknesses	CT is not clear on their intent of whether additional native assessments will be developed with the exception of stating that if additional funding is available it may be pursued.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) ☐ No (0 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

A.3.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, as defined by the SEA and identified under A.3.i of the consolidated State plan template?

➢ 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?

➢ 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:
  o 1) gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English;
  o 2) collect and respond to public comment; and
  o 3) consult with educators, parents and families of English learners, students, as appropriate, and other stakeholders?

➢ If applicable, 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 an explanation of the reasons (*e.g.*, legal barriers) the State has not been able to complete the development of such assessments despite making every effort?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT's plan indicates that the state is "committed to making its current assessments accessible to all students" via an

	array of multilingual supports. CT does not describe if or how assessments in other languages would be developed. Limited resources have prevented CT from developing/offering its assessment in any language other than English and Spanish for math CT will "definitely consider" assessments in other languages if resources are available.
Strengths	The available supports are varied and are specifically focused on Spanish. CT identifies embedded designated supports for ELs via a math glossary and stacked translations and test directions. Non-embedded supports include a bilingual dictionary and reader directions for science and read aloud and translations glossary for math, as well as test directions for ELA and math.
Weaknesses	CT does not have a plan to develop additional assessments unless resources increase. CT does not provide information on the development of assessments in languages other than English.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewer(s)) ☒ No (4 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	CT must explain their process, aside from the availability of resources, for deciding whether to develop assessments in any language other than English.

A.4: Statewide Accountability Systems & School Support and Improvement (ESEA section 1111(c) and (d))

A.4.i: Subgroups (ESEA section 1111(b)(3), 1111(c)(2))

A.4.i.a: Major Racial and Ethnic Subgroups of Students (ESEA section 1111(c)(2)(B))

➢ Does the SEA list each major racial and ethnic group that the SEA includes as a subgroup of students in its accountability system?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT lists the seven racial/ethnic groups that will be reported for long-term and interim goals. The following groups are included: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, Pacific Islander, Two or More Races, White.

	The summative accountability calculation does not explicitly account for each of these seven racial/ethnic groups individually. Rather, these groups are collectively accounted for as part of a 'high needs' group, which represents an unduplicated count of students from the students with disabilities, English learners, and low socioeconomic status student groups, in the summative accountability rating.
Strengths	Groups are specifically named. CT includes the major race/ethnic groups of White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian/Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and Two or more races.
Weaknesses	The 'high needs' group focuses on student demographic characteristics rather than actual 'need' of a student.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) ☐ No (0 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

A.4.i.b: Additional Subgroups at SEA Discretion

➢ If applicable, does the SEA describe any additional subgroups of students other than the statutorily required subgroups (*i.e.*, economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners) included in its statewide accountability system?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT includes a "high needs group" comprised of an unduplicated count of students who are from a low SES background, an English learner, or a student with a disability. Separate points are awarded for subgroup performance such that students in subgroups contribute to more than 40% of the summative rating.
Strengths	Inclusion of the 'high needs' group double counts student groups who have been historically underperforming in accountability, placing more focus on ensuring successful outcomes through accountability policy.
Weaknesses	The SEA should consider a more thorough explanation of "an unduplicated count". While this may be clear to educators, the general public may need additional information. The 'high needs' group focuses on student demographic characteristics rather than actual 'need' of a student. A focus on the lowest performing students would be more apt.

	Students with an academic need who do not meet criteria for socioeconomic, special education, or English language receive less weight/emphasis.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) ☐ No (0 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

A.4.i.c: Previously Identified English Learners

Note: State Plan template item A.4.i.c requires a binary yes/no response from SEAs, and thus has no applicable peer review criteria.

A.4.i.d: If Applicable, Exception for Recently Arrived English Learners

Note: This peer review criterion applies only if a State selects the third option in item A.4.i.d in the consolidated State plan template for recently arrived English learners under which the State applies the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i) <u>or</u> the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii) to a recently arrived English learner.

➢ Does the SEA describe how it will choose which exception applies to a recently arrived English learner (*e.g.*, a statewide procedure that considers English language proficiency level in determining which, if any, exception applies)?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT is applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii) to a recently arrived English learner. Recently arrived ELs in CT will test in year 1, be included in growth in year 2, and be included in growth and achievement in year 3.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) ☐ No (# peer reviewer(s)) *Not applicable*
If no, describe the specific information or	

clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

A.4.ii: Minimum N-Size (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A))

A.4.ii.a: Minimum N-Size for Accountability (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)(i))

➢ Does the SEA provide the minimum number of students that the State determines is necessary to meet the requirements of any provisions under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that require disaggregation of information by each subgroup of students for accountability purposes, including annual meaningful differentiation and identification of schools?
➢ Is the minimum number of students the same State-determined number for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State (*i.e.*, economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners) for accountability purposes?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT has selected a minimum N-size of 20 students for reporting of a group and all students. It is implied, but not explicitly stated, that 20 is also the minimum N for summative accountability ratings.
Strengths	CT reduced the minimum N-size from 40 to 20 students in 2012-13 with stakeholder involvement in the decision and has maintained this N-size for the ESSA plan and has consistently applied it as a standard across all student data reporting. CT acknowledges, despite discussions with stakeholders of reverting to a higher minimum N-size, that the lower N-size of 20 upholds the spirit of transparency and accountability. More subgroups can be captured and reported using an N-size of 20 versus 40. An N-size of 20 can also decrease the likelihood of unintended disclosure of personally identifiable information. CT's data masking algorithm is consistent across all reporting.
Weaknesses	CT should explicitly state the minimum N-size for the summative accountability rating. CT provides no data to support the selection of this N-size. While data may have previously been provided to support the selection of this N-size in 2012, there is no indication that stakeholders considered updated data on what percentage of students an N-size of 20 includes or excludes going forward. It is also unclear if the state intends to use the same N-size for accountability as well as reporting purposes.

Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) ☐ No (0 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

A.4.ii.b: Statistical Soundness of Minimum N-Size (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)(i))

➢ Is the selected minimum number of students statistically sound? [2]

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT's selected minimum N-size is defensible using the best practices established by the Institute of Education Sciences congressionally mandated report "Best Practices for Determining Subgroup Size in Accountability Systems While Protecting Personally Identifiable Student Information," published in January 2017. It is unclear if the selected N-size is appropriate for CT's selected indicators in its accountability system. No data are available on whether this N-size yields valid and/or reliable data for either reporting or accountability purposes.
Strengths	Per state report, lowering the N-size to 20 has led to increased transparency. Stakeholders were involved in the decision to lower the number from 40. Disclosure avoidance precautions have been put into place. The minimum N-size is low enough to be inclusive and not personally identifiable. CT did not increase the N-size just because it was permissible and there was some pressure from the stakeholder field to do so.
Weaknesses	The narrative indicated that "measurement experts" had been involved in the stakeholder groups, but there was no

---

[2] Consistent with ESEA section 1111(i), information collected or disseminated under ESEA section 1111 shall be collected and disseminated in a manner that protects the privacy of individuals consistent with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g, commonly known as the "Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974"). When selecting a minimum n-size for reporting, States should consult the Institute of Education Sciences report "Best Practices for Determining Subgroup Size in Accountability Systems While Protecting Personally Identifiable Student Information" to identify appropriate statistical disclosure limitation strategies for protecting student privacy.

	discussion of how or what statistical principles were applied when making the decision to lower the N-size to 20.
	CT did not provide evidence that an N-size of 20 is statistically sounds relative to their chosen indicators.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) ☒ No (1 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The decision to change the N-size was done during the NCLB waiver process several years ago. CT should provide documentation as to why this decision was made; i.e. technical analysis, TAC meetings notes, stakeholder feedback, etc. CT should provide documentation on the statistical soundness of this N-size as it relates to the new indicators.

A.4.ii.c: How the SEA Determined Minimum N-Size (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)(ii))

➢ Does the SEA describe how it determined the minimum number of students?
➢ Does the description include how the State collaborated with teachers, principals, other school leaders, parents, and other stakeholders when determining such minimum number?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Minimal explanation was given for the reduction from 40 to 20, other than it was part of CT's ESEA flexibility request in 2012. The narrative indicated that over dozens of meetings, the following stakeholders were included in the decision to lower the N-size to 20: superintendents, district leaders, principals, educators, legislators, community groups, measurement experts. CT provided a skeletal explanation for selecting 20 as the minimum N-size. The explanation included the rationale that it was currently used minimum N-size, which was downsized from 40 in 2012-13, and because it maintains the spirit of transparency and accountability. CT indicates that minimum N-size has been a widely discussed policy topic at dozens of stakeholder meetings with educators, legislators, community groups, and measurement experts since it was decreased by half in 2012-13. CT is continuing the N-size it selected in 2012 under its previous ESEA flexibility request.
Strengths	CT indicated it had discussed the N-size at meetings with various stakeholders over the past few years.

	It appears that a great deal of time was put into stakeholder meetings and a variety of stakeholders were involved.

The N-size provides continuity and continues to include far more students than a higher N-size might otherwise capture.

CT indicates that stakeholders, including measurement experts, have been consulted on this N-size since 2012-2013. |
Weaknesses	CT could provide additional evidence that stakeholders were meaningfully consulted on the impact of maintaining an N-size of 20 based on new, updated measures within its accountability system.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) ☐ No (0 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

A.4.ii.d: Minimum N-Size and Ensuring Student Privacy (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)(iii))

➢ Does the SEA describe how it ensures that the minimum number of students will protect the privacy of individual students?[3]

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT applies a 'complex disclosure algorithm' which suppresses cell counts and computed statistics that would reveal personal information. CT cites the rules have been vetted by representatives of the US Department of Education (USDE) and the Privacy Technical Assistance Center (PTAC) within the USDE.
Strengths	While not yet in use, CT could apply the algorithm to extreme percentages of over 95%.

Per the narrative, the standard has been applied across all student data. |

---

[3] See footnote 5 above for further guidance.

	CT has a formal, documented process for suppression for all publicly reported student data. And this documented process is publicly shared on the department's website.
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) ☐ 0 No (0 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

A.4.ii.e: If Applicable, Minimum N-Size for Reporting

➢ If the SEA's minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is lower than the minimum number of students for accountability purposes, does the SEA provide the minimum number of students for purposes of reporting?
➢ Is the SEA's minimum number of students for purposes of reporting consistent with the requirements in ESEA section 1111(i), including with respect to privacy and statistical reliability?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT's plan does not specifically delineate a minimum N size for reporting that is different than accountability. CT has selected a minimum N-size of 20 students for reporting or a group. It is implied, but not explicitly stated, that 20 is also the minimum N-size for summative accountability ratings (reiterated from comments in A.4.ii.a). The N-size of 20 is unlikely to jeopardize student privacy given CT's well-documented data privacy practices.
Strengths	A disclosure avoidance algorithm is utilized.
Weaknesses	CT focused on student privacy but has not provided specific evidence of statistical reliability.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) ☐ No (0 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this	

requirement	

A.4.iii: Establishment of Long-Term Goals (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A))

A.4.iii.a: Academic Achievement (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(aa))

A.4.iii.a.1: Long-term goals

➢ Does the SEA identify (*i.e.*, by providing a numeric measure) and describe the long-term goals for all students for improved academic achievement, as measured by grade-level proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (which must apply the same academic achievement standards to all public school students in the State, except those with the most significant cognitive disabilities)?
➢ Does the SEA identify and describe long-term goals for each subgroup of students?
➢ Does the SEA's description include baseline data for all students and for each subgroup of students?
➢ Does the SEA's description include the timeline for meeting the long-term goals?
➢ Is the timeline the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students?
➢ Are the long-term goals ambitious?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT identified long-term goals for students based upon growth, not academic achievement.
	Goals for measuring improved academic achievement, as measured by grade level proficiency, is a requirement for the state plan. The establishment of growth goals would be an innovative and welcome addition to goal setting.
	Preliminary baseline data is included, but will be adjusted based upon 2016-2017 data which will be available in Oct 2017. The plan establishes a 13-year timeframe to allow for one full cohort of students to progress K-12. The ultimate target for all students and all subgroups is an average percentage of target achieved of 100.
	Growth targets are established for students in grades 4-8. The metric that will be used is the average percentage of growth target that is achieved by all students in grades 4-8 combined.
	CT meets all the criteria for establishing long-term goals; regrettably, the goals are set for growth, not academic achievement.
	CT identifies their long-term goals in terms of student growth over achievement, rationalizing the decision with stakeholder feedback and explaining that 'students will increase their proficiency on the annual state assessment if

they evidence growth.' If this is true, then CT should also have provided goals measuring achievement to prove this point. Simply measuring growth will not provide an understanding as to whether students are achieving grade level proficiency, because even if 100% of students are making growth, there could be 0% of students that are proficient.

The growth targets are measured as the average percent of growth target achieved by students in grades 4-8. The model establishes individual growth targets and then determines what percent of the growth target is met. If the student does not fully meet the growth target, they can still be awarded credit for the goal at a 50% rate or a 40% rate. The calculation is looking at the average percent of growth target achieved, and does allow a student to count for up to 110% of target achieved, thereby masking some performance of lower achieving students. This proposed calculation is complex and the value yielded from the percentage does not provide information to the user about what percentage of students are achieving grade level proficiency, or even what percentage of students are making at least a year's progress in a year's time.

Additionally, CT measures growth as a binary indicator of whether the student met the growth target, in addition to the percent of target achieved measure. The binary indicator of growth provides more meaningful information about student progress toward achieving grade level proficiency given the criterion nature of the measure and the assigned meaning of earning a positive mark in the numerator.

"In response to strong stakeholder input favoring" academic growth over accountability for grade level proficiency, CT does not identify long-term goals for all students or each subgroup of students in terms of annual achievement. CT identifies interim and long-term goals for student growth only. This is done for all students and each subgroup of students but omits a key indicator required in the state's accountability system – annual achievement in Reading and Mathematics.

Strengths	All students and all subgroups are included. The rate of growth is greater for groups with lower baseline scores to ensure that all students reach the same goal by the end of year 13. Each subgroup of students, regardless of their baseline performance in the 2016-2017 school year are expected to reach a common long-term goal of 100% making growth by 2029-30 is ambitious.
Weaknesses	The SEA did not identify and describe long-term goals for all students for improved academic achievement, but rather improved growth. Because growth measures require that a student be measured from one year to the next, the danger exists for students who are transient to not be assessed or included in accountability.

	High school ELA and math are not included. Focusing only on growth makes it possible to mask lack of academic achievement. The goals do not capture improved academic achievement as measured by grade level proficiency. Even as measured by growth, the goals are not meaningful to parents, educators, policymakers, or the public. These long-term do not qualify as an academic achievement indicator because they do not measure grade level proficiency in ELA and math.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewer(s)) ☒ No (4 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	CT must provide long-term goals for all students for improved <u>academic</u> achievement as measured by grade-level proficiency on the annual statewide ELA and mathematics assessments. While the suggested growth model has merit and the support of stakeholders, it does not meet the requirement of establishing long-term academic achievement goals.

A.4.iii.a.2: Measurements of interim progress
➢ Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for all students?
➢ Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for each subgroup of students?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT meets all the criteria for establishing interim goals; regrettably, the goals are set for growth, not academic achievement.
Strengths	Interim progress toward growth goals was identified. All students and all subgroups are included. The rate of growth is greater for groups with lower baseline scores to ensure that all students reach the same goal by the end of year 13.
Weaknesses	Academic achievement for grade level proficient was not used for the basis for interim goals. Only three interim goals are established over a 13-year period. Indicators measured only every three years may not detect leading indicators of positive or negative trends that could be addressed earlier. While interim goals and intervals are set at the state's discretion, assurances that the state will monitor progress in non-interim years would

	strengthen the narrative and demonstrate commitment to improvement. The assumption is the interim goal is a single year measure, of combined grade 4-8 student growth, not averaged over the three-year interim span. Plan should clarify the calculation in terms of years of data used.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewer(s)) ☒ No (4 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	CT must provide interim goals for all students for improved <u>academic</u> achievement as measured by grade-level proficiency on the annual statewide ELA and mathematics assessments. While the suggested growth model has merit and the support of stakeholders, it does not meet the requirement of establishing interim academic achievement goals.

A.4.iii.a.3: Improvement necessary to close statewide proficiency gaps

➢ Do the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for academic achievement take into account the improvement necessary for subgroups of students who are behind in reaching those goals to make significant progress in closing statewide proficiency gaps, such that the State's long-term goals require greater rates of improvement for subgroups of students that are lower achieving?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT did not identify academic achievement in this section. Given the complexity of the calculation, it is unlikely that significant progress in closing statewide proficiency gaps will occur. First, because grade level proficient is not being measured, and second, because the growth measure being used cannot be quantified for gap closure. CT measures growth as a binary indicator of whether the student met the growth target, in addition to the percent of target achieved measure. The binary indicator of growth provides more meaningful information about student progress towards achieving grade level proficiency given the criterion nature of the measure and the assigned meaning of earning a positive mark in the numerator. This measure of growth, if used in addition to academic achievement goals, could drive progress towards gap closure. CT does not provide baseline proficiency rates in order to determine the extent to which subgroups require greater improvements to close proficiency gaps. CT provides no data to suggest that all students meeting growth targets by 2030 can close any existing achievement gaps within the state.

Strengths	All students and all subgroups are included. The rate of growth is greater for groups with lower baseline scores to ensure that all students reach the same goal by the end of year 13. The state's interim and long-term goals require greater improvement among subgroups with lower growth rates.
Weaknesses	CT does not set goals to measure proficiency, making it extraordinarily difficult to determine if there is significant progress to closing proficiency gaps. Additionally, the complexity of the growth-to-target calculation make quantifying the values in a meaningful way problematic. Growth should be meaningful to a student for a school to earn credit in an accountability rating. An increasing or improved average percentage of growth target and a maximum average growth target score of 100% does not inherently close achievement gaps. Achievement gaps can persist or even widen with no accountability for improving actual achievement rates among subgroups with the most struggling students.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewer(s)) ☒ No (4 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	CT must provide baseline data for performance of the groups to demonstrate achievement gaps. CT must provide evidence that supports the proposed method will, in fact, measure and close achievement gaps. CT should revisit the achievement gap calculation and method once the long-term achievement goals have met all the ESSA requirements.

A.4.iii.b: Graduation Rate (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(bb))

A.4.iii.b.1: Long-term goals for four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate

➢ Does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students?
➢ Does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for each subgroup of students?
➢ Does the SEA's description include baseline data for all students and for each subgroup of students?
➢ Does the SEA's description include the timeline for meeting the long-term goals?
➢ Is the timeline the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students?
➢ Are the long-term goals ambitious?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT identified and described long-term goals for the 4-year adjusted cohort for all students and for each subgroup.

	Preliminary baseline data is included, but will be updated for the 2014-15 cohort when that data becomes available in April 2017. It is unclear if CT is using 2015-16 rather than 2014-15 cohort data.

A timeline is included for meeting the long-term goals for all students and for each subgroup with the ultimate goal of 94% for 2028-29. This 94% target will leave 6% of students not graduating in four years.

CT has identified interim goals every three years through the 2028-29 school year, one year prior to the culmination of long-term goals for academic achievement and English learners. |
| *Strengths* | All students and subgroups are addressed.

Subgroups with lower graduation rates are expected to make greater improvements over the next 12 years, bringing the state's graduation rate to 94% by 2028-29. |
| *Weaknesses* | CT will review the progress of the cohort every three years rather than every year. The target graduation rate is 94%. No explanation was given for setting this rate nor for the missing 6%.

While 94% is ambitious, it will not address 6% of CT's students who will still not be graduating on time at the end of the 13-year timeline.

CT's graduation rate goal is not ambitious for subgroups which exceed the goal in the baseline year; i.e. the Asian subgroup is not expected to grow at all since the current baseline is higher than the long-term goal. |
| *Did the SEA meet all requirements?* | ☐ Yes (0 peer reviewer(s))
☒ No (4 peer reviewer(s)) |
| *If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement* | Clarification is needed from CT on the baseline year of 2014-15 or 2015-16.

An explanation on how long-term goals are ambitious for White and Asian subgroups is needed.

An explanation is needed as to why CT set a graduation goal at 94%. |

A.4.iii.b.2: If applicable, long-term goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate

➢ If applicable (*i.e.*, if the SEA chooses, at its discretion, to establish long-term goals for one or more extended-year rates), does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students?
➢ If applicable (*i.e.*, if the SEA chooses, at its discretion, to establish long-term goals for one or more extended-year rates), does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for each subgroup of students?

➢ Does the SEA's description include baseline data for all students and for each subgroup of students?
➢ Does the SEA's description include the timeline for meeting the long-term goals?
➢ Is the timeline the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students?
➢ Are the long-term goals ambitious?
➢ Are the long-term goals more rigorous than the long-term goals set for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT does not mention the use of an extended rate, nor does CT set goals using of an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate in the long-term and interim goal setting process. However, in the school accountability system, CT uses a six-year extended rate as an indicator (Indicator 9) for high needs students with an ultimate target of 94%. Although CT includes an extended-year graduation rate measure in its accountability system, CT does not describe any long-term goals for its extended-year graduation rates. It is unclear whether CT has state-wide goals for its extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) ☐ No (# peer reviewer(s)) Not applicable
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

A.4.iii.b.3: Measurements of interim progress

➢ Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students?
➢ Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for each subgroup of students?

	Peer Response

Peer Analysis	CT provided measurements of interim progress toward long-term goals using the baseline of 2015-16 and projecting out to the 2028-29 school year (13 years) for all subgroups.

Measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals are included for all students and for all subgroups.

CT provides an example of how the three interim targets over 13 years will be set using 2015-16 graduation data. Actual goals will be set using 2016-17 baseline data when it is available in May 2017.

CT has identified interim goals every three years through the 2028-2029 school year. |
| *Strengths* | All subgroups were included in the long-term goals.

Interim measurements will significantly advance the on-time graduation rate for many of the subgroups. |
| *Weaknesses* | No reasoning was given for the three-year schedule.

CT's graduation rate interim goals are not ambitious for certain subgroups which nearly meet the goal in the baseline year. Interim measurements will only slightly advance the four-year graduation rate for several subgroups. For example, the rate for Asian students will not advance and the White subgroup will increase only less than half a percentage point every three years until 2029.

Only three interim goals are established over a 13-year period. Indicators measured only every three years may not detect leading indicators of positive or negative trends that could be addressed earlier. While interim goals and intervals are set at the state's discretion, assurances that the state will monitor progress in non-interim years would strengthen the narrative and demonstrate commitment to improvement. |
| *Did the SEA meet all requirements?* | ☒ Yes (4 peer reviewer(s))
☐ No (0 peer reviewer(s)) |
| *If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement* | |

A.4.iii.b.4: Improvement necessary to close statewide graduation rate gaps

➢ Do the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate take into account the improvement necessary for subgroups of students who are behind in reaching those goals to make significant progress in closing statewide graduation rate gaps, such that the State's long-term goals require greater rates of improvement for subgroups of students that graduate from high school at lower rates?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT's long-term goals require greater rates of improvement for subgroups of students that graduate from high school at lower rates so that all students and each subgroup share a common graduation rate goal of 94% by 2029.
Strengths	All students and all required subgroups are included and have the same long-term goal. CT's goals clearly aim to close existing graduation rate gaps.
Weaknesses	Minimal or no improvement is required for several subgroups (e.g., female, Asian). Only three interim goals are established over a 13-year period. Indicators measured only every three years may not detect leading indicators of positive or negative trends that could be addressed earlier. While interim goals and intervals are set at the state's discretion, assurances that the state will monitor progress in non-interim years would strengthen the narrative and demonstrate commitment to improvement. To close these gaps, it is unfortunate that certain subgroups are not expected to grow through 2029 so that other subgroups may catch up.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) ☐ No (0 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

A.4.iii.c: English Language Proficiency (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii))

A.4.iii.c.1: Long-term goals

➢ Does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving

English language proficiency, as measured by the statewide English language proficiency assessment?
➢ Does the SEA's description include baseline data?
➢ Does the SEA's description include the State-determined timeline for English learners to achieve English language proficiency?
➢ Is the long-term goal ambitious?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT is in the process of developing a growth model for ELP. Criteria has been set for students to exit from English learner status. The long term goal is for 100% of English learners to meet the criteria by the 2029-30 school year. Baseline data will be based upon 2016-17 growth results, which will not be available until Oct 2017. CT will use LAS Links to measure student English progress and proficiency. The long-term goal is set at 100% of English Learners achieving 100% of their growth target by 2029-30, with a baseline of 2016-17. The English Learner growth model has not been adopted, but is being created to mirror the growth model developed for the ELA and math Smarter-Balanced assessments. Students have five years to exit English leaner status with no differentiation for level of achievement when entering. Similar to the limitations discussed in A.4.iii.a.1, the average percentage of growth target achieved does not indicate whether students are making progress toward achieving English language (EL) proficiency. CT's use of an average percentage of progress target achieved as a measure of progress toward EL proficiency does not support any inferences regarding the actual percentage of students achieving EL proficiency annually. Because this model is still under development, baseline data are based on a "best estimate" only.
Strengths	CT used the same timeframe of 13 years for this calculation using the 2016-17 year as the baseline starting at 40% and increasing to the ambitious goal of 100% by the 2029-30 school year. The criteria for exit are presented, and the long term goal is for 100% of EL students to meet this goal by the 2029-2030 school year. Setting the expectation at 100% making growth is ambitious. The approach to setting growth targets is criterion-referenced, research-based, and consistent with how the state sets growth expectations on content area assessments.
Weaknesses	The model is still in development. The growth model has not yet been developed. The model is not differentiated for higher or lower performing

students.

Not differentiating based on EL entry level to create higher expectations. High performing EL students should be expected to exit sooner than entering low performing students.

CT does not set goals to measure proficiency, making it extraordinarily difficult to determine if there is significant progress towards meeting proficiency. Additionally, the complexity of the growth-to-target calculation make quantifying the values in a meaningful way problematic. Growth should be meaningful to a student for a school to earn credit in an accountability rating.

The growth targets used in CT's ELA and Mathematics assessments did not clearly factor in a timeline for attaining proficiency within a certain number of years.

CT did not provide information on setting growth targets (although they attached their plan for setting growth targets).

Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (2 peer reviewer(s)) ☒ No (2 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	CT should use a growth calculation that can be translated into terms of meeting proficiency expectations. The current calculation of percent of target achieved does not give information about whether EL group of students in the school are on track to exit EL status via English language proficiency. CT should explain the applicable timelines over which English learners sharing particular characteristics would be expected to attain ELP within a State-determined maximum number of years and a rationale for that State-determined maximum. CT must revisit the method used for creating the EL growth model and cannot simply use the Smarter Balanced growth model method because this method does not result in students achieving proficiency if they meet growth every year. CT should explain how the student-level targets expect all English learners to make annual progress toward attaining English language proficiency within the applicable timelines. CT should explain how the state considers a student's English language proficiency level at the time of identification and, if applicable, any other student characteristics that the state takes into account (i.e., time in language instruction programs, grade level, age, Native language proficiency level, or limited or interrupted formal education, if any).

A.4.iii.c.2: Measurements of interim progress

➢ Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT will use LAS Links to measure student English progress and proficiency. Three interim goals are set over 13 years with 100% achieving their growth target by 2029-30, with a baseline of 2016-17. The English Learner growth model has not been adopted, but is being created to mirror the growth model developed for the ELA and math Smarter-Balanced assessments. CT's interim progress goals are not appropriate for inferring an increase in the percentage of students making progress in achieving EL proficiency. Instead, the average percentage of growth targets achieved are slated to increase every three years through 2029.
Strengths	The goal of 100% is ambitious.
Weaknesses	Only three interim goals are established over a 13-year period. Indicators measured only every three years may not detect leading indicators of positive or negative trends that could be addressed earlier. While interim goals and intervals are set at the state's discretion, assurances that the state will monitor progress in non-interim years would strengthen the narrative and demonstrate commitment to improvement. CT does not set goals to measure proficiency, making it extraordinarily difficult to determine if there is significant progress toward meeting proficiency. Additionally, the complexity of the growth-to-target calculation make quantifying the values in a meaningful way problematic. Growth should be meaningful to a student for a school to earn credit in an accountability rating. An increase in the average percentage of progress targets achieved does not mean an increase in the percentage of students on track to achieving EL proficiency within a certain time frame.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) ☐ No (0 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

A.4.iv: Indicators (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B), 1111(c)(4)(E)(ii))

Note: A single indicator may consist of multiple components or measures. Peers must review each such component or measure for compliance with all of the required elements.

A.4.iv.a: Academic Achievement

➢ Does the SEA describe the Academic Achievement indicator used in its statewide accountability system, including that the SEA uses the same indicator for all schools in all LEAs across the State?
➢ Does the description include how the SEA calculates the indicator, including: 1) that the calculation is consistent for all schools, in all LEAs, across the State; 2) a description of the weighting of reading/language arts achievement relative to mathematics achievement; 3) if the State uses one, a description of the performance index; 4) if, at the high school level, the indicator includes a measure of student growth, a description of the growth measure (*e.g.*, a growth model); and 5) if the State averages data, a description of how it averages data across years and/or grades (*e.g.*, does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
➢ Is the indicator valid and reliable?
➢ Is the indicator based on the SEA's long-term goals?
➢ Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?
➢ Is the indicator measured by grade-level proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments?
➢ Does the indicator measure the performance of at least 95 percent of all students and 95 percent of all students in each subgroup?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT is proposing an accountability system that incorporates 12 indicators: 1) academic achievement; 2) academic growth; 3) participation rate; 4) chronic absenteeism; 5) preparation for postsecondary and career coursework; 6) preparation for postsecondary and career readiness exams; 7) graduation, on track in ninth grade; 8) four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate; 9) six-year adjusted cohort graduation rate; 10) postsecondary entrance; 11) physical fitness; and 12) arts access.
	ELA, math and science are included as academic achievement indicators. A performance index score is calculated derived from the student's actual score; unfortunately the law does not allow science to be included in the academic achievement indicator.
	The performance index score is derived from taking a student's actual score, subtracting the lowest possible score on the test, dividing it by the range of scores possible, and multiplying it by 110 to arrive at the index score. The student index scores are averaged across all students in the schools to determine the performance index, then the performance index is compared to the target goal of 75 to determine the proportional amount of points the school

will earn for that subject.

While the calculation may be valid and reliable, it does not produce number that is meaningful to users or can quantify how many and how well students are mastering the state standards.

The long-term and interim academic achievement goals are not the same goals, nor the same calculation, as being used in the accountability system for the academic achievement indicator. CT has set an "ultimate target" of 75 for the accountability system based on the performance index compared to the long-term goal of 100% for the academic achievement goals currently based on the percent of target met growth measures.

The performance index will be computed for each of the groups, but the accountability system will only use the data from the all students and high needs student groups in accountability.

The indicator does not directly measure grade level proficiency on the annual statewide assessment.

The plan alludes to a gap measure applied to the academic achievement calculation, but does not describe how this gap measure interplays with the indicator or overall rating.

CT does not explain how the academic achievement indicator will measure the performance of at least 95 percent of all students and 95 percent in each group.

Academic achievement is represented by a performance index. This approach can be disaggregated by subgroup and includes Science, the state's alternate assessment, and the SAT on a standardized scale ranging from 0 to 110 points. This academic achievement indicator is not based on the state's long-term goals nor does the indicator measure grade-level proficiency on the state's annual assessments of ELA and Mathematics. A decision matrix assigns some students who do not complete testing the lowest obtainable scale score, but there is no explicit requirement or inclusion of at least 95% of all students to be included in the academic achievement indicator.

Strengths	It is evident from the variety of indicators proposed that CT listened to stakeholders over the past few years as to what was desired in an accountability system.
Weaknesses	CT must move science to another academic indicator or to the SQSS indicator to meet the requirements of law. There is discrepancy between the accountability indicator and the achievement indicator – the first using student growth and the second using a performance index that lacks clarity and, thus, usefulness to users and stakeholders. It does not provide clarity in regards to how many students are meeting grade level proficiency standards. CT does not indicate how or whether the indicator will measure the performance of at least 95% of all students and 95% of

all students in each subgroup. The subgroup "high needs" is utilized as opposed to each individual subgroup.

The plan does not state how the points earned on the three performance indexes (ELA, math, and science) will be allocated over the 300 points allotted to the academic achievement indicator.

CT does not explain how the proportional points will be awarded for the index score compared to the target.

CT does not explain how the academic achievement indicator will measure the performance of at least 95 percent of all students and 95 percent in each group.

Using and reporting on a 0-100 point scale for the academic achievement indicator provides great opportunity for misinterpretation of results. Earning a 75 on the academic achievement indicator will lead many users to believe that 75 percent of students are achieving grade level proficiency (since the indicator is described as the measure of students meeting grade level proficiency). In all actuality 75 does not quantify to any meaningful measure of grade level proficiency. The value is further confounded because the target is only 75, so a school earning 100 points on the indicator only achieved the target of 75.

It is unclear how the Year 1 and Years 2 and 3 work together. Points are presented in the chart, but are not explained in the narrative.

In the spirit and intent of ESSA, this indicator is not designed for transparency and meaningful information for students and parents, educators, policymakers, and the public. It is also contrary to CT's self-described "tangible need for, and our civic obligation to public accountability, the CSDE reports academic achievement status…."

Weighting all scores on all assessments including raw scores by an additional 10 points is unnecessarily complex and may not be appropriate for the purposes of inferring student performance against a grade-level standard. This is especially true when raw scores are used. A school's performance index score lacks transparency in the percentage of students that are performing at or above grade level standard.

Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewer(s)) ☒ No (4 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this	Science cannot be included in the academic achievement indicator. It could, however, be placed in School Quality and Student Success (SQSS). CT must base the academic indicator on grade-level proficiency on state assessments.

requirement	CT must explain how the average scale score will not mask the impact of the lower achievers with high performers.
	CT must clearly explain how the 95% participation requirement will explicitly apply to the academic achievement indicator.
	CT must explain how meeting 75% of the target demonstrates grade-level proficiency.
	CT should consider the complexity of the system and how it will communicate results that are understandable to parents, community, and the public.

A.4.iv.b: Other Academic Indicator for Elementary and Secondary Schools that are Not High Schools

Note: If the SEA uses a different Other Academic indicator for each grade span, peer reviewers must separately review each indicator that an SEA submits. For example, if an SEA submits one Other Academic indicator for elementary schools and a different Other Academic indicator for middle schools, then peer reviewers will provide feedback, using the criteria below, separately for each indicator.

➤ Does the SEA describe the Other Academic indicator used in its statewide accountability system for public elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools, including that the SEA uses the same indicator and calculates it in the same way for all elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools, in all LEAs, across the State, except that the indicator may vary by each grade span?
➤ Does the SEA describe, if applicable, how it averages data across years and/or grades (*e.g.*, does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
➤ If the SEA uses a different indicator for each grade span, does it describe each indicator, including the grade span to which it applies?
➤ If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, is the indicator another valid and reliable statewide academic indicator?
➤ If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, does the indicator allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance?
➤ Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT uses growth in ELA and math in grades 4-8 as one of the other academic indicators for elementary and middle schools. The calculation is computed the same was across all schools and districts in the state.
	English language proficiency will be added to this indicator in 2019-2020.
	The long-term and interim targets are based on this growth calculation. The ultimate target for the growth indicator is 100%, matching the long-term goal.

	The growth targets are measured as the average percent of growth target achieved by students in grades 4-8, in aggregate. The model establishes individual growth targets and then determines what percent of the growth target is met. If the student does not fully meet the growth target, they can still be awarded credit for the goal at a 0% rate to 110% rate. The calculation is looking at the average percent of growth target achieved. The indicator is on a 0-100 point scale at the school, but allows a student to count for up to 110% of target achieved, thereby masking some performance of lower achieving students. This proposed calculation is complex and the value yielded from the percentage does not provide information to the user about what percent of kids are achieving grade level proficiency, or even what percent of kids are making at least a year's progress in a year's time.

Additionally, CT measures growth as a binary indicator of whether the student met the growth target called "growth rate," in addition to the percent of target achieved measure. The binary indicator of growth provides more meaningful information about student progress towards achieving grade level proficiency given the criterion nature of the measure and the assigned meaning of earning a positive mark in the numerator. Unfortunately, this measure is not used in accountability calculations.

CT references the use of multiple years of data; however, it does not explicitly discuss a process to include data averaged across multiple years.

Schools are evaluated separately on the academic growth of CT's combined "high needs subgroup," and the indicator can be further disaggregated for each subgroup of students. |
| *Strengths* | It is evident from the variety of indicators proposed that CT listened to stakeholders over the past few years as to what was desired in an accountability system. |
| *Weaknesses* | The complexity of the growth-to-target calculation makes quantifying the values in a meaningful way problematic. Growth should be meaningful to a student for a school to earn credit in an accountability rating.

CT should clarify how points are allocated in the other academic indicator over the two subjects and in conjunction with academic achievement as mentioned on page 10 of the "Using Accountability Results to Guide Improvement" paper. |
| *Did the SEA meet all requirements?* | ☒ Yes (4 peer reviewer(s))
☐ No (0 peer reviewer(s)) |
| *If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to* | |

fully meet this requirement	

A.4.iv.c: Graduation Rate

➢ Does the SEA describe the Graduation Rate indicator used in its statewide accountability system for public high schools in the State, including that the SEA uses the same indicator across all LEAs in the State?
➢ Does the description include how the SEA calculates the indicator including: 1) that the calculation is consistent for all high schools, in all LEAs, across the State; 2), if applicable, whether the SEA chooses to lag adjusted cohort graduation rate data; and 3) if applicable, how the SEA averages data (*e.g.*, consistent with the provisions in ESEA section 8101(23) and (25), which permit averaging graduation rate data over three years for very small schools)?
➢ Is the indicator valid and reliable?
➢ Is the indicator based on the SEA's long-term goals?
➢ Is the indicator based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate?
➢ If the State, at its discretion, also includes one or more extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates, does the description include how the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is combined with that rate or rates within the indicator?
➢ If applicable, does the SEA's description include how the State includes in its four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates students with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed using an alternate assessment aligned to alternate academic achievement standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(D) and awarded a State-defined alternate diploma under ESEA section 8101(23) and (25)?
➢ Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT's proposed accountability system includes 2 indicators related to graduation rate: Indicator 8 – four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate; and Indicator 9 – six-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. A related indicator is Indicator 7 of graduation, on track in ninth grade.
	The 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is included and can be broken down to each subgroup. Additionally, it is based upon CT's long-term goal of 94%. A 6-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is also included as an indicator. Lagging the adjusted cohort graduation rate data is not discussed.
	CT uses the same graduation rate indicators, a four-year rate for all students and a six-year rate for high needs group, in all high schools statewide using the 2008 defined cohort adjusted rate.
	Because the state's definition of the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate references 2008 guidance (34 C.F.R.

	§ 200.19), it is not clear whether CT awards a State-defined alternate diploma for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed using an alternate assessment aligned to alternative academic achievement standards and whether those students are captured in the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate calculation. CT should clarify its adjusted cohort graduation rate calculation to follow the statutory requirements of ESSA for including students awarded alternate diplomas when applicable.
Strengths	The four and six year rates are not combined making the percentage of students that graduate on-time versus two years later more transparent.
Weaknesses	It is not apparent how the 6-year cohort will be calculated, whether each subgroup will be examined, and how it interacts with the 4-year rate. The long-term goal of 94% still leaves 6% of the state's students without a high school diploma. It would appear the 6-year cohort should be held to a higher expectation. The 4 year cohort is measured for "all" students while the 6-year cohort is measured for the "high needs" group. CT sets lower expectations for students in the high needs group by only holding this group accountable for the six-year rate. The same target is used for four- and six- year rates. The additional two years to graduation should come with a higher expectation. The weighting of the four- and six year rates are equal, 100 points each in the accountability system. Equal weighting provides less incentive to move kids on in four years, and a lot less incentive to move high needs kids in four year. CT does not address students with disabilities and alternate diplomas in the context of graduation rate. The plan alludes to a gap measure applied to the graduation calculation, but does not describe how this gap measure interplays with the indicator or overall rating. There is little to no incentive for increasing graduation rates beyond 94% in either the four year or six year graduation rate. The target needed to earn full credit for the six year rate is not more ambitious than the four year rate. A cohort with a 94% four year graduation rate does not have to graduate any additional students over the following two years to earn full credit again for a six year rate.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) ☐ No (0 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or	

clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

A.4.iv.d: Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency Indicator

➢ Does the SEA describe the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator used in its statewide accountability system, including that the SEA uses the same indicator across all LEAs in the State?
➢ Is the indicator valid and reliable?
➢ Is the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator aligned with the State-determined timeline described in A.4.iii.c.1?
➢ Does the indicator consistently measure statewide the progress of all English learners in each of grades 3 through 8 and in the grade for which such English learners are otherwise assessed under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) during grades 9 through 12?
➢ Does the SEA's description include the State's definition of English language proficiency, based on the State English language proficiency assessment?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The SEA plan does not include an indicator for progress in achieving English language proficiency in its accountability system. Vague mention of this requirement is included in the weighting section for academic growth but details are lacking.
	The plan indicates that progress toward English language proficiency is expected to be added to the academic growth indicator effective 2019-2020.
	CT describes its progress in achieving EL proficiency indicator in its accountability system. While the state's assessment may be high quality and its growth model may be statistically sound, there is little data provided to suggest this indicator is valid and reliable for the purposes of evaluating English learner language proficiency. The EL proficiency definition aligns with the state's long-term goals; however, it does not align with the state's long-term goals because the indicator may be aggregated with the academic growth indicator.
	The state will extend their SBAC growth approach to measuring the growth of EL proficiency on its EL assessment; these growth targets are not set for grades 9 through 12. CT's identifies EL proficiency as attainment of Levels 4 or 5 in LAS' overall score, Reading and Writing.. Including this measure in an academic growth indicator may not clearly demonstrate the EL progress indicator receives substantial weight in the state's accountability system.
Strengths	

Weaknesses	CT does not include the EL indicator as a separate part of the accountability system. CT does not plan to include EL proficiency until 2019-20.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewer(s)) ☒ No (4 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	CT must provide information on how English language proficiency is used as an independent indicator in the accountability system. Please see long-term goals comments (A.4.iii.c.1). CT must explain how EL proficiency will be included in 2017-18 accountability.

A.4.iv.e: 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 criteria below, separately for each indicator. For any School Quality or Student Success indicator that does not apply to all grade spans, the SEA's description must include the grade spans to which it does apply. (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(v))

➢ Does the SEA describe each School Quality or Student Success indicator used in its statewide accountability system for all public schools in the State?
➢ If the SEA uses a different indicator for each grade span, does it describe each indicator, including the grade span to which it applies?
➢ Does the indicator allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance?
➢ Is the indicator valid, reliable, comparable, used statewide in all schools (for the grade span to which it applies), and calculated in a consistent way?
➢ Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT does not specifically identify which of the 12 indicators would be considered a school quality or student success indicator, but it is assumed the indicators 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, and 12 might be included in this category. Seven indicators are included related to School Quality or Student Success: Chronic Absenteeism, Preparation for Postsecondary and Career Readiness Coursework, Preparation for Postsecondary and Career Readiness Exams,

Graduation, On Track in Ninth Grade, Postsecondary Entrance, Physical Fitness, and Arts Access. All 7 of the indicators are applicable to high school, three to middle school, and two to elementary school. Results cannot be disaggregated for each subgroup of students. Six of the 7 indicators are measured using only the "all students" group. This makes meaningful differentiation difficult in that differences amongst schools will be masked due to the lack of drilling down to subgroups.

Only chronic absenteeism and physical fitness applies to elementary and middle schools, all seven apply to high schools.

The success/school quality indicators can be disaggregated by subgroup, but it is difficult to determine if the indicators will meaningfully differentiate schools as no impact data was provided.

CT does not explain how indicators are meaningful, reliable, valid, comparable and ensure that they are not systemically biased specifically for newly proposed indicators such as physical fitness and arts access.

CT provides state averages and assigns points based on a research-based target; however, it does not provide any measures of standard deviation or standard error related to each.

Strengths	CT included indicators after listening to a wide variety of stakeholders in determining what should be included in the accountability system.
	The indicators include a variety of areas supporting a positive and productive school environment.
	Indicator 6 – Preparation for Postsecondary and Career Readiness Exams focuses on student outcomes of earning college ready scores or scores that qualify for college credit on ACT/SAT/AP/IB, SBAC.
	PE indicator is criterion based, but the explanation of requirements to be deemed meeting or exceeding the 'health fitness zone standard' are not provided.
	Educators and policymakers will receive access to a high volume of data not readily available or consumable in other state accountability systems.
Weaknesses	CT did not provide research-based evidence as to how the chosen indicators will increase student achievement and decrease achievement gaps.
	The indicators are skewed to the high school level.

	Targets for these indicators vary and points are awarded on a proportional basis making confounding the complexity of each measure and making interpretation to the user unnecessarily difficult.
	Success/school quality indicators focus on access, enrollment, and participation rather than student outcomes.
	CT's data suggests higher chronic absenteeism rates among certain students identified as "high needs". CT does not present any evidence to suggest this indicator differentiates among schools in any meaningful manner beyond student demographics.
	CT's use of target rates that allow schools to earn the maximum available points also dilute the impact of these measures. The rationale for selecting weights and targets are not evident. For example, CT suggests postsecondary entrance should not be "weighted too heavily and the ultimate target is reasonable" to appease certain stakeholders opposed to including this indicator. However, postsecondary entrance carries the same weight as four-year graduation rate with a target set at only 75% which is only slightly higher than the state's average postsecondary transition rate. Although CT has not provided impact data on how this indicator meaningfully differentiates among schools within its accountability system, the state's rate and target suggest that all schools above the state average could receive full credit for their postsecondary entrance rates. There are also several outstanding data quality issues related to tracking K-12 students through postsecondary education. CT has not demonstrated the degree to which it can effectively and accurately report disaggregated postsecondary entrance by subgroup.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (1 peer reviewer(s)) ☒ No (3 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Beyond stakeholder input collected, CT must explain how each proposed indicator is valid and reliable, comparable and measurable, and meaningfully differentiates without systemically biasing any group or school. CT should provide baseline and impact data to demonstrate validity, reliability, comparability, and measurability to differentiate without systemically biasing any group or school.

A.4.v: Annual Meaningful Differentiation (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C))

A.4.v.a: State's System of Annual Meaningful Differentiation

➢ Does the SEA describe its system of meaningfully differentiating, on an annual basis, all public schools in the State?
➢ Is the State's system of annual meaningful differentiation based on all indicators in the State's accountability system?
➢ Does the State's system of annual meaningful differentiation include the performance of all students and each subgroup of students on each of the indicators in the State's accountability system?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT will rate schools using five categories: category 1 is the top quartile of schools, category 2 is the middle two quartiles, and category 3 is the bottom quartile of schools based on 2015-16 and 2016-17 data. These cut points will inform criterion referenced cuts in the future. Category 4 and 5 schools will be comprehensive and targeted support schools based on normative rankings of the lowest five percent and ten percent respectively, based on a three-year aggregate. It is unclear if the category 4 and 5 cut points will remain normative or be criterion in the future. Only one of the indicators breaks down performance by each required subgroup. Six of the indicators only measure "all students". CT describes a system to meaningfully differentiate all public schools but it is unclear if this is an annual or every three year determination.
Strengths	CT differentiates using five categories of schools and provides identification beyond comprehensive and targeted support. Although indicator 3, test participation is not attributed any points, it is a factor in assigning school categories.
Weaknesses	CT did not provide information on how individual indicators differentiated, making it difficult to determine whether the summative rating will differentiate. Determining if the categories will meaningfully differentiate schools depends greatly on how well each indicator differentiates. Since no information was provided on the differentiation of each indicator, it is not possible to confirm this system will annually meaningfully differentiate. Differentiation is 'guaranteed' in a normative model, but that does not mean the differentiation is meaningful. CT identifies categories based on quartiles but did not appear to look at natural breaks (cut points) that would meaningfully differentiate. For example, multiple schools with similar scores may be clustered around the quartile break. Disaggregation of each of the indicators for each subgroup is not included as part of this plan. This leads to the possibility of overlooking or "masking" performance information about various subgroups of students.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (2 peer reviewer(s)) ☒ No (2 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to	CT must explain how the individual indicators will work in concert for meaningful differentiation. CT must explicitly state how they will differentiate schools into five categories on an annual basis.

fully meet this requirement	

A.4.v.b: Weighting of Indicators

➢ Does the SEA describe the weighting of each indicator in its system of annual meaningful differentiation, including how the weighting is adjusted for schools for which an indicator cannot be calculated due to the minimum number of students (*e.g.*, for the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator)?
➢ Do the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicators each receive substantial weight individually?
➢ Do the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicators receive, in the aggregate, much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s), in the aggregate?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	According to the graph provided by the SEA (p. 36), Academic Achievement and Other Academic indicators carry substantial weight – 22.2% and 29.6% respectively. Graduation rate indicators for both the 4 year and 6 year cohort carry the same weight (7.4%) which also the same as Indicators 10 and 4. All other indicators carry 3.7% each. English Language Proficiency is not weighted and is not yet included as an indicator.

CT indicator	Elem points	Elem weight	Middle points	Middle weight	High points	High weight
AA: Academic Achievement (100 pts each ELA, math, science—half all students, half high needs)	300	35%	300	35%	300	32%
OA: Other Academic (Growth/Graduation) (Growth: 200 pts each ELA and math—half all students, half high needs) (Graduation 100 pts each—half four-year rate all students, half six-year rate high needs students)	400	47%	400	47%	200	21%
EL: Not a CT Indicator - EL Progress	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
SS/SQ: Student Success/School Quality	150	18%	150	18%	450	47%
Total Points Possible	850	100%	850	100%	950	100%

CT indicator	Elem points	Elem weight	Middle points	Middle weight	High points	Middle weight
AA: Indicator 1 – Academic Achievement	300	35%	300	35%	300	32%
OA: Indicator 2 – Academic Growth	400	47%	400	47%		
OA: Indicator 8 – Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate and Indicator 9 – Six Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate					200	21%
EL: Not a CT Indicator - EL Progress	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
SS/SQ: Indicator 4 – Chronic Absenteeism	100	12%	100	12%	100	11%
SS/SQ: Indicator 11 – Physical Fitness	50	6%	50	6%	50	5%
SS/SQ: Indicator 12 – Arts Access					50	5%
SS/SQ: Indicator 10 – Postsecondary Entrance					100	11%
SS/SQ: Indicator 7 – Graduation, On Track in Ninth Grade					50	5%
SS/SQ: Indicator 6 – Preparation for Postsecondary and Career Readiness Exams					50	5%
SS/SQ: Indicator 5 – Preparation for Postsecondary and Career Readiness Coursework					50	5%
Total Points Possible	850	100%	850	100%	950	100%

Science is included in the academic achievement indicator but, per law, must be moved to Other Academic Indicator or SQSS.

Each of the indicators appears to have 'substantial' weight except for the EL progress indicator. The inclusion of the EL progress indicator into the state accountability system was not included in the pie chart, list of indicators, or narrative. The only mention was in the weighting where the plan stated EL progress would be included in the growth calculation, but growth is only available in grades 4-8 elementary and middle school, not high schools, and there was no detail on how it would be incorporated into growth.

	In high schools, the indicators of achievement, other academic achievement, and English language proficiency, in aggregate, do not carry much greater weight (53%) than the success/school quality indicators (47%).
	CT differentiates using five categories of schools. Although indicator 3, test participation, is not attributed any points, it is a factor in assigning school categories.
Strengths	CT spent nearly two years engaging stakeholders in designing the new accountability system and provided evidence of meetings and comments in their submission.
Weaknesses	CT did not provide evidence as to how the weightings were determined. Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator has not yet been developed and is not planned for inclusion until 2019-20, nor is it an individually weighted component. The number of indicators pertaining to high schools is greater than those pertaining to elementary and middle so Academic/Other Academic indicators will carry lesser weight at high school than at elementary and middle level. High school success/school quality indicators count for 47% of the overall rating.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewer(s)) ☒ No (4 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	CT should provide evidence as to how the weights were determined. CT must adjust high school weights as indicators of achievement, other academic achievement, and English language proficiency, in aggregate, do not carry much greater weight (53%) than the success/school quality indicators (47%). CT must relocate science achievement to the Other Academic Indicator or SQSS. CT must include the ELP indicator with a separate assigned weight.

A.4.v.c: If Applicable, Different Methodology for Annual Meaningful Differentiation

➢ If the SEA uses a different methodology or methodologies for annual meaningful differentiation than the one described in 4.v.a of the State's plan for schools for which an accountability determination cannot be made (*e.g.*, P-2 schools), does it describe the different methodology or methodologies, including how the methodology or methodologies will be used to identify schools for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement?
➢ Does the SEA's description of a different methodology indicate the type(s) of schools to which it applies?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT does not indicate its use of a different methodology or methodologies for other types of schools. There is no indication for how CT plans to evaluate schools which have no data on any of the required measures. In the plan section on weighting there is reference that schools will only be rated on components for which they have data, but there is no explanation of what happens when the school does not have any data for any of the indicators.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) ☐ No (# peer reviewer(s)) *Not applicable*
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

A.4.vi: Identification of Schools (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D), 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D))

A.4.vi.a Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools—Lowest Performing

➢ Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement including, if applicable, how it averages data (*e.g.*, does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
➢ Does the SEA's methodology result in the identification of not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement?
➢ Does the SEA include the year in which it will first identify these schools for comprehensive support and improvement (*i.e.*, does the timeline comply with the Department's guidance)?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT will identity comprehensive support schools as the bottom five percent of all (not just title I schools) schools based on a three-year average of accountability index data for 2018-19.

| | CT does not explain how data will be averaged across the three years of accountability. Given the scale for the accountability index is 0-100, it is implied that the points earned in each of the three year will be added and then divided by 3 then ranked to determine the lowest five percent of schools.

CT is using three year averages but does not specify which three years will be used in the average starting in the 2017-18 school year. |
|---|---|
| *Strengths* | Identification of the lowest performing five percent of all schools, not just title I schools. |
| *Weaknesses* | The plan reads as if these schools will be identified for the 2018-19 school year, not based on the 2018-19 data for implementation in the 2019-20 school year; clarification should be made. |
| *Did the SEA meet all requirements?* | ☒ Yes (4 peer reviewer(s))
☐ No (0 peer reviewer(s)) |
| *If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement* | |

A.4.vi.b: Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools—Low Graduation Rates

➢ Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify all public high schools in the State failing to graduate one-third or more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement, including: 1) a description of whether the SEA uses one or more extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates in addition to the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and 2) if applicable, how the SEA averages data (*e.g.*, does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
➢ Does the SEA's methodology result in the identification of all public high schools in the State failing to graduate one-third or more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement?
➢ Does the SEA include the year in which it will first identify these schools for comprehensive support and improvement (*i.e.*, does the timeline comply with the Department's guidance)?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Schools with six-year adjusted cohort graduation rates for all students that are less than 70% in each of the three most recent cohorts will be identified for comprehensive support. The 4-year adjusted cohort was not mentioned. They will be identified for the first time in 2018-2019.

	CT high schools will be identified for comprehensive support if the six-year graduation rate is less than 70% (higher than the required 67%, but off set by the six-year rate) in each of consecutive years.
Strengths	CT exceeded the ESSA requirement of 67%; however, it is on a 6 year rate
Weaknesses	The 4-year cohort is not utilized. The 6-year graduation rate is used without using the 4-year cohort. The method for identification of using three consecutive years sets a higher bar for entering comprehensive support than the use of a three year average.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewer(s)) ☒ No (4 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	CT must, at least, use the 4-year cohort rate when identifying schools for comprehensive support.

A.4.vi.c: Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools—Additional Targeted Support Not Exiting Such Status

➢ Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify schools receiving Title I, Part A funds that have received additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C) (*i.e.*, based on identification as a school in which the performance of any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification as one of the lowest-performing five percent) that have not satisfied the statewide exit criteria for such schools within a State-determined number of years?
➢ Does the SEA's methodology result in the identification of such schools?
➢ Does the SEA include the year in which it will first identify these schools for comprehensive support and improvement (*i.e.*, does the timeline comply with the Department's guidance)?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT will identify consistently underperforming targeted support schools that do not meet the exit criteria for five consecutive years as comprehensive support schools. CT schools enter targeted support only based on the performance of the high needs group. Based on the initial identification of targeted support schools in 2018-19, and then not meeting exit criteria for five consecutive years, these additional schools will be identified for comprehensive support for the first time in 2023-24. It is inferred that this will be an annual identification thereafter as targeted support schools are identified

	annually so the five-year window will also be annual. The use of average percentage of target achieved by the high needs subgroup is unlikely to result in the identification of the lowest achieving students. However, CT has not set any long-term goals related to academic achievement of students. Schools identified for underperforming subgroups are eligible for comprehensive support after five years of average percent of growth targets achieved scores in the lowest 10% -- for three consecutive years. CT should clearly articulate if schools will be identified for comprehensive support only after the schools' high needs subgroup maintains growth scores in the lowest 10% of the state for eight consecutive years.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	Using 5 consecutive years as the criteria for exiting means that low performing schools may remain low performing if they have one year every five years in which they meet minimum standards. CT does not explain how they will identify schools for comprehensive support in 3 years if they only have 2 years of data. CT did not base identification on all indicators and all subgroups.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewer(s)) ☒ No (4 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	CT must provide an explanation of how schools will be identified for targeted support as required in A.4.vi.f. CT should explain how they will identify schools for comprehensive support in 3 years if they only have 2 years of data. CT must base identification on all indicators and all subgroups, not just the high needs subgroup.

A.4.vi.d: Frequency of Identification

➢ Does the SEA include the frequency with which the State will identify each type of school for comprehensive support and improvement after the first year of identification?
➢ Does the SEA's timeline result in identification of these schools at least once every three years?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT will identify schools for comprehensive support once every three years.

	CT will begin supporting schools in 2018-2019 and every three years from then; however, it should clarify the timeline for future identifications and include which years of data will be considered.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) ☐ No (0 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

A.4.vi.e: Targeted Support and Improvement Schools—"Consistently Underperforming" Subgroups

➢ Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify schools with one or more "consistently underperforming" subgroups of students, including its definition of "consistently underperforming"?
➢ Does the SEA's methodology result in the identification of any school with one or more "consistently underperforming" subgroups of students?
➢ Is the methodology based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation?
➢ Does the SEA identify these schools annually?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Schools that are in the bottom 10% of all schools statewide based on the average percentage of target achieved by **high needs** students in ELA or math in each of the prior three years will be identified for Targeted Support (Focus). Schools that do not meet the exit criteria for 5 consecutive years will enter comprehensive support. These schools will be identified for the first time in 2018-2019. CT will identify schools that are in the bottom 10 percent of all schools statewide based on the average percentage of target achieved by high needs students in ELA or mathematics in each of the prior three years as targeted support schools. Additionally, schools with six-year adjusted cohort graduation rates for the high needs group that are less than 70 percent in each of the three most recent cohorts will also be identified for targeted support. CT briefly describes "consistently underperforming" as schools with the lowest 10% of average percentage of target

	achieved by high needs students in ELA or mathematics for three consecutive years. CT identifies these schools annually; however, the methodology is based on only one indicator – academic growth – in the accountability system.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	Identification of these schools is based solely on the high needs student subgroup. Utilizing the "high needs" group as opposed to individual subgroups for identifying schools in need of support may fail to identify needs of specific groups of students. Targeted support is based only on the percent of target met growth calculation, not academic achievement.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewer(s)) ☒ No (4 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	CT must base targeted support and intervention on all indicators. CT must look at all subgroups, not just the high needs subgroup, for targeted support and intervention.

A.4.vi.f: Targeted Support and Improvement Schools—Additional Targeted Support

➢ Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify schools in which the performance of any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State's methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D) (*i.e.*, the methodology described above in A.4.vi.a), including: 1) whether the methodology identifies these schools from among all public schools in the State or from among only the schools identified as schools with one or more consistently underperforming subgroups and 2) if applicable, how the SEA averages data (*e.g.*, does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
➢ Does the SEA's methodology result in identification of such schools?
➢ Does the SEA include the year in which the State will first identify such schools (*i.e.*, does the timeline comply with the Department's guidance)?
➢ Does the SEA include the frequency with which the State will identify such schools after the first year of identification?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT does not have criteria for identifying additional targeted support schools.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	

Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewer(s)) ☒ No (4 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	CT must address how it will identify additional targeted support schools.

A.4.vi.g: If Applicable, Additional Statewide Categories of Schools

➢ If the State chooses, at its discretion, to include additional statewide categories of schools, does the SEA describe those categories?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Schools of Distinction are those in the top 10% overall in any of the 4 following categories and are not flagged as having an achievement gap, a graduation rate gap, or participation rate below 95% on the state summative assessments: Overall Performance, Growth – All Students, Growth – High Needs, Overall Improvement. CT will recognize 'schools of distinction' which are category 1, 2, and 3 schools that are in the top 10 percent of schools in any of the four categories (Overall Performance on accountability index, Growth for all Students, Growth of high needs group, and Overall Improvement) and do not have achievement gaps, graduation gaps, or participation less than 95%. CT does not provide detail about how the data is used to make the designations, so it is unclear if this is an average over multiple years, an annual measure, or when the recognition starts and what the recognition entails.
Strengths	CT recognizes schools of distinction. Schools can be recognized for accomplishments in a number of different ways. Recognizes schools with high growth scores among high needs students.
Weaknesses	How schools of distinction will be recognized was not explained in the SEA's plan. It is unclear as to the frequency of recognizing these achievements. CT does not describe what type of recognition these schools will receive. It is not clear what support or meaningful

	recognition will be made available to these schools.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) ☐ No (0 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

A.4.vii: Annual Measure of Achievement (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(iii))

➢ Does the SEA describe how it factors the requirement for 95 percent participation of all students and 95 percent of all students in each subgroup of students in statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments into the statewide accountability system?

➢ If applicable, does the SEA describe how the SEA differentiates its approach based on such factors as the number of subgroups in the school missing the participation rate requirement, the length of time over which the school has missed the requirement, or the degree to which the school missed the requirement (*e.g.*, 92 percent participation rate vs. 70 percent participation)?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Schools that would otherwise be categorized as 1 or 2 will be lowered a category if the participation rate in the state summative assessment in any subject for either the all students group of the high needs group is less than 95%. Schools are not eligible for distinction if less than 95% of students assessed in any subject for either the all students or high needs subgroup. CT's accountability system does not factor the requirement for 95% test participation of students in each subgroup.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	No explanation was given as to why this specific consequence was chosen for schools having less than 95 percent participation in statewide math and reading/language arts assessments. High needs group is utilized as opposed to each required sub group.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewer(s)) ☒ No (4 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the	CT must explicitly account for 95% tested in the academic achievement indicator for ELA and math for all schools.

A.4.viii: Continued Support for School and Local Educational Agency Improvement (ESEA Section 1111(d)(3)(A))

A.4.viii.a: Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(I))

➢ Does the SEA describe its statewide exit criteria for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, which may include how the exit criteria are aligned with the State's long-term goals and measurements of interim progress?
➢ Does the SEA's description include the number of years within which schools are expected to meet such criteria?
➢ Is the number of years no more than four years?
➢ Do the exit criteria ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in the State (*e.g.*, do the exit criteria improve student outcomes and ensure that a school that exits no longer meets the criteria under which the school was identified)?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Comprehensive and targeted support schools will exit if they no longer meet the reason for their identification in the two consecutive years after identification. All identified schools are expected to meet their growth targets at Interim Progress Checkpoints. It is not clear within how many years schools in Comprehensive Support are expected to meet this criteria.
	The plan gives a nod to the interim progress check points stating "All identified schools are expected to meet or exceed their growth targets at Interim Progress Checkpoints outlined in section 2.2B Performance Management of this document." However, there is not an explicit exit criteria associated with the long-term goals or interim progress checkpoints.
	The exit criteria do not ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement. Schools are expected to meet interim progress targets. After two to three years of comprehensive support, schools may exit based on no longer being among the lowest performing statewide, but student achievement can decrease over that time frame.
Strengths	Interim progress checkpoints will be conducted during the time the schools are receiving support.
Weaknesses	Based upon the lack of clarity regarding within how many years these schools are expected to meet the exit criteria, a school could languish in this low performance area for an undetermined number of years.
	The exit criteria are normative and do not ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and

	school success. While the plan states there is an expectation that the schools meet their goals, it is not explicitly built into the exit criteria. The normative exit criteria mean a school in comprehensive support could remain at current performance levels, or even go down in performance, and still exit of there were other schools in the state that did worse.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewer(s)) ☒ No (4 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	CT must include in its comprehensive support exit criteria the expectation of schools improving student achievement or meeting goals, not just normative criteria for exit.

A.4.viii.b: Exit Criteria for Schools Receiving Additional Targeted Support (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(II))

➢ Does the SEA describe its statewide exit criteria for schools receiving additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C), which may include how the exit criteria align with the State's long-term goals and measurements of interim progress and the requirement that the goals and measurements of interim progress take into account the improvement necessary to close statewide proficiency and graduation rate gaps?
➢ Does the SEA's description include the number of years within which schools are expected to meet such criteria?
➢ Do the exit criteria ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in the State (*e.g.*, do the exit criteria improve student outcomes for the subgroup or subgroups that led to the school's identification and ensure that a school that exits no longer meets the criteria under which the school was identified)?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Targeted support schools will exit if they no longer meet the reason for their identification in the two consecutive years after identification. All identified schools are expected to meet their growth targets at Interim Progress Checkpoints. The plan also gives a nod to the interim progress check points stating "All identified schools are expected to meet or exceed their growth targets at Interim Progress Checkpoints outlined in section 2.2B Performance Management of this document." However, there is not an explicit exit criteria associated with the long-term goals or interim progress checkpoints. CT describes its statewide exit criteria including the number of years schools are expected to meet exit criteria. Exit

	criteria for targeted support schools are the same as comprehensive support. CT does not outline how this exit criteria align with goals to close statewide proficiency gaps because CT does not use a proficiency measure to identify schools for support nor does it identify schools based on the four-year graduation rate. Schools are expected to meet interim progress targets. The exit criteria do not ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement. After two to three years of targeted support, schools may exit based on no longer being among the lowest performing statewide, but student achievement can decrease over that time frame.
Strengths	Interim progress checkpoints will be conducted during the time the schools are receiving support.
Weaknesses	Using 5 consecutive years as the criteria for exiting means that low performing schools may remain low performing if they have one year every five years in which they meet minimum standards. The plan gives a nod to the interim progress check points stating "All identified schools are expected to meet or exceed their growth targets at Interim Progress Checkpoints outlined in section 2.2B Performance Management of this document." However, there is not an explicit exit criteria associated with the long-term goals or interim progress checkpoints.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewer(s)) ☒ No (4 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	CT must include in its targeted support exit criteria the expectation of schools improving student achievement or meeting goals, not just normative criteria for exit.

A.4.viii.c: More Rigorous Interventions (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(I))

➢ Does the SEA describe the more rigorous State-determined action required for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the SEA's exit criteria within a State-determined number of years, which may include interventions that address school-level operations, such as changes in school staffing and budgeting or the school day and year?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Any comprehensive support school that does not exit within 3 years will be required to implement more rigorous, evidence-based interventions with high statistical probability of success in three areas: increased academic performance and growth, increased graduation rates, and increased English language proficiency. Until 2023-2024 LEAs assume primary responsibility for interventions, review and implementation of intervention strategies. In

	2023-2024 the interventions become more state directed, and in 2026-2027 LEA's are required to enter into a "State Structured Decision-Making Pathway" which may include reconstitution, consolidation/closure, restructuring school governance council, and/or restructuring school board governance. Comprehensive support schools in CT that fail to meet the exit criteria within three years are subject to more rigorous interventions. However, the LEA is responsible for conducting, determining, selecting, and implementing interventions for the first eight years. It is not until 2026-27 that schools identified for implementation in 2018-19 are required to take a state structured decision-making pathway. Up until the third set of interim progress checks, LEAs have flexibility to determine how to improve their schools with limited, but increasing state oversight and support. State structured pathways include reconstitution, consolidation/closure, restructuring governance/school board.
Strengths	CT will conduct annual site visits by cross-divisional teams. Various levels of support are included. State structured decision making pathway provide a menu of intervention options.
Weaknesses	The first interim progress check is three years after initial identification. The second interim progress check is another three years. SEA intervention does not begin until the 2026-27 school year. CT provides districts eight years of implementation time before providing structured oversight. Whole school interventions are initiated 9-10 years after identification. The use of "interim progress" checks every three years are not truly interim if CT expects schools to exit after two to three after identification.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) ☐ No (0 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

A.4.viii.d: Resource Allocation Review (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(ii))

➢ Does the SEA describe how it will periodically review resource allocation to support school improvement in each LEA in the State serving a

significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The plan indicates that LEA's will be required to identify resource inequities in comprehensive and targeted support schools and to identify how the LEA will address the inequities. The state will annually review LEA resource allocations. LEA's with a significant number of schools requiring comprehensive or targeted support will receive support and technical support in the allocation and management of resources available through local, state, and federal funds. LEA's receiving Tier I and Tier II supports will also receive assistance in identifying resource inequity through inventories and training modules. Tier III Districts will work with the CSDE's Talent Office to address the equitable distribution of teachers and leaders through the state's Equity Plan. CT requires districts to identify resource inequities in comprehensive and targeted support schools and then districts must identify how to address the inequities. The state will review the district allocations, but does not explain any action the state will take to address the districts' findings or actual inequities. CT strictly limits oversight and requires districts to act, but with no listed consequence. The only state support is for the lowest performing (Tier III) schools who the state will work with on distribution of teacher/leaders via the Equity Plan.
Strengths	Teacher quality is included when addressing struggling schools. The annual consolidated plan application streamlines the process for Title I LEAs.
Weaknesses	CT fails to explain what will be done to assist LEAs beyond the annual review of resource allocations other than, "receive support and technical support in the allocation and management of resources available through local, state, and federal funds." State support is limited. Consequences and detailed review process is not included. CT does not explain how it will review district resource allocation, only it will, but with no consequence listed. CT over relies on districts to ensure appropriate resource allocation. CT should consider more structured oversight of districts and schools earlier in the process.

	The state's consolidated plan requires LEAs to identify resource inequities in comprehensive/targeted support schools only. CT should require LEAs to annually identify resource allocations to all schools regardless of improvement status. Also, the SEA requires LEAs to identify resource inequities among its lowest performing schools. CT's periodic review of resource allocations should provide technical assistance, monitoring and oversight in this area to ensure schools with the most significant need receive appropriate support.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewer(s)) ☒ No (4 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	CT must provide more detailed information on the process for the annual review, the possible supports for LEAs in need of assistance, and the consequences for LEAs who fail to comply.

A.4.viii.e: Technical Assistance (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(iii))

➢ 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?
➢ Is the technical assistance likely to improve student outcomes by, for example, 1) identifying State-approved evidence-based interventions; 2) supporting LEAs and schools in the development and implementation of support and improvement plans; and 3) differentiating the technical assistance?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT has identified the technical assistance that it will provide each LEA receiving comprehensive or targeted support. Technical assistance is differentiated based upon the tier of services for LEA's that serve a significant number of percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement. For the most part, the LEA's are expected to determine and implement interventions until Tier 3 when the services of the state's Talent Office will be accessed to address the equitable distribution of teachers and leaders through the state's Equity Plan. CT provides descriptions of differentiated technical assistance provided to districts based on tiers. More supports and direct interaction will be provided to Tier III districts, but the state's role remains limited and indirect by providing lists of resources and evidence based practices, developing web data and early identification tools for district use.

	CT describes the technical assistance it will provide to LEAs serving the most comprehensive and targeted support schools. Cross-divisional support teams, capacity-building, and evidence-based interventions are considered standard if not best practice.
Strengths	CT has three interim progress checks over a 10-year period with differentiated support during this time. LEA's maintain ownership of improving schools. State is empowering districts to take the lead on improving schools. Differentiated/tiered technical assistance strategies available across the improvement spectrum.
Weaknesses	Relying primarily on local improvement decisions and strategies may lead to inconsistent and potentially ineffective improvement efforts. CT assumes all districts are up for the challenge, and the district may not recognize if/where deficiencies lay in their planning and intervention process. With limited state oversight, and little state consequence, improvement of processes and implementation could be delayed. CT should provide data or "evidence" used to approve these interventions in its turnaround framework.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) ☐ No (0 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

A.4.viii.f: If Applicable, Additional Optional Action

➤ If applicable, does the SEA describe the action that it will take to initiate additional improvement in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools that it consistently identifies for comprehensive support and improvement and are not meeting the State's exit criteria or in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools implementing targeted support and improvement plans?

Peer Response

Peer Analysis	Not applicable.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) ☐ No (# peer reviewer(s)) *Not applicable*
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

A.5: Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators (ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B))

➢ Does the SEA describe the extent, if any, that low-income children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, which may include the State definition of ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers?

➢ Does the SEA describe the extent, if any, that minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, which may include the State definition of ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers?

➢ Does the SEA describe the measures (*e.g.*, data used to calculate the disproportionate rates) that it will use to evaluate and publicly report its progress with respect to how low-income and minority children are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers?[4]

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Rates at which students are taught by an ineffective teacher and/or principal is "to be calculated." Data included in appendix C indicates that students in poverty and minority students are more likely to be instructed by out-of-field and/or inexperienced teachers and principals; however, no data was provided to illustrate the inequity.

---

[4] Consistent with ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B), this description should not be construed as requiring a State to develop or implement a teacher, principal or other school leader evaluation system

	CT does not have a way to identify ineffective teachers at the state level. In CT, LEAs are responsible for teacher evaluation and report only aggregate data to the SEA.
Strengths	CT acknowledged that students attending high-poverty, high-minority schools are somewhat more likely to be taught by inexperienced teachers and led by inexperienced principals than students in low-poverty and low-minority schools. The plan included a timeline and funding sources for addressing teacher equity strategies.
Weaknesses	While CT acknowledges that students attending high-poverty, high-minority schools are more likely to be taught and led by inexperienced teachers and leaders, the plan was lacking in detail as to the extent of this challenge. The CSDE does not collect data on the effectiveness of teachers and principals. CT's plan for increasing equity focuses on better partnerships and supports in the early years, but does not articulate how these supports will directly benefit educators in high-poverty, high-minority schools. CT has goals to increase educators of color and decrease vacancies in high-poverty, high-minority schools but aside from sharing 'promising practices,' holding a summit, and continuing existing strategies, there is no detail on how this will be accomplished – and if the continuation of programs will remedy inequity in the future since they have not to date. It is not clear how CT's SEED data will be used in calculating the rate at which low-income and minority students are taught by ineffective teachers.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (2 peer reviewer(s)) ☒ No (2 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	CT must demonstrate how effective teachers are equitably distributed. Given CT's Equity Plan, information on ineffective teachers should be available and provided in this section.

A.6: School Conditions (ESEA Section 1111(g)(1)(C))

➢ Does the SEA describe how it will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A to improve school conditions for student learning?
➢ Does the SEA's description include how it will support LEAs to reduce incidences of bullying and harassment?

➢ Does the SEA's description include how it will support LEAs to reduce the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom?
➢ Does the SEA's description include how it will support LEAs to reduce the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT is in the process of developing a Next Generation Student Support System which will provide tiered supports to Title I LEA's to promote safe and healthy schools, including evidenced based practices in developing positive school climate, eradicating bullying and harassment, skill development in trauma-informed practice, reducing chronic absenteeism, building social-emotional learning systems, and reducing exclusionary discipline through restorative justice practices.
Strengths	The planned guidance documents cover the appropriate topics for improving school conditions for student learning. CT is on track for the development of a proposed plan that will likely address all required areas.
Weaknesses	The guidance documents are scheduled for completion prior to June 2018.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewer(s)) ☒ No (4 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	CT must provide a completed plan to satisfy this requirement.

A.7: School Transitions (ESEA 1111(g)(1)(D))

➢ Does the SEA describe how it will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A in meeting the needs of students at all levels of schooling (particularly students in the middle grades and high school)?
➢ Does the SEA's description include how it will work with LEAs to provide effective transitions of students to middle grades and high school to decrease the risk of students dropping out?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT identified strategies from its comprehensive plan that address the use of data for early identification of students most in need of intervention and key transition points along the PreK-12 continuum from early childhood through

	post-secondary education/training or workforce.
	The "Next Generation Student Support System" which will be ready by June 2018 addresses transitions preschool into postsecondary. During K-12 transitions (elementary to middle, middle to high), tiered supports will be provided in evidence based strategies in developing positive school climate, eradicating bullying and harassment, skill development in trauma-informed practice, reducing chronic absenteeism, building social-emotional learning systems, and reducing exclusionary discipline through restorative justice practices.

CT highlights strategies from the state's five-year (2016-2021) comprehensive plan to improve student learning starting with the development of early identification and transitions tools to matriculate students successfully into, though, and beyond the K-12 continuum and providing access to broad curricular opportunities.   The tools have not been developed but the plan provides evidence of tier-supports and LEA assistance for transitions from early childhood to workforce. |
| *Strengths* | The plan includes early childhood care that includes providers and stakeholder engagement.

Preschool and post high school transitions are included.

Transitions extend to postsecondary/workforce and commence in early childhood, not just focused on K-12 years.

Use of evidence-based strategies such as summer transition academies; increased career and technical education options; student-to-student mentoring; and orientation events for students and families. |
| *Weaknesses* | The Next Generation Student Support System must be fully planned and implemented.

It is not clear how CT will monitor the effectiveness of its technical assistance in being able to support the implementation of these activities in LEAs throughout the state. CT should ensure its tiered supports account for student need in high-poverty schools. |
| *Did the SEA meet all requirements?* | ☒ Yes (4 peer reviewer(s))
☐ No (0 peer reviewer(s)) |
| *If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement* | |

SECTION E: TITLE III, PART A, SUBPART 1: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND ENHANCEMENT

E.1: Entrance and Exit Procedures (ESEA section 3113(b)(2))

➢ Does the SEA describe how it will establish and implement, with timely and meaningful consultation with LEAs representing the geographic diversity of the State, standardized statewide entrance and exit procedures for English learners, including a description of how, if applicable, a State will ensure that local input included in the exit procedures, such as teacher input or a portfolio, will be applied statewide?

➢ Does the SEA's description include an assurance that all students who may be English learners are assessed for such status within 30 days of enrollment in a school in the State?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT thoroughly described the entrance and exit procedures for English learners. All English learners will be identified within 30 days after beginning the school year or within the first two weeks of enrollment through the Home Language Survey. To exit status as an English learner, students must reach an overall of 4 or higher on the LAS Links.
	Stakeholders from various areas (higher education, English learner providers, bilingual educators, Connecticut EL educators) provided feedback regarding current entry and exit tools. All English learners must be identified within 30 days of the beginning of the school year or within the first two weeks after enrollment.
	CT describes how it established its entrance and exit procedures in meaningful consultation with appropriate stakeholders. It is not clear if its stakeholder group or survey results represented the geographic diversity of the state. English learners are required to be identified using CT' s Home language survey guidance within 30 days of the beginning of the school year or two weeks within enrollment if applicable.
Strengths	Students are quickly identified upon enrollment.
	Early identification, first 30 days and within two weeks during the school year.
	LEAs are encouraged to share translations of the home language survey across districts.
Weaknesses	Use of an overall and sub scores on LAS Links to determine exit criteria.
	LEAs are not required to use a *standardized* home language survey. Proper implementation of the home language survey and/or a teacher referral process is necessary to identify students with an English language need.

Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) ☐ No (0 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

E.2: SEA Support for English Learner Progress (ESEA section 3113(b)(6))

➢ Does the SEA describe how it will assist eligible entities in meeting the State-designed long-term goal for English language proficiency established under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii), including measurements of interim progress towards meeting such goal, based on the State's English language proficiency assessment under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(G)?

➢ Does the SEA describe how it will assist eligible entities in helping to ensure that English learners meet challenging State academic standards?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	CT is in the progress of developing a growth model for the English language proficiency assessment that will determine the long term goal and interim goals. CT's plan first describes assistance as establishing the actual model the will measure growth, this is not assistance, this is a statewide measurement tool to determine effectiveness. CT's plan provides a link to the EL standards but does not provide an explanation of how the state will assist eligible entities in meeting the standards. CT does not appear to provide technical assistance to LEAs which underperform against the state's interim targets on EL proficiency. CT will provide a criterion-based growth model to measure student progress toward EL proficiency; however, CT does not describe any strategies it will use to support EL progress and proficiency. CT describes its standards for English language proficiency but does not describe how the SEA will assist entities to ensure EL can also meet the state's challenging ELA and Mathematics standards.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	Development of goals and targets does not necessarily equate with providing assistance to LEA's to ensure that English learners meet challenging State academic standards.

Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewer(s))
	☒ No (4 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	CT must describe actual support, not just technical assistance and monitoring, that will support ELs in meeting language proficiency.

E.3: Monitoring and Technical Assistance (ESEA section 3113(b)(8))

➢ Does the SEA describe how it will monitor the progress of each eligible entity receiving a Title III, Part A subgrant in helping English learners achieve English language proficiency?

➢ Does the SEA describe the steps it will take to further assist eligible entities if the strategies funded under Title III, Part A are not effective, such as by providing technical assistance and support on how to modify such strategies?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	This area was not specifically addressed in CT's plan.
	CT's plan for Monitoring, Continuous Improvement and Differentiated Support makes little specific mention of how the plan will be specifically differentiated for English learners. Additional technical assistance and support are provided through a variety of activities including disseminating resources to LEA's via newsletters and the CSDE website, disseminating information at statewide and/or national professional organizations, designing and posting EL resource materials/professional development/technical assistance supports, and overseeing the administration of the annual English language proficiency assessments and analyze the performance data.
	CT explains that EL is part of the larger performance management system and alludes to the need to support ELs in meeting their growth targets in three goals areas. The tiered system of support is explained 'inclusively' with little mention of specific supports to Title III, Part A or how strategies will be modified or supported specifically for ELs.
	Technical assistance and support described in the plan is limited and distant. Cited supports are administering EL proficiency assessments and analyzing data, posting resource materials for LEAs and parents, providing guidance on disseminating resources, and partnering with CT regional entities to collaborate and disseminate information.

	CT describes how it will monitor the progress of each eligible entity receiving Title III Part A subgrants to help EL students achieve EL proficiency. CT describes the performance management system which includes interim progress checks against several indicators including EL progress. This process includes the opportunity for a needs assessment and tiered supports in several areas, but these are not specifically outlined with regard to supporting strategies under this subgrant.
Strengths	A variety of support formats are included.
Weaknesses	Descriptions of supports are general and lack specificity. Monitoring the progress of entities receiving funding via Title III, Part A is not specified. CT does not specifically address EL Title III, Part A monitoring. The skeletal description of monitoring is in the context of all students with the responsibility for improvement, monitoring, and technical assistance relying heavily on LEAs, with the state as a backup. LEA plans and requirements are not clearly delineated in the state plan and there is not an explanation of LEA requirements specifically related to Title III, Part A. CT's approach to monitoring progress of EL proficiency is not aligned to the goal of helping EL students attain EL proficiency within a specific timeline. There are no growth targets available yet and baseline and interim targets remain theoretical. Because CT does not have a separate EL progress indicator in its accountability system, CT may not be able to identify entities where EL students truly struggle to achieve EL proficiency.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewer(s)) ☒ No (4 peer reviewer(s))
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	CT must provide more evidence-based options for direct technical assistance, specifically for EL. CT must provide more explanation of how the state will monitor the LEA plans and how the state will intervene when needed.