STATE PLAN
PEER REVIEW CRITERIA
Peer Review Panel Notes Template

STATE: Nevada

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	Nevada administers end-of-course assessments for two mathematics course-taking pathways: (1) Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II, or (2) Integrated I, Integrated II, and Integrated III. SEA does not clarify if both pathways are offered in every school. Nevada checked 'yes' on page 24 that the state will use the 8th grade mathematics exception, but the responding text does not explicitly state this option will only apply to 8th graders vs. 'middle schoolers' which could include earlier grades. Additional clarification would strengthen the response.

[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).

Strengths	The state provides some information and description of the Nevada Ready Network that will work on closing the instructional gap for struggling students. Recognition of performance decrease in the middle school years. Network team is identified. Data-informed strategy to increase support for upper elementary & middle school math teachers, focusing on standards-based instruction lead by the Nevada Ready Network to improve mathematics performance.
Weaknesses	The information provided is insufficient in detail, as no description is provided on the extent of this support (i.e., will it be available to all districts/schools that have non-proficient students, or only a limited number of schools), and what types of support will be provided.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada should clarify which EOC assessment is used at the high school level for ESSA purposes in lieu of the one required for those not exempt. Nevada should provide the data procedures to ensure a student's performance on the EOC assessment taken in the eighth grade would be used in the year in which the student takes the assessment.

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	Nevada's plan does not explicitly state the definition of "languages other than English present to a significant extent." However, the response outlines that Spanish meets the definition.

Nevada's plan provides data on the percent of English learner students' native language and specifies "languages other than English that are present to a significant extent" as Spanish (91.5% of EL students). The next most prominent languages represent a significantly smaller percentage of students statewide. However, Nevada does not provide information on whether these languages are spoken by a significant portion of the student population in one or more of the state's LEAs.

Nevada does imply a plan to quantify the population of students who may require assessments in languages other than English in partnership with LEAs. However, the response does not appear to specifically address English learners who are Native Americans. |
| *Strengths* | Nevada provided information on major non-English languages spoken by students, including those representing less than 1% of non-English-speaking students.

Nevada provides clear data that, statewide, Spanish represents the native language of a significant percentage of EL students. |
| *Weaknesses* | It is not clear from the information if an LEA-level analysis was done to determine if any district has specific needs above and beyond the state level.

Response does not address grades 9-12. Native American population is not addressed.

Nevada does not provide data on whether any of the native languages with less predominance statewide, represent a significant proportion of students in an individual LEA or grade span. |
| *Did the SEA meet all requirements?* | ☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers)
☒ No (4 peer reviewers) |
| *If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement* | Nevada needs to provide a definition of languages other than English that are present to a significant extent, including the specific languages that meet that definition, and include at least the most populous language other than English spoken by the State's participating student population.

Nevada also needs to include answers to all of the other peer review criteria for this section. |

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	Nevada states its required assessments are administered in English and provides details on the Smarter Balanced Assessments (grades 3-8) in ELA and mathematics. However, it is unclear whether the same statement and similar accommodations are applied to high school end-of-course assessments. This is not applicable because the tests are not administered in any language other than English.
Strengths	Nevada provided information on Smarter Balanced Assessments in ELA and Math for grades 3-8, and accessibility features available for use by students. SBA supports accessibility features – glossary and side by side bilingual version Nevada outlines accommodations available to students in grades 3-8, including stacked Spanish translations, translated test directions in 19 languages, side-by-side bilingual test version, and glossaries provided in 10 languages.
Weaknesses	The information provided does not indicate whether the glossaries or translated test directions include any of the non-English languages present in the state, other than Spanish, and whether the side-by-side bilingual test version for Smarter Balanced Assessments is in Spanish. Nevada does not provide information on high school assessments.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
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	The documentation provides sufficient information that addresses this requirement, indicating the state does not have sufficient numbers of students who need a test (or accommodations) other than Spanish. Nevada identifies Spanish as the predominant language after English Nevada is claiming that this section is not applicable although it identified Spanish as a language present to a significant extent.
Strengths	Nevada provides data on the extent to which additional languages are present in the state and commits to meeting with stakeholders and LEA representatives to define languages other than English that are present to a significant extent and then make further decisions about efforts to develop assessments.
Weaknesses	Nevada is claiming that this section is not applicable although it identified Spanish as a language present to a significant extent.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (3 peer reviewers) ☒ No (1 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada should clarify why this requirement is not applicable.

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	The documentation provides a brief description of a plan and process to determine if assessments are required in languages other than English. The process to gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English is 'to be determined' based on additional analysis. Nevada does not appear to provide the barriers to develop assessments in languages other than English. Nevada references waiting until it has "administered consecutive years of successful testing under our new assessment system" but does not provide a timeline of when that will be and then claims that other work will be conducted but no timeline is provided.
Strengths	Nevada intends to study the effect of its new assessments on EL students and engage with stakeholders before making decisions on additional assessments or changes to existing assessments.
Weaknesses	The information provided does not include specific dates (month/year) when an examination of need for non-English assessments will be done, just a vague statement ("After…consecutive year,"). There are no specific stakeholders denoted that will participate in any meetings to determine if additional non-English assessments are needed. No description of process or timeline is provided.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada needs to submit a detailed timeline of when an examination of need for non-English assessments will be done. The plan should address how the state will: 1) gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English; 2) collect and respond to public comment; and 3) consult with educators, parents and families of English learners, students, as appropriate, and other stakeholders Nevada should define "consecutive years" and "successful testing."

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	Nevada lists each major racial & ethnic group to include in its accountability system: American Indian/Native American, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Pacific Islander, Two or More races, White/Caucasian (page 30).
	Note that these subgroups are not all included in the state's proposed long-term goals for grades 3-5 on page 11, rather 5 race/ethnicity classifications are proposed.
Strengths	All major racial and ethnic groups are noted in the plan on pages 30-31.
	Nevada provides the required information and defines all seven race/ethnicity classifications as major.
Weaknesses	It is not clear if Asian and Pacific Islander are two separate groups or are considered as one group, as they are on separate lines in the documentation
	Nevada should be consistent with terminology (i.e. Students with disabilities versus special education)
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (3 peer reviewers) ☒ No (1 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada needs to rectify discrepancies on the numbers of subgroups.

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	No additional groups noted.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
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	Nevada selected the second option, therefore this section is non-applicable.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	

Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
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	Nevada proposes an N-size of 10, consistent with the state's prior practice. However, Nevada also states it will require an N-size of 25 for school classifications for targeted and comprehensive support and improvement.
Strengths	Nevada will apply the same N-size to all student groups. Good to acknowledge greater confidence needed (i.e. – higher N-size) in determinations for CSI and TSI
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
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	Although the plan did not include information on statistical analyses undertaken to determine validity and soundness of the minimum N-size, the rationale provided is reasonable, and consistent with minimum N-sizes in educational research to ensure identity protection. Nevada does articulate that the SEA's experience and stakeholder input supported the larger n-size for accountability determinations. Nevada states that a statistical analysis of school ratings will need to be conducted to determine the conditions under which a rating would be statistically unreliable.
Strengths	Nevada notes that the minimum N-size is increased for high stakes decisions based on assessment results. Nevada's N-size reflects input from stakeholders. Appendix D includes an ESSA Advisory Group decision to convene a technical advisory group to review using an N-size of 10 for all accountability determinations, which suggest this work is ongoing.
Weaknesses	Nevada's plan does not include data on the statistical benefit of a larger N-size of 25 for accountability determinations which outweighs the exclusion of some students from accountability determinations.

---

[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.

	Stakeholders provided diverse input and it is unclear why Nevada made its final decision.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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	Although the plan did not include information on statistical analyses undertaken to determine validity and soundness of the minimum N-size, the rationale provided is reasonable, and consistent with minimum N-sizes in educational research to ensure identity protection. Number was chosen at the time of submission of ESEA waiver. Nevada states that stakeholder input contributed to the selection of the N-size. Page 19 states that more than thirty participants were part of the accountability work group, with teachers, school leaders, parents/family members assigned to each the workgroup. Appendix D states the recommendation to use an N-size of 10 for all accountability determinations was discussed at the ESSA advisory group and a decision made to convene a technical advisory group to review (page 73).
Strengths	Nevada's stakeholders provided feedback and input into the selection of the minimum N-size.
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
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	Nevada states that cell sizes fewer than 10 are suppressed to protect students from being identified. However, Nevada does not articulate suppression procedures (e.g., whether totals are also suppressed, if complementary suppression is used, etc.) While it can be assumed that Nevada has developed standardized procedures given the previous use of a reporting size of 10, those procedures are not included.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	Nevada does not articulate suppression procedures (e.g., whether totals are also suppressed, if complementary suppression is used, etc.)
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

---

[3] See footnote 5 above for further guidance.

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	Same for accountability and reporting except for identification of schools for CSI and TSI where the N=25.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
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	Nevada provides a detailed explanation on the guidelines used by the state to set long-term academic achievement goals. The resulting goals for each grade and subgroup in ELA and Math are ambitious and, if achieved, would enable Nevada to have rapidly improving student achievement across grades and in all subgroups. The tables provided in the plan include baseline results for all students and each subgroup, and the 2022 target. Emphasis on making Nevada fastest growing state in the nation. There is a disconnect between the list of major race/ethnicity groups for accountability determinations and the race/ethnicity categories for grades 3-5. In the table on page 11, some of the data included were surprising, and Nevada may want to check the table to make sure everything included is correct. Nevada's long-term goals for 2022 are based on an annual 5% reduction in non-proficient students for all subgroups. Nevada states that based on research, this trajectory puts Nevada on track to become the fastest-improving state in the nation. (Unclear whether the research reflects all states or Smarter Balanced states per Appendix A.) The state does not provide information about whether an annual 5% reduction in non-proficient students is ambitious based on historical assessment results. Nevada's plan will require faster rates of growth for lower-achieving student groups and does set a goal of 2022 for all student groups. Nevada lists 10 subgroups on page 31 but on page 11 for "Academic Achievement – Grades 3-5" only lists 8 subgroups (not counting the "all students" group). The same occurs on page 14 with the "4-year graduation rate" long term goals.
Strengths	To move from at or near the bottom to the fastest growing is very ambitious. Nevada's long-term goals for 2022 aim for lower achieving subgroups to improve at greater rates and all subgroups to achieve the same, high proficiency rate by 2030. Nevada set a long-term goal of 2022, and after the six-year time horizon, the state will re-establish the baseline and re-evaluate goals.
Weaknesses	Families were not listed as one of the stakeholder groups in the narrative. Long-term goals are not applied to the same, consistent group of race/ethnicity categories

	Calculations on page 11 need to be reviewed for accuracy of the 5% annual reduction in non-proficient students.
	Missing goals for the sections listed above
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada must provide data for the missing subgroups Nevada must confirm that the data provided on page 11 are accurate.

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	Nevada (in Appendix A) indicates specific measurements of interim progress for all students, but not for subgroups of students. The plan indicates that the long-term goals are based on an annual reduction of non-proficiency of 5%, as measured by the State assessments. Nevada gives a verbal description on the interim progress process which it states is annual (p.11) but then only reports a baseline and the end of 2022 for long term goals. Appendix A (p.69) also lists interim progress numbers that do not match those listed on p. 11.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	Interim goals for grades 3-8 appear not to be disaggregated by subgroup or grade-span consistent with long-term goals. Interim goals for high school appear to be based on the ACT composite score or missing, while long-term goals are based on ELA and math end-of-course assessments. "Measurements" in title is spelled incorrectly too.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)

If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada should review the alignment of interim measures of progress (in Appendix A) to proposed long-term goals.

Nevada must supply the actual interim goals for all required grade spans and the assessments used in the tables along with including all of the subgroups and should have numbers consistent on pages 11 and 69. |

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	Meets requirement for long-term goals, but does not meet for interim goals.

Long-term goals specify greater rates of improvement for lower achieving groups of students. For example, in middle school, the white-Hispanic gap would decrease from 24.7 in ELA to 18.1 in 2022 requiring greater increases in the percent of Hispanic students achieving proficiency compared to their white peers.

Interim goals appear to be set across grade-bands and subgroups. Therefore, it would be possible to meet an overall interim goal target if over-performance of some groups at some grade spans compensated for under-performance of other groups at other grade spans. |
| *Strengths* | Nevada's long-term goals require greater improvement for lower-performing groups of students. |
| *Weaknesses* | Narrative does not contain information to indicate how goals will be reached.

Nevada's interim goals appear to not align with the state's proposed long-term goals

A reviewer could not confirm the accuracy of the calculations computed by Nevada given the baseline and long-term goals of 2022 listed on page 11. The omission of goals for some of the subgroups is problematic too. |
| *Did the SEA meet all requirements?* | ☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers)
☒ No (4 peer reviewers) |
| *If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an* | Nevada must confirm the calculations for the data provided and include the annual interim progress values. |

SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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	Nevada provides the long term (2022) graduation rate goals for all students and for each subgroup of students, with baseline (2016 or 2015) data provided. The long-term goals for all students and for each subgroup of students are ambitious; with lower-performing subgroups needing a higher rate of change than high-performing groups. Timeline in the narrative is not consistent. Nevada's table for 4-year graduation rate long-term goals appears to be missing a long-term goal for white students and students of two-or-more races. Nevada aims to increase its overall graduation rate for all students by 10.4 percentage points in 6 years. Over the period from 2010-11 to 2015-16, the graduation rate rose by 11.5 percentage points (to 73.55%). Given that improvement can be more difficult to achieve the closer a state gets to 100%, the intended long-term goals seem reasonable. Nevada is missing two subgroups on page 14 for graduation rates.
Strengths	The goals are very ambitious for some historically underserved subgroups. Nevada's long-term goals for graduation rates adhere to the same principles as the long-term goals for ELA and mathematics

Weaknesses	4-year chart is incomplete. Narrative proposes a six-year time horizon, however, narrative indicates that the long-term goal for Nevada is 5 years. Nevada appears to be missing long-term goals for two race/ethnicity groups.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada must provide missing data on page 14 for graduation rates.

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	Nevada provides the long term (2022) graduation rate goals for all students and for each subgroup of students, with baseline (2016 or 2015) data provided. The long-term goals for all students and for each subgroup of students are ambitious, with lower-performing subgroups needing a higher rate of change than high-performing groups. The long-term goals for the extended graduation rates are more rigorous than for the four-year graduation rate, being about 2% higher for each group/subgroup. On page 14, Nevada makes reference to the fact that the 5-year graduation rate reported is for the 2014 cohort while the 4-year graduation rate is for the 2016 cohort. However, the chart for the 5-year rate is based on the 2015 cohort. This also matches the data on page 69 which also reflects the Class of 2015 rates.

Strengths	Nevada provided sufficient baseline data and complete information on long-term goals.
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (3 peer reviewers) ☒ No (1 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Five-year cohort rate needs to be more rigorous than the four-year cohort rate for the two missing subgroups. Nevada should confirm the cohort used. There is a discrepancy between the text and the table on page 14.

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	Nevada documents in Appendix A the specific measurements of interim progress for all students, but not for subgroups of students. No graduation rate information has been included for subgroups. Page 13 states Nevada will set measures of interim progress, implying they are not yet set. Appendix A outlines interim goals that do not vary by subgroup, but are consistent with the all students long-term goal for both the 4-year and 5-year graduation rate. Nevada does not show the annual interim progress goals for either the 4- or 5-year graduation rates.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	Interim goals are not specified by subgroup consistent with long-term goals.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or	Nevada must submit the interim progress goals by both subgroup and year.

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	Nevada provides the long term (2022) graduation rate goals for all students and for each subgroup of students, with baseline (2016 or 2015) data provided. The long-term goals for all students and for each subgroup of students are ambitious, with lower-performing subgroups needing a higher rate of change than high-performing groups. The narrative indicates that gaps between subgroups will have closed by 2022. Long-term goals will require greater rates of improvement for student groups with lower baseline graduation rates.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	Nevada states on page 13 that the long-term goals will be 5 years when it should be 6 years. Nevada also states on page 13 that it "followed the same process described above in the Academic Achievement section above" to set the long-term goals for graduation rates. The long-term goals will be based on a 5% annual reduction in non-proficiency for all subgroups. For graduation rates, substitute "non-graduates within 4-years" for "non-proficient."
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada must provide interim goals for each subgroup of students, Nevada must correct the number of years from five years to six years on page 13 and review for consistency throughout the document.

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	Nevada provides substantial information on how the State uses initial English language proficiency in establishing a timeline for English language acquisition. The baseline year (2016) performance (percent reaching English proficiency on the WIDA within the expected time) is provided, along with ambitious yearly goals toward the 2022 target goal. To move from 24.9% in 2016 to 90% in 2022 is very ambitious. Nevada's long-term goal is that 90% of EL students will exit within 6 years of initial identification and that 90% of long-term EL students will exit by 2022. The interim progress goals are listed (page 17)
Strengths	Nevada has an ambitious long-term goal of 90% by 2022 with a baseline of 24.9%.
Weaknesses	The assumption that the rate can improve from the current state of 24.9% to 90% seems overly ambitious without specific interventions to demonstrate how the goals can be achieved. Clarification that the baseline data are based on a six-year cohort.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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	Nevada provides a chart detailing the yearly interim progress required in achieving English language proficiency, as measured by the WIDA.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	The narrative does not indicate that families were included in the conversations around goal setting of the 6 year target. Such an ambitious goal will require the assistance of families in the home setting.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
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	Academic Achievement: For each school level (i.e., ES, MS, HS), the Academic Achievement Indicator is consistent across all LEAs in the state, and can be disaggregated for each student subgroup. The number of proficient students on statewide ELA, Math, and Science tests at a level are combined to contribute 25% to the total index score for the SEA and LEAs, with test participation of at least 95% expected on each test. Academic Progress: For each school level (i.e., ES, MS), the Academic Progress Indicator is consistent across all LEAs in the state, and can be disaggregated for each student subgroup. The results of statewide ELA and Math tests at a level are combined to contribute 35% to the total ES and MS index score for the SEA and LEAs. Nevada proposes to use proficiency rates on the Smarter Balanced assessments in ELA and Mathematics, Science CRT, and end-of-course exams. ELA and math exams align with intended long-term goals. Nevada states that points earned will contribute 25% to the total index score but does not articulate the relative weight of ELA to math or science. Nevada specifies that the number of proficient student is divided by the number of students tested (but not the greater of the number of students tested vs. 95% of enrollment). Nevada's response regarding uniform averaging appears to be inconsistent – stating on page 32 it will not average data but on page 36 Nevada outlines procedures for pooled averaging for schools with small student populations. Participation rates are averaged across 2 and 3 years if the school does not meet the 95% participation requirement. On page 27, Nevada states low test participation will result in a reduction in a star rating.
Strengths	The Academic Progress growth model is similar to ones used in a number of other states, and has a history of adequate validity and reliability. This is a model that schools and LEAs are familiar with and can continue toward improvement. Nevada includes academic achievement measures in ELA, math and science.
Weaknesses	The plan does not document that the ELA, Math, and Science End-of-Course exams and CRTs have valid and reliable statistical properties, but merely states they are subject to peer review. The plan does not indicate how the separate results from ELA, Math, and Science are combined to comprise 25% of the index score for Academic

	Achievement. The plan does not indicate how the separate results from ELA and Math are combined to comprise 35% of the index score for Academic Progress. Nevada does not outline the relative weighting of indicators within the academic achievement category (e.g., are points equally apportioned across all 3 subjects?)
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada should remove science as an indicator from the academic achievement section and include it as a separate indicator in the model. Nevada also needs to specify the relative weights of reading and math. Nevada should clarify whether the number of proficient students is divided by the greater of (1) the number of students tested or (2) 95% of enrollment. Nevada should resolve the contradictions regarding averaging on pages 32 and 36.

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	Nevada provides specific information for the Other Indicator measures at each level (i.e., ES, MS, HS). For each indicator, it is applied for all students and each subgroup, subject to minimum Ns, and each indicator is sufficiently

	specific and applicable for the school level to provide meaningful differentiation between schools and LEAs. Nevada does not provide the relative weighting of AGP and SGP. Nevada's growth model has been in place for several years (designed in response to the 2009 state legislation) suggesting the state has policies/procedures for attributing growth for students who move between schools. On page 32, Nevada states that it "will not average data as part of the accountability system. When the state accumulates enough historical data, NDE may revisit this decision." On page 36, under "F. Data Procedures," Nevada describes rating some schools using "pooled averaging."
Strengths	Nevada provides a detailed description of how Academic Progress/Growth is calculated. Academic Learning plans are required for all middle school students. Nevada proposes to use two measures of growth for grades 4-8 in ELA and mathematics – one normative measure relative to other students and a criterion-referenced measure of whether the student is on track to reach proficiency in 3 years or by eighth grade.
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada should specify the relative weighting of AGP and SGP. Nevada should resolve the contradictions regarding averaging on pages 32 and 36.

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	The information provided in the plan on Graduation Rate generally provides sufficient information on a valid and reliable method for calculating cohort graduation rates, applicable to all LEAs, and able to be disaggregated for student subgroups. The calculation includes data for students assessed using the alternative assessment aligned to alternate academic achievement standards and awarded a State-defined alternative diploma. Nevada proposes 4-year and 5-year graduation rates but does not specify the relative weights. Nevada proposes to adjust the cohort to include students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards who are awarded a state-defined alternative diploma. Nevada's response on pooled averaging suggests the state allows for averaging over 3 years for very small schools.
Strengths	Goals for 5-year rates are greater than goals for the 4-year rates.
Weaknesses	Nevada does not describe how the Graduation Rate calculation is included in the Total Index Score for high schools (i.e., what percent does it determine); neither does it describe how the 4-year rate is combined with the 5-year rate to determine a graduation rate indicator.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada should provide the relative weights of the 4-year versus 5-year rates.

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	Nevada will use the adequate growth percentile (AGP) on the WIDA ACCESS with a growth to target calculation set to five years or by the twelfth grade.
Strengths	Progress in achieving English language proficiency uses a methodology analogous to the Academic Growth indicator, using student growth percentiles (SGP) and adequate growth percentiles (AGP). These are computed for students with two years of WIDA performance, at all three school levels, for all LEAs.
Weaknesses	Nevada states the measure is valid and reliable, but provides no statistical or research support for the assertion. The documentation does not specify how SGP and AGP scores are combined to create a score that is used as 10% of the overall Total Index score.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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 – Closing Opportunity Gaps
Peer Analysis	Nevada provides a description for ES and MS School Quality. The SEA calculates Closing Opportunity Gaps overall, for each LEA and school, and for each subgroup and special population. This indicator is the percentage of students who did not score at least proficient but who did meet the Adequate Growth Percentile, calculated for ELA and Math in grades 4-8. In high school, Nevada will compare the 4-year graduation rate to the prior year by subgroup.
Strengths	Indicators will be disaggregated by all subgroups to highlight subgroups in need of academic intervention. Nevada proposes a breadth of indicators focused on measuring achievement and opportunity gaps as well as critical engagement and school quality measures.
Weaknesses	Nevada should clarify how the indicator will be disaggregated by subgroup given that it requires a comparison by subgroups. E.g. - the Hispanic population, will the gap be Hispanic-black, Hispanic-white, etc.? Nevada does not provide information on how Closing Opportunity Gaps scores from separate ELA and Math analyses are combined to create one indicator that is used for 20% of the Total Index Score for ES and MS. At the HS level, additional explanation is needed regarding how points are calculated what percent of the Total Index Score is determined at the HS level through these analyses. In addition, a more complete explanation is needed on how results are used to apply conjunctive triggers against points earned when subgroups do not meet graduation targets.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the	Nevada should clarify what it means by "conjunctive triggers" and "points earned in the Graduation Indicator will

specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	be conditioned on the subgroup graduation rates." Nevada should clarify how the indicator will be disaggregated by subgroup given that it requires a comparison by subgroups.

	Peer Response – Student Engagement (Chronic Absenteeism and School Climate)-Elementary
Peer Analysis	Chronic absenteeism: Nevada may benefit from articulating procedures on how absence is defined to support consistency across schools and procedures for highly mobile students who may attend several schools in a year and cumulatively meet the 18-day absence threshold, but not at any individual school. School Climate: On page 51 Nevada explains the NDE is collaborating with AIR to design and administer a statewide school climate/social-emotional learning survey for all students in grades 5-12. However, Nevada does not appear to articulate how the survey will be used to measure outcomes (average score, participation, criterion-referenced threshold). It is unclear whether the measure can be disaggregated reliably by subgroup at the school level. Nevada mentions the inclusion of school climate in only the middle school student engagement indicator and not in high school.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	No description of disaggregation by subgroup. No timeline for when the school climate survey will become available and entered in the model. No description of the relative weighting.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada should provide specific details regarding disaggregation by subgroup, relative weighting, how the indicator applies to grade levels given that the school climate survey is only grades 5-12, and when the school climate survey will become available. Nevada should provide information on how School Climate will allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance.
	Peer Response – Student Engagement (Chronic Absenteeism, School Climate, High School Readiness & Academic Learning Plans)-Middle
Peer Analysis	Chronic absenteeism: Nevada may benefit from articulating procedures on how absence is defined to support consistency across schools and procedures for highly mobile students who may attend several schools in a year and cumulatively meet the 18-day absence threshold, but not at any individual school.

	School Climate: On page 51 Nevada explains the NDE is collaborating with AIR to design and administer a statewide school climate/social-emotional learning survey for all students in grades 5-12. However, Nevada does not appear to articulate how the survey will be used to measure outcomes (average score, participation, criterion-referenced threshold). It is unclear whether the measure can be disaggregated reliably by subgroup at the school level. Nevada mentions the inclusion of school climate in only the middle school student engagement indicator and not in high school. High School Readiness: Number of grade 8 students meeting credit requirement in ELA, Math, science, and social studies and receive a passing grade. Nevada does not provide data on whether there is meaningful differentiation among schools meeting the requirement, but the indicator's inclusion suggests variability. Given its inclusion in the accountability system, Nevada may wish to also consider evaluating grade inflation as the plan is rolled out. Academic Learning Plans: Nevada mentions that academic learning plans are required for middle school students suggesting limited differentiation among schools. However, Nevada appears to be calculating a rate of student signed plans divided by the number of students enrolled in the school. Nevada may consider outlining how the denominator would be calculated for a combined elementary and middle school (e.g., 4-8). Nevada also includes this as an indicator for high schools. Nevada may consider setting a higher threshold or target for high schools. Given the various middle school grade configurations possible, Nevada may benefit from outlining how the relative weights of middle school indicators will be assigned (e.g., 6-7 school without a grade 8 for high school readiness).
Strengths	
Weaknesses	It is unlikely that there will be meaningful differentiation among schools given that academic learning plans are a requirement for all students in middle school. Nevada's plan lacks specificity in the relative weight of measures within this category and how measures would apply to schools with grade configurations spanning middle and high school.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada should provide information on how School Climate will allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance along with specific details regarding the high school readiness measure and the current percentage of students with academic learning plans. Nevada should clearly define "middle school" (grade level specification).

	Peer Response – College and Career Readiness & Student Engagement (chronic absenteeism)-High School
Peer Analysis	Average ACT Composite Score: Nevada's interim goals outline targets for composite scores. Nevada's opening letter mentions that the ACT is administered statewide. Post-Secondary Pathway Options: Nevada details an impressive increase in AP course enrollment of 4% and aims to have CTE enrollment increase by 9,000 (see page 51). Nevada's plan would benefit from information about access to AP, IB, Dual Enrollment, CTE for all schools, especially those in rural or isolated areas. Nevada also notes that there are 'bonus points' for college- or career-endorsed diplomas, receiving 1.25 points compared to 1.0 for standard diplomas. Ninth and Tenth Grade Credit sufficiency: Reviewers were unable to locate additional details on this. Percentage of students Achieving CCR status on math, science or ELA end-of-course exams: Nevada's plan would benefit from a clear articulation of how the CCR threshold is the same as, or different from, the proficiency threshold for academic achievement. Chronic absenteeism: Nevada may benefit from articulating procedures on how absence is defined to support consistency across schools and procedures for highly mobile students who may attend several schools in a year and cumulatively meet the 18-day absence threshold, but not at any individual school. Academic Learning Plans: Nevada mentions that academic learning plans are required for middle school students suggesting limited differentiation among schools. However, Nevada appears to be calculating a rate of student signed plans divided by the number of students enrolled in the school. Nevada may consider outlining how the denominator would be calculated for a combined elementary and middle school (e.g., 4-8). Nevada also includes this as an indicator for high schools. Nevada may consider setting a higher threshold or target for high schools.
Strengths	Extra weight for college-endorsed or career-endorsed diplomas. Nevada has seen a remarkable 4% increase in AP course enrollment.
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to	Nevada should provide the required information for all proposed indicators as stated in the peer review criteria. Nevada should supply information on how all indicators will be combined.

fully meet this requirement	

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	Nevada provides substantial evidence that the State has developed a system (the NSPF) that meaningfully differentiates all public schools (including charters) on an annual basis. The NSPF includes all of the academic achievement indicators, along with growth indicators, for all students and each student subgroup to determine a summative rating of 1-5 stars.
Strengths	Nevada describes the process used to calculate the NSPF if schools do not have an ELPA measure (which constitutes 10% of the total index calculation). Nevada has experience using a process of 1-5 star rating system. Nevada is engaging stakeholders in setting performance level descriptors for meaningful differentiation among schools. Nevada intends to use pooled averaging to include small schools where possible.
Weaknesses	Clear performance level descriptors have not yet been established. Narrative does not indicate who is involved in the discussion.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Because of the lack of specificity in earlier sections, Nevada must provide evidence that the 5-star rating system will result in meaningful differentiation.

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	The academic achievement, ELPA progress, graduation, and other academic indicators (growth) constitute the majority of the Index weight, with the school quality indicator accounting for only 10% of the total at each level (ES, MS, HS). The academic achievement, ELPA progress, graduation, and growth indicators each receive substantial weight (from 10%-35%) at each school level.
Strengths	Nevada describes the process used to calculate the NSPF if schools do not have an ELPA measure (which constitutes 10% of the total index calculation).
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada should provide the specific weights for each individual indicator, for example, what is the exact percentage for math, ELA, graduation rates, etc.

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	Nevada provides a description of the procedure used to generate an index score and rating for schools without a sufficiently large student population to be reliably rated. For these schools, three years of data are combined, which is an acceptable method to create a sufficient N-size for analysis. Also, for P-2 schools, the plan provides a description of a process to assess and assign ratings. Overall, the information in the plan provides a description of all the types of schools that may not have sufficient students to calculate a traditional NSPF rating, including schools serving special populations and newly opened schools. [Note on page 37 that the Roman numerals are not correct.] Nevada's plan articulates that P-2 schools in which no grade level is assessed would not be rated under the accountability system. However, Nevada also states that these schools would be required to be assessed under the "Read by Grade 3" legislation using a Nevada State Board approved assessment, allowing results to be reported but insufficient data for a comparable rating. Nevada should consider reviewing other state strategies for including P-2 schools in the accountability system including attributing grade 3 scores back to feeder schools and alternative metrics to include P-2 schools in the accountability system.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	Nevada will not rate schools designed to exclusively serve special populations (page 37), removing schools serving vulnerable students from the accountability system. The state should consider alternatives to include such schools and ensure the students they serve receive the interventions and supports that are needed. Nevada's system of meaningful differentiation is not yet complete or fully articulated in the plan.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada must provide information on how it will provide a designation for all schools.

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	Nevada describes a process for identifying schools that will receive comprehensive support and improvement, which includes the lowest 5% of ES and MS, all 1-star schools, and downward trending 2-star schools. This process should identify at least 5% of all ES/MS. This process will be used to identify schools for the 2017-18 school year, and will be used each year to identify new schools for a three-year improvement process. Nevada does not clearly include high schools in the lowest 5% analysis, noting that high schools with graduation rates below 67% will be identified for CSI. Nevada does not provide a justification for the exclusion of high schools.
Strengths	Nevada intends to identify all 1-star schools and downward trending 2-star schools for CSI.
Weaknesses	It is not clear how schools have been identified for the 2016-17 school year, or if the methodology identifies not less than the lowest performing 5% of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds or the lowest performing 5% of all schools (some of which may not be receiving Title I, Part A funding). It is not clear if the rank-ordering of schools for the process includes all schools or just those receiving Title I, Part A funds. Identification starts in the 2017-18 school year, however it is unclear how "downward trending" 2 star schools will be identified as showing a "downward trend". Nevada appears to not include high schools in determining the lowest 5% of Title I schools.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this	Nevada should clarify that all Title I schools are reviewed to determine the lowest-performing 5%.

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	Starting with the 2017-18 school year, schools will be identified for CSI. Nevada states that schools with 4-year graduation rates below 67% will be identified for CSI.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	Nevada outlines a process to identify all high schools with a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate below 67% to receive Comprehensive Support and Improvement services. The documentation states that NDE will use the NSPF to identify CSI schools, and the NSPF graduation rate calculation includes a five-year cohort. The identification process begins with the 2017-18 school year, and should identify all schools failing to graduate one-third or more of their students.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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	Nevada provides information that the state will identify schools for CSI that have not satisfied the exit criteria for Targeted Support and Improvement based on chronically low-performing subgroups after implementing a 3-year plan. TSI schools will be identified no later than 2018-19, with a three-year implementation plan ending in 2021-22, earliest identification for CSI identification would be 2022-23.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	Nevada's plan does not specify the improvement required of a TSI school that would prevent identification for CSI after a 3-year period.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada should clearly articulate what improvement would prevent a school from being identified as CSI and how this relates to the exit criteria for TSI.

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	Nevada states that identification will be a yearly process, and schools identified each year will be part of a cohort for three years.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
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	Nevada presents a description of the methodology used to identify schools for Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI). The process uses those NSPF indicators that focus on interim progress for ELA and Math, and schools with subgroups who failed to reduce the number of non-proficient students by 10% over the previous year. The process does not include all the indicators comprising the NSPF, excluding English-language proficiency students and school climate indicators. Consistently is defined as two consecutive years. Nevada also clarifies the same subgroup must be identified in the same content area for two consecutive years.

	There is ambiguity in the text regarding how academic achievement, academic progress, and school quality and student success indicators factor into TSI identification. Nevada states that all indicators will be included in the star rating but some descriptions for TSI identification reference only ELA and mathematics interim goals. Clarification regarding the indicators used for identification would bring greater coherence and consistency to the plan.
	Nevada's criteria for identification include schools failing to meet interim measures of progress or failing to reduce the number of non-proficient students by 10%. Clarification of the text would help to clearly illustrate how Nevada's operational plan aligns with state-defined goals.
Strengths	Schools are identified annually.
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada should revise its methodology to identify schools for TSI so that it includes all indicators in the statewide system, i.e. ELP and school climate.

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	Nevada proposes to rank order schools by proficiency rates for each CSI school in ELA and mathematics to identify the lowest proficiency rates in each content area. These rates will be the cut points used to identify TSI-Additional Support schools. This would not meet the requirement to use all indicators.
Strengths	

Weaknesses	Nevada appears to be using one metric for CSI identification (index scores) and another (percent proficient) for TSI-additional support.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada should revise its plan to ensure identification of schools for TSI additional support is based upon analysis of all schools in the state and using all indicators and clarify the year or years of data used to identify schools "no later (than the) 2018-19 school year."

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	Not applicable
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
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	Nevada provides a description of the state's participation rate penalties for schools. Nevada has established three levels of penalties for schools missing the 95% participation requirement – Warning, Penalty, and Continuing Penalty (page 35) based on the number of consecutive years the school has missed the 95% participation requirement. Schools receiving the Continuing Penalty designation (3 consecutive years of missing the 95% requirement) will earn zero points for the Student Proficiency indicator.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	It is unclear in the narrative at what point the school engages in an improvement plan.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada should define "a significant number of points" and the indicator to which it applies (academic indicator?) and clarify what is meant by a "significant number of schools" on page 36.

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	Nevada denotes the process used for schools to exit CSI status, which is based on their scores on the NSPF. Schools (ES and MS) must achieve a 3-star rating to exit, but it is not clear if this is a one-time or multi-year requirement.

	High schools must have a 67% or higher graduation rate for two consecutive years, and a 3-star rating to exit CSI status. The plan indicates that schools are identified as part of a 3-year cohort, but it is not clear if that means the intent is for schools to exit CSI status within three years. Since the exit requirements are based on the NSPF scores, the exit criteria ensure improved student outcomes (for both academic achievement and academic success/growth). Without a justification or explanation of sustained improvement, it is difficult to determine whether exit criteria ensure that the school no longer meets the criteria under which the school was identified.
Strengths	Nevada's requirement that schools receive a 3-star rating to exit CSI.
Weaknesses	Narrative does not indicate the time frame in which schools are expected to exit. Nevada's plan lacks clarity on whether 'sustained improvement' represents a separate exit pathway for schools and a definition of sustained improvement.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada should define "sustained improvement" and whether it represents a separate exit pathway for schools in addition to receiving three stars. Nevada should clarify if a high school must have a 3-star rating for two consecutive years in addition to a graduation rate above 67% in order to 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	Nevada describes uniform exit criteria for schools receiving TSI. It is the expectation that this exit will occur after implementing an improvement plan over three years. The exit process requires interim progress for the identified subgroup by 10% for two consecutive years or reduction in the percent non-proficient in that subgroup for two

	consecutive years. Thus, the exit criteria ensure continued progress in academic achievement and school success for the identified subgroup of students.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	It is not clear from the narrative if students that move in and out of the school are included as part of the subgroup and affect the progress measure.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (3 peer reviewers) ☒ No (1 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada should provide exit criteria that align with a revised system of TSI additional support identification that meets requirements.

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	Nevada provides a brief description of the Nevada Achievement School District (NV ASD). The NV ASD accepts up to six schools each year for transformation, which is an intensive, collaborative effort of transforming schools to achieve successful outcomes for students. The plan also notes that schools can enter into a voluntary performance contract agreement with the SEA, and receive priority for state and federal school improvement funds. Nevada's plan would be strengthened by adding information about how long the NV ASD has been in place and any preliminary positive results from participating schools. The design and resources provided to schools are impressive. Additionally, Nevada's plan would benefit from any other examples of more rigorous interventions for CSI schools that fail to exit.
Strengths	Nevada describes inclusion in the Nevada Achievement School District as a possible more rigorous intervention.
Weaknesses	Nevada's plan does not specify if there are other actions the state will take for CSI schools that fail to exit, or

	whether all CSI schools that fail to exit will be added to the NV ASD (e.g., will there be CSI schools that fail to exit where more rigorous interventions are not applied?)
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada should clarify whether all CSI schools that fail to exit will be subject to more rigorous interventions and whether there are state interventions in addition to inclusion in the NV ASD. For example, whether Nevada's alternative governance models referenced in the differentiated support approach (Empowerment, Compact School, Reinvent School) would also be considered.

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	Nevada briefly describes a process to annually collect data on teachers, and discuss the results of this data collection effort with LEA staff during annual planning sessions. Nevada has a relatively small number of school districts, allowing the state to conduct an annual SEA consultation during the LEA needs assessment & planning process. Nevada makes a commitment that any inequities will be discussed and strategies to remove those inequities will be implemented.
Strengths	Nevada references existing development to track school funding allocations of both federal and state monies, suggesting ongoing statewide work to ensure equitable funding allocations. Nevada includes a broad range of resources for the review – exploring access to high-quality teachers in addition to funding allocations
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to	

fully meet this requirement	

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	Nevada describes a series of actions the SEA will undertake, including determining a list of evidence-based service providers, and coordinating professional development activities. The documentation also describes four tiers of differentiated SEA support to low-performing schools, but the plan includes very little description of specific services and actions within the defined roles and responsibilities for the NDE within each tier (e.g., how much staff time and other resources will be provided to a school in the highest need tier). Nevada's plan includes a commendable and effective strategy to have 4- and 5-star schools serve as mentors to low-performing schools. To the extent Nevada can add information about this strategy, it would be beneficial to share with other states. Nevada's plan would be strengthened by providing research that supports the proposed interventions are proven and effective.
Strengths	Nevada outlines a model of differentiated supports that ensure state capacity is directed to where it can be most effective and focuses on building local capacity.
Weaknesses	Nevada's plan would be strengthened by providing research that supports the proposed interventions are proven and effective.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (3 peer reviewers) ☒ No (1 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada should clarify if the technical assistance, as presented in the plan, is likely to improve student outcomes because there is insufficient information provided related to more specific SEA roles and responsibilities.

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 (0 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
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	Per Appendix B – Nevada Dept. of Ed. does not currently have a system in place to calculate educator equity rates using student level data. Nevada conducted a root cause analysis of equity gaps in 2015 and used the information to build strategies to narrow gaps. Nevada commits to publish annually information disproportionate rates of access to educators on the Nevada state report card.
Strengths	Nevada's response includes long-standing work to explore root causes of equity gaps and continued work to improve data.
Weaknesses	Nevada's response does not include a timeline by which the state will be able to calculate educator equity rates using student-level data.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada must fully implement additional data collection processes on teacher effectiveness, and develop the capacity to calculate educator equity rates using student level data. Nevada should provide a timeline by which the state will be able to calculate educator equity rates using student-level data

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

---

[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.

- ➢ 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	The verbiage in the plan is not specifically aligned to the components. For example, the words "bullying and harassment" are not mentioned in the plan, and the reader must infer that the programs and actions described include programs to reduce incidents of bullying and harassment. Similarly, it must be inferred that diverting students from the discipline process speaks to the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom. Nevada's statewide school climate survey would be a powerful tool to identify successful practices and strategies implemented by LEAs to promote safe and supportive school environments. Nevada may also consider encouraging LEAs to publicly post bullying and harassment policies, address high or disproportionate rates of exclusionary discipline in the LEA annual needs assessment planning process with the SEA, and provide professional learning opportunities for teachers and school leaders on positive behavior interventions and supports or restorative justice programs. Nevada's current plan seems focused on social workers and behavioral health workers, vital to supporting student health and safety, but would be encouraged to also target teachers and other school and district leaders in its efforts (as not all schools may have access to, or be fully staffed, with necessary social and behavioral health workers). Nevada also outlines programs to support placement of social workers in both traditional and charter schools. Nevada mentions the creation of a Safe and Respectful Learning environment initiative to empower schools to grow respectful school climates and 10 counties have published district-wide bullying prevention policies and program.
Strengths	Recognition that additional training is required for school leaders and teachers on positive behavior interventions.
Weaknesses	Nevada has many promising strategies, programs and community resources which are not included in the response, including the statewide school climate survey, which could strengthen the state's response to this requirement.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or	Nevada should expand its description of state programs to conform with the specific requirements of this section.

clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada should reference appropriate community resources in the narrative.

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	Nevada includes an extensive description of multiple strategies the SEA will undertake to support the continuum of a student's education from preschool through grade 12. Multiple strategies are described that address issues in each transition phase: early childhood to elementary school; elementary school to middle school; middle school to high school; and high school to post-secondary. Many of the strategies target the need for effective transitions of students to MS and HS to decrease risk of dropping out (e.g., the MS program Nevada Ready 21, and the ES Read by Grade 3 program).
Strengths	
Weaknesses	In the Scale section data is presented of how many schools/students are engaged. It would be helpful to know the total numbers for comparison
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (3 peer reviewers) ☒ No (1 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada should revise the narrative to address how effective transitions of students are taking place to decrease the risk of students dropping out.

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	The description of the information required for this section (ESEA section 3113(b)(2)) is substantially different between these peer review notes and the plan submitted by the SEA. The plan does not address how the SEA will establish and implement entrance and exit procedures for English learners, with meaningful consultation from LEAs and assurance that local input is applied statewide. Nevada proposed to use the WIDA assessments for entrance and exit procedures. Nevada mentions the WIDA screener will be used for identification but does not appear to include an assurance of assessment within 30 days of enrollment for students who may be EL. On page 16, Nevada states, "NDE assesses every English learner upon enrollment to understand the level of English proficiency." In regard to exit criteria, Nevada will require a minimum score of 5.0 on both the composite & literacy sub-score. (Page 60)
Strengths	Nevada aims to ensure consistency in entrance and exit requirements across federal programs.
Weaknesses	Nevada does not articulate 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.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada should address the requirements for 3113(b)(2), such as the involvement of LEAs in the process and address the 30-day rule.

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	The information provided in the plan to address this section (ESEA section 3113(b)(6)) does not describe how the SEA will assist entities in meeting English proficiency goals, including measurements of interim progress. Neither does the plan describe how the SEA will assist entities in helping ensure that English learners meet challenging State academic standards.
Strengths	
Weaknesses	Nevada's plan does not specify how it will assist eligible entities in helping to ensure that English learners meet challenging State academic standards.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada should clearly articulate how statewide procedures for monitoring and technical assistance will be applied to assisting eligible entities in meeting the State-designed long-term goal for English 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	Nevada includes a brief description of the NDE monitoring system to ensure effective use of all plan-related funds and the quality of plan-related implementation. Four steps are outlined, but not all steps may be utilized, as the plan states that NDE can use one or more steps as needed. The NDE will provide differentiated technical assistance to schools and districts whose strategies funded under Title III, Part A are not effective. A prioritized list of LEAs will

	be created, with selected LEAs and their schools provided with assistance to specifically address overall performance and achievement gaps.
Strengths	SEA cross-departmental teams monitor progress.
Weaknesses	Community engagement is not reflected in the narrative. Families must be engaged in the process in order for students to have the support at home that they require. Nevada's plan lacks details on how the state's overall monitoring & technical assistance strategy will apply to Title III subgrantees.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Nevada must provide details on how the state's overall monitoring & technical assistance strategy will apply to Title III subgrantees.