

Questions and Answer Summary from the English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Peer Review Webinars

Office of School Support and Accountability, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE)
January 30 and 31, 2019

Slide deck from webinar available at:

<https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa/elpstatesubmissionppt.pdf>

Recording of webinar also available at:

<https://meetingconnect.adobeconnect.com/a994396717/pe8sfvcylk2l/?launcher=false&fcsContent=true&pbMode=normal>

1. For Critical element (CE) 3.4 (Validity based on relations to other variables), what kind of evidence would the reviewer expect to see on a State's response?
 - If this State is part of an ELP assessment consortium, we would anticipate that the consortium submission would address CE 3.4.

If this is a State that is not a part of a consortium, we would encourage looking at the exemplars provided in the peer review guide for CE 3.4 as well as consulting the technical advisory committee in your State.
2. We don't have an alternate ELP assessment (AELPA) yet, what would the reviewer expect to see from CE 1.3 on a State's response?
 - We would expect to see a description of the State's plan for developing and implementing an AELPA. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and its implementing regulations require all States to have an AELPA. OESE will include compliance with this requirement as part of its monitoring of States.
3. Critical Element 6.4 (reporting) includes publicly reporting ELP assessment results on ELP and attainment of EL proficiency. What are the exact requirements for public reporting, and where can we find these in statute or regulations?
 - In the Department's [Title III guidance](#), we note that there are three types of reporting relating to ELs:
 - To parents of ELs, through the annual notice, in ESEA section 1112(e)(3).
 - In LEA/SEA report cards: number and percentage of students attaining ELP, progress of students towards the ELP goal, and EL subgroup reporting on academic achievement and grad rate (in ESEA sections 1111(h)(1), (2)).
 - Title III LEAs only: report on all of the Title III elements, to the SEA, and SEA reports to the Department (ESEA section 3121), many of which are included in section H of the Title III guidance.
4. We are a member of a consortium. For CE 3, CE 4, CE 2.1-2.2, CE 6.1-6.3, all CEs are likely addressed by the consortium. If we believe the consortium's response is complete for those CEs, are there any specific CE from above for which we need to add something? Or we only focus on other CEs that are addressed with State-specific evidence?
 - See the peer review guide "Map to the Critical Elements" and supporting text for suggestions regarding State-specific versus consortium-specific evidence requirements. This map is only a guide, however, and may vary by consortium.

5. Is a recording of the webinar available?
 - See https://meetingconnect.adobeconnect.com/_a994396717/pe8sfvcylk2l/?launcher=false&fcsContent=true&pbMode=normal
6. Does slide 31 apply only to a State that is not a member of a consortium? Because for a member of a consortium, CE 3 and CE 4 have been already addressed by the consortium.
 - Slide 31 refers to a list of the critical elements where states have most frequently needed to provide additional evidence. The summary does not distinguish between evidence provided by a consortium or evidence provided by a state.
7. How can I download a copy of the presentation?
 - See <https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa/elpstatesubmissionppt.pdf>
8. What is the timeline for peer review (A) if a State has new standards and (B) when a State administers a new assessment to these new standards?
 - Our general requirement is you are expected to submit about six months after the first full administration of an assessment. [See pages 12-14 of the peer review guide for discussion of this topic.](#)
9. In looking at the [ELP Submission Cover Sheet and Index Template](#), I do not see Critical Element 7 for documenting evidence. Is a State expected to use the Academic Assessment Peer Review Section 7 for documenting this evidence and then combine it with the ELP Index?
 - CEs 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3 are not applicable to ELP peer review, because they are related to locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessments. No evidence is required for ELP assessments that pertain to CE's 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3.
10. If a State creates new standards, is the State required to submit those standards for peer review? The submission is only after the first full administration and standards setting?
 - It is important to distinguish between content standards and achievement standards. To be clear, the Department does not review a State's content standards. If a State changes content standards, then it will need to develop new assessments with new achievement standards that align to those content standards. Once implemented, the Department would conduct a full, new peer review after the first full administration of the new assessment.

Sometimes, a State keeps its content standards, but changes its achievement standards (cut scores). In that case we would need to do a partial peer review. [See pages 12-14 of the peer review guide for discussion of this topic](#) (though that is not relevant in 2019 because no State has had its ELP assessment peer reviewed previously).
11. If the consortium submits a manual, such as the test administration manual, as evidence, that a State uses to address different or additional evidence, should the State refer to the consortium's evidence or resubmit that evidence?
 - If the State uses consortium evidence to address a State-specific critical element, we suggest the State submit that evidence separately and refer the peers to the specific page numbers in that case.

12. We administer an ELP test that is used in a few other States. Does our vendor submit a "centralized" submission of evidence or do we embed it?
 - That is a determination that each State should make with its vendor (and perhaps in discussion with the other States administering the same ELP test). We encourage States to submit as a consortium if possible to streamline our review and ensure consistency in our response across member States for common elements – this could be done through one submission from the vendor (with the States' agreement and acknowledgement to the Department) or by having one State submit on behalf of the consortium (and acknowledgement to the Department that the submission is on behalf of the other States administering that test).
13. What is the most recurrent issue among the States regarding the peer review assessment under ESSA?
 - See slide 31 for the most common issues.
14. Would you say that "5.1 Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities (Alternate)" is one of the most critical for the states to comply?
 - It is certainly very important and one where peer reviewers often flag concerns with States. It is a CE that has many specific sub-criteria.
15. When evidence is uploaded to the max.gov site, is it possible to upload them in folders?
 - No, there is not a way to organize documents in folders. We encourage clear naming conventions so it's easy for peer reviewers to find the right document.
16. There are many examples of evidence in the middle column. Should we collect everything we have, or just one or two really good pieces of evidence? Is the "Examples of Evidence" like a checklist?
 - You should treat the examples as suggestions, not a checklist. We encourage you to be selective and choose the best evidence(s) that meets all the components of the critical element. In our experience, including all possible evidence (i.e., the "kitchen-sink approach") causes confusion by the peers in sifting through the evidence and finding the most relevant and responsive information.
17. Is the AELPA evidence and index also due on March 15, 2019?
 - If the State has administered its AELPA, it should submit its evidence by March 15, 2019. If the State has not yet administered its AELPA, you should in your submission provide an explanation of your anticipated timeline. We'll be reaching out to States about a year from now to confirm your progress developing and administering your AELPA.
18. Is the max.gov system being used for States to submit documentation impacted by the number of users across States uploading at the same time?
 - Max.gov supports over 200,000 users. We do not anticipate that the assessment peer review will impact the performance of the system.
19. Can a State provide website links for evidence?
 - No.
20. Can a State submit video files as evidence?
 - No. Video files typically exceed the 100MB file limitation. Contact the ED department staff if it is critical to upload video files. [See page 17 of the peer review guide for discussion of this topic.](#)

21. Should a State indicate in our template when evidence was submitted by the consortium on behalf of the member state?
 - Yes, in the index, note “Evidence for this critical element submitted by XYZ Consortium on behalf of the State.”
22. We don’t have an alignment study between the State’s ELP standards and the State’s academic content standards yet. We plan to release a request for proposals (RFP) later. What do we need to write in the State’s response? If we need include a plan and timeline, could you explain in detail or give some example?
 - In this situation, a State should supply information relevant to their context. The State might submit a copy of the RFP, for instance, and provide a brief description of the timeline within the index.
23. If in development of AELPA assessment and the first administration is not scheduled until 2020-2021 school year, –when should the AELPA be submitted for peer review?
 - [See pages 12-14 of the peer review guide for discussion of this topic.](#) Typically, the Department expects a State to submit documentation regarding new assessments approximately six months after the first operational administration.
24. For a State that does not have an AELPA, do the ELs with significant cognitive disabilities take the main operational ELP assessment or do they not test at all for the AELPA?
 - All ELs must participate annually in the ELP assessment.
25. Can we upload a zip file that contains folders?
 - No. Our system will not allow uploading of compressed file formats like *.zip.
26. Could you talk more about what evidence is needed to show the adoption of English Learner Proficiency standards by States?
 - [See Critical element 1.1 page 30 of the peer review guide for discussion of this topic.](#)
27. How should 5.2 [Procedures for Including ELs] be addressed in the ELP peer review submission?
 - CE 5.2 does not apply to ELP assessments. It only applies to the inclusion of ELs in academic assessments.
28. We are submitting an update to our ESSA plan that changes our ELP cut score. Which cut score process should be covered in the submission?
 - The answer to this question will depend upon the specific context of this question for the State. A State with this or a specific question should contact the Department to discuss the issue.

For further information, contact donald.peasley@ed.gov , deborah.spitz@ed.gov or lisa.sadeghi@ed.gov