



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

April 24, 2020

The Honorable Eric G. Mackey
State Superintendent
Alabama State Department of Education
Gordon Persons Building
P.O. Box 302101
Montgomery, AL 36130-2101

Dear Superintendent Mackey:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (the Department) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). I appreciate the efforts of the Alabama State Department of Education (ALSDE) to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in March 2020.

State assessment systems provide essential information that States, districts, principals and teachers can use to identify the academic needs of students, target resources and supports toward students who need them most, evaluate school and program effectiveness and close achievement gaps among students. A high-quality assessment system also provides useful information to parents about their children's advancement against and achievement of grade-level standards. The Department's peer review of State assessment systems is designed to provide feedback to States to support the development and administration of high-quality assessments.

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated ALSDE's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that this component of your assessment system met some, but not all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of the ESEA. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- Reading/language arts (R/LA), mathematics, and science general assessments in high school (ACT with Writing): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**

The assessments that substantially meet requirements of the ESEA, as amended by ESSA, means that these assessments meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The Department expects that ALSDE may be able to provide this additional information within one year.

I request that ALSDE submit a plan within 30 days outlining when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. I recognize the unprecedented situation affecting you and your schools due to widespread and extended school closures caused by the novel coronavirus,

400 MARYLAND AVE., SW, WASHINGTON, DC 20202
<http://www.ed.gov/>

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.

COVID-19. As a result, if you need more than 30 days to submit your plan, please let my staff know at ESEA.Assessment@ed.gov. Upon submission of the plan, the Department will reach out to the SEA to determine a mutually agreeable schedule. Resubmission should occur once all necessary evidence is complete (rather than in multiple submissions).

The full peer review notes from the review are enclosed. These recommendations to the Department formed the basis of our determination. Please note that the peers' recommendations may differ from the Department's feedback; we encourage you to read the full peer notes for additional suggestions and recommendations for improving your assessment system beyond what is noted in the Department's feedback. Department staff will reach out to your assessment director in the next few days to discuss the peer notes and the Department's determination and to answer any questions you have.

The Department placed a condition on ALSDE's Title I, Part A grant award beginning July 1, 2017. The condition required that the State make progress toward implementing a new assessment system and submitting it for peer review. This condition was also placed on ALSDE's Title I, Part A grant award for Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 and 2019. The condition also stipulated that the Department may take further action if the condition was not resolved in a timely manner. With the submission of the ACT, ALSDE has submitted its new high school general assessment for peer review. However, the condition will continue until the State provides information that the ACT has met all requirements and demonstrates, through the Department's peer review, that the other components of your assessment system also meet all ESEA requirements.

Thank you for your ongoing commitment to improving educational outcomes for all students. I look forward to our continued partnership as we move ahead with this critical work. I appreciate the work you are doing to improve your schools and provide a high-quality education for your students.

If you have any questions, please contact my staff at: ESEA.Assessment@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan
Assistant Secretary
for Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Maggie Hicks, Director of Student Assessment

Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed for Alabama’s Assessment System

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments	For ALSDE’s assessment system: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that children with disabilities who are publicly placed in private schools for special education and related services are included in the assessment system.
2.1 – Test Design and Development	For the ACT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the test design addresses the full breadth and depth of the academic content standards. • Evidence the ACT science subdomains reflect the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards. • Evidence of specific intended uses and interpretations of assessment results.
2.3 – Test Administration	For the ACT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of contingency plans that outline strategies for managing possible technology challenges or disruptions.
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration	For the ACT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State adequately monitors the administration of the ACT to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools (e.g., a schedule of visits or a follow-up letter specific to ACT).
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	For the ACT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence submitted for critical element 2.1 will address this critical element.
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	For the ACT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards.
4.1 – Reliability	For the ACT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a plan to improve the reliabilities of the component sub-tests that support the State content standards sub-domains in mathematics. • Evidence of reliability for the writing portions of the reading/language arts (R/LA) assessment for all students and all sub-groups.
5.3 - Accommodations	For the ACT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that accommodations do not deny any student the benefits from participation in the assessment. • Evidence that the accommodations provided to Alabama students are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments.
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	For the ACT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Alabama monitors the ACT administration for special populations (e.g., a schedule of visits or examples of results of ACT administration monitoring).

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	For the ACT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Alabama formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards for the ACT in R/LA, mathematics, and science.
6.4 – Reporting	For the ACT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the individual student reports report the student’s academic achievement in terms of Alabama’s grade-level academic achievement standards. • Evidence that individual student reports are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian. • Evidence that upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, individual student reports are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent. • Evidence that Alabama follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

March 2020 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Note: Peer review notes provide the combined recommendations of the individual peers to the U.S. Department of Education (Department), based on the statute and regulations, the Department's peer review guidance, and the peers' professional judgement of the evidence submitted by the State. These assessment peer review notes, however, do not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for assessment peer review. Although the peer notes inform the Secretary's consideration of each State's assessment system, the Department makes the final decision regarding whether the assessment system meets the requirements in the statute and regulations. As a result, these peer notes may not completely align with the final determination made by the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS4

Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students 4

Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards 6

Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments..... 7

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments .. 9

Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments..... 11

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS..... 12

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development 12

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development 14

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration..... 15

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration 17

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security..... 18

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 22

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY24

Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content24

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes 26

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 28

Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables..... 29

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER.....30

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability 30

Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility 32

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum 33

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 34

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 35

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 36

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 37

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS.....38

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 38

Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments..... 41

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations 43

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

..... 45

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING.....48

Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students..... 48

Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting 50

Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 51

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting 53

SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS

.....ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic AssessmentsError! Bookmark not defined.

Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic AssessmentsError! Bookmark not defined.

Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State AssessmentsError! Bookmark not defined.

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic content standards:</u> The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public schools and public school students in the State.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALSDE #101 - Historical Timeline of Math and ELA Alabama Courses of Study • ALSDE #102 – Alabama’s Path to College and Career Ready Standards (CCRS) • ALSDE #103 – Adoption of Math Course of Study (COS) • ALSDE #104 - November 18, 2010 Minutes of the Alabama State Board of Education approving Resolution to Adopt the Common Core State Standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics • ALSDE #105 – Resolution to adopt Common Core State Standards in ELA and Math • ALSDE #106 – Resolution to adopt College and Career Ready Standards for Mathematics and ELA • ALSDE #107 – January 2014 Minutes of the Alabama State Board of Education adopting the Revised Courses of Study for Mathematics and ELA (pg. 2) • ALSDE #108 – State Board of Education alters Common Core Standards • ALSDE #109 – Public Review of College and Career Ready ELA and Mathematics Standards – October 2014 • ALSDE #110 – 2015 Review of Math and ELA Standards - Alabama State Board of Education Work Session (#2 and #3) • ALSDE #111 – Article – “No Changes Recommended for Math Standards after Public Review” • ALSDE #112 – January 2016 – Standards Annual Review Communication 	<p>ALSDE #102 & 104. Reviewers found sufficient evidence in support of formal adoption of academic content standards for ELA and Mathematics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALSDE #102, p 9: evidence that Alabama has adopted the Alabama College and Career Ready Standards (CCRS) in November 2011. • ALSDE #104, p. 2: evidence that Alabama Board of Education adopted the Common Core State Standards in ELA and math. <p>ALSDE #117 & 120 reviewers found evidence of consideration of the Science Courses of Study but could not find formal adoption motion.</p> <p>Reviewers found sufficient evidence that the academic content standards apply to all schools and public school students in Alabama.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALSDE # 123 page vii “Content standards in this document are minimum and required (Code of Alabama, 1975, §16-35-4). They are fundamental and specific, but not exhaustive.” Equity statement on page 4: “All Alabama students, without no exception, must have opportunity to learn relevant and challenging mathematics.”

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALSDE #113 – Communication encouraging Legislators to “Examine the Standards” • ALSDE #114 – Communication – ACCRS Once Again up for Public Review – February 2016 • ALSDE #115 – Article – Alabama College-and-Career Ready Standards Annual Review Open (page 6) • ALSDE #116 – State Standards Revision Process (page 5) • ALSDE # 117 - Historical Timeline of 2015 Alabama Course of Study: Science Draft • ALSDE #118 - Communication of Public Review of 2014 Alabama Science course of Study Draft Begins • ALSDE #119 – Public Feedback Sought for Draft of 2015 Alabama Course of Study: Science • ALSDE #120 - September 10, 2015 Minutes of the Alabama State Board of Education approving Adoption of Science State Course of Study 	
Section 1.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of formal adoption of Alabama Course of Study for Science. 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic content standards:</u> The State’s challenging academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science are aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALSDE #121 - Code of Alabama 1975, Title 16, Section 35-1 “Composition, appointment, qualifications, and terms of members” • ALSDE #122 - 2016 Revised Alabama Course of Study: English Language Arts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2010-2015 Alabama English Language Arts State Standards Task Force (pp. v-vi) ○ General Introduction (pp.1) • ALSDE #123 - 2016 Revised Alabama Course of Study: Mathematics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2010- 2015 Alabama Mathematics State Standards Task Force (pp. viii-ix) ○ General Introduction (pp. 1) • ALSDE #124 - 2015 Alabama Course of Study: Science <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2012-2015 Alabama State Science Course of Study Committee and Task Force (pp. v-vii) ○ General Introduction (pp.1) • ALSDE #125 – ACT Alignment 2016 • ALSDE #126 – Third-Party Independent Alignment Study Report • ALSDE #127 – Documentation of process to establish Alabama ACT Benchmarks (pp. 4, 5-11) • ALSDE #128 Absences During Testing Days 	<p>Reviewers found sufficient evidence that the challenging academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science are aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in Alabama and relevant State career and technical education standard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALSDE #122: The 2016 Alabama Course of Study: English Language Arts standards are “an extension” of College and Career Readiness (CCR) standards (p. 1). Also, the Preface on p. iv briefly outlines the process of creating the ELA standards and aligning them with coursework. • ALSDE #123: Mastery of the 2016 Alabama Course of Study: Mathematics standards “enables students to succeed in entry-level, credit-bearing academic college courses and in the workforce training programs” (p. 1). The Preface on p. vii briefly outlines the process of creating and revising the Math standards. • ALSDE #124: The Preface on p. iv outlines the process of creating and revising the Science standards.
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments aligned with <u>grade-level academic achievement standards</u> or alternate academic achievement standards in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 9-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). <p>AND</p> <p>The State’s <u>academic content assessments</u> must be the same assessments administered to all students in the tested grades, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may take an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards. • A State may permit an LEA to administer a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in lieu of the State high school assessment if certain conditions are met. • A State that administers an end-of-course high school mathematics assessment may exempt an 8th grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALSDE #121 - Code of Alabama 1975, Title 16, Section 35-1 “Composition, appointment, qualifications, and terms of members” • ALSDE #122 - 2016 Revised Alabama Course of Study: English Language Arts • 2010-2015 Alabama English Language Arts State Standards Task Force (pp. v-vi) • General Introduction (pp.1) • ALSDE #123 - 2016 Revised Alabama Course of Study: Mathematics • 2010- 2015 Alabama Mathematics State Standards Task Force (pp. viii-ix) • General Introduction (pp. 1) • ALSDE #124 - 2015 Alabama Course of Study: Science • 2012-2015 Alabama State Science Course of Study Committee and Task Force (pp. v-vii) • General Introduction (pp.1) • ALSDE #125 – ACT Alignment 2016 • ALSDE #126 – Third-Party Independent Alignment Study Report • ALSDE # 129- Alabama State Board of Education Minutes, September 10, 2009 (pp. 2-3) • ALSDE #130 - State Board of Education Resolution—Appointment of Assessment and Accountability Task Force, July 12, 2011 (p.12) • ALSDE #131 - Alabama Education News, September 2012 (pp. 1-2) CCRS to be implemented. • ALSDE #132 - State Superintendents Association power point—initial timeline for implementation of assessments, October 8, 2012 (slide 13) • ALSDE #133 - Press Release—Alabama State Board of Education Adopts Assessment System 	<p>ALSDE’s Student Assessment Integrity Handbook and Decision Charts demonstrate that the State provides the required assessments, including alternate assessments, in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science at the required grade levels.</p>

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

<p>eighth grade and allow the student to take the State end-of-course mathematics test instead.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Department may have approved the State, under the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority, to permit students in some LEAs to participate in a demonstration assessment system in lieu of participating in the State assessment. 	<p>Aligned with Two- and Four-Year College and Business/Industry Expectations, April 12, 2013</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ALSDE #134 - Alabama Education News, March 2014 (pp. 1-2) ALSDE #135 - Press Release—Alabama First State in America to Offer Full ACT Suite of College and Career Ready Aligned Assessments, April 9, 2014 ALSDE #136 - Memo to Superintendents—Assessments, October 28, 2014 ALSDE #137 - Summative Assessment – Memo declaring ACT as the high school accountability measure. ALSDE #138 - 2020 Testing Dates Memo reminding Districts that ACT will continue as the high school accountability measure. ALSDE # 128 Absences During Testing Days ALSDE #139 - Alabama Student Assessment Program Integrity Handbook for Test Administration ALSDE #140 - Memo – Testing Dates for 2018-2019 ALSDE #141 - Memo – Testing Dates for 2019-2020 ALSDE #142 – Revised Testing Dates for 2019-2020 ALSDE # 143 – Alabama ESSA State Plan 	
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with disabilities, policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including those children with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For ELs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all ELs must be included in all aspects of the content assessment system, unless the State has chosen the statutory option for recently arrived ELs under which such ELs are exempt from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment. ○ If a State has developed native language assessments for ELs in R/LA, ELs must be assessed in R/LA in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except, if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ALSDE #144 - State Board of Education State Department of Education Administrative Code Chapter 290-4-2 (pp. 1, 2, 9) ○ ALSDE #145 - State Board of Education State Department of Education Administrative Code Chapter 290-8-9 Special Education Services (p. 505) ○ ALSDE #139 - Alabama Student Assessment Program Integrity Handbook for Test Administration [pp.1, 3, 5 (#18 and 19), 11-13, 14 (#2-3), 16 (#8), 20, 21 (#14), 26-32, 37-40, 46, 91-94, 103-104] ○ ALSDE #146 - Alabama Student Department of Education Student Assessment Program Policies and Procedures for Students of Special Populations (pp.1-3) ○ ALSDE #147 - Alabama Student Assessment Program Decision Chart – 2017-2018 ○ ALSDE # 148- Alabama Student Assessment Program Decision Chart – 2018- 2019 ○ ALSDE # 149 - English Learner Students Decision Chart – 2017 ○ ALSDE # 150- English Learner Students Decision Chart – 2018 ○ ALSDE # 128 - Absences During Testing Days ○ ALSDE #151 – IEP Team Decision Making Guidelines ○ ALSDE #152 – Summative Testing for Spring 2018 ○ ALSDE #153 – ALSDE English Learner Guidebook 	<p>ALSDE’s State Code and Assessment Integrity Handbook clearly provide that all students must be included in the assessment system, including students with disabilities and ELs. The Handbook indicates that ELs may be exempt from one administration of the reading/language arts assessment but otherwise must take all assessments.</p> <p>However, there was no indication that children with disabilities publicly placed in private schools for special education and related services are included in the assessment system. Rather, the Handbook indicates that students in private schools are not included in the assessment system.</p>

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

<p>language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the State uses the flexibility for Native American language schools and programs: (1) the State provides the content assessment in the Native American language to all students in the school or program; (2) the State submits such content assessment for peer review as part of its State assessment system; and (3) the State continues to provide ELP assessments and services for ELs as required by law. The State must assess in English the students' achievement in R/LA in high school. 		
Section 1.4 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that children with disabilities publicly placed in private schools for special education and related services are included in the assessment system. 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments

(Note: this is a new requirement under ESSA, so it does not apply to standards and assessments adopted prior to the passage of ESSA (December 2015)).

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State has developed or amended challenging academic standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education). • Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas). • Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State. • Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALSDE #154 - Advisory Meeting and Nomination for Committees Memo • ALSDE #155 - Alabama Assessment Task Force Report • ALSDE #156 - High School Assessments Task Force Report • ALSDE #157 – Assessment Committee Guidelines for Nominee Selection • ALSDE #158 – Technical Advisory Committee Notes 8-23-19 • ALSDE #159 – Technical Advisory Committee Notes 9-13-19 	<p>ALSDE provided evidence of adoption of language arts, mathematics, and science standards prior to the passage of ESSA, so this critical element does not apply.</p> <p>ALSDE also provided evidence of consultation on the development of its new assessment system.</p>
Section 1.5 Summary Statement		
x No additional evidence is required		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <u>the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards</u> for the grade that is being assessed and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <u>the State’s grade-level academic content standards</u> and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. • Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <u>the State’s academic content standards</u>, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills). • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design 	<p>Alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[1]: How ACT Assessments Align with State College and Career Readiness Standards. • Evidence #[1b]: Alabama Independent Alignment Study • Evidence #[1c]: ACT Alignment Updates. <p>Statement of purpose and intended interpretations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[2]: ACT Technical Manual for the statement of purpose (see pp. 1.1-1.7) and information about the College Readiness Benchmarks (pp. 8.9-8.10). • Evidence #[3]: Using Your ACT Results, which is written for students to understand score interpretations and reporting. <p>Test blueprints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[2]: ACT Technical Manual includes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ English Test Blueprint (pp. 3.1-3.3) ○ Mathematics Test Blueprint (pp. 3.4-3.10) ○ Reading Test Blueprint (pp. 3.10-3.12) ○ Science Test Blueprint (pp. 3.11-3.14) ○ Writing Test Blueprint (pp. 3.15-3.20) ○ Scoring procedures (p. 2.9-2.11). <p>Processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[2]: ACT Technical Manual <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Test development process (pp. 2.1-2.9) ○ College and Career Readiness Standards (pp. 8.1-8.9) ○ Technical Characteristics of State and District Test (p. 16.5) 	<p>Reviewers did not find sufficient evidence the design and development process of the ACT aligns the assessments to the depth and breadth of Alabama’s academic content standards for the grade being assessed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence 1 is the alignment between ACT tests and College and Career Readiness Standards. • Evidence 1b appears to be missing. This would be a critical piece of evidence to peruse. • Three state-specific alignment studies (#125, #126, and ACS Ventures referenced in #1c but not provided in evidence) provide evidence the test design does not cover the depth and breadth of Alabama’s academic content standards for the grade being assessed in all three content areas. • #1c. ACT’s plans to address alignment are provided. It is unclear if the ACT plans are in response to Alabama’s alignment finding – the plan seems to be in response to an alignment evaluation conducted by ACS. No plan is submitted in this document to address the alignment issues uncovered for Science in #126 and #125. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Does ALSDE have a plan or expectation to receive an updated technical manual such that evidence would be available to assess whether ACT update plans as outlined in #1c have occurred? <p>Statement of Purpose and intended interpretations: #2 ACT Technical Manual Purpose is more specific to national use of ACT rather than Alabama specific. Additional Alabama uses are not specified. 16.3.1 Does not provide evidence the reports</p>

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

<p>and intended uses and interpretations of results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting. • If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be <i>entirely</i> administered through a portfolio. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[4]: Fairness Report for the ACT Tests (pp. 2-5). <p>Evidence #[5]: National Curriculum Survey (2012). Figure 1 illustrates different processes and sources of evidence used to inform ACT test blueprints (p. 2, Figure 1).</p>	<p>support local interpretations regarding grade level AL standards.</p> <p>The Science subtest of the ACT represents a portion of the academic content standards in science. It is not clear how the disciplinary core ideas of science are part of the assessment.</p>
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence Alabama has a plan or process to address alignment deficiencies noted in the alignment studies. • Evidence of Alabama specific intended uses and interpretations of assessment results. • Evidence the ACT science subdomains reflect the depth and breadth of the academic content standards within the Alabama Courses of Study. 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills. 		Requirement Previously Met
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
<input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or <input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>Procedures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[15]: The ACT Test Administration Manual: State and District Testing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ACT state and district testing policies and procedures (pp. 5-8). ○ Test facility requirements (pp. 9-11). ○ Testing staff requirements (pp. 12-15). ○ Test administrator training session outline and topics for discussion (p. 95). <p>Training:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[15]: ACT Test Administration Manual: State and District Testing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Test coordinator is expected to participate in training conducted by ACT (if previously untrained) and is responsible for training room supervisors and proctors (p. 12). ○ All staff are expected to participate in training conducted by ACT (p. 15). ○ Training session outline and topics for discussion for the training conducted by the test coordinator (pp. 95). • ALSDE #160 - LEA Report of Training Form • ALSDE #161 - Student Assessment Training Assurance Statement – draft • ALSDE #139 - Alabama Student Assessment Program Integrity Handbook for Test Administration • ALSDE #162 - Sign-in sheet from Summer Trainings • ALSDE #163 - System Test Coordinator Summer Workshops – 2018 Memorandum 	<p>Evidence that Alabama has standardized procedures for the administration of assessments is sufficient. However, the reviewers did not find sufficient evidence that (a) the appropriate staff and personnel receive necessary training, and (b) online training is tracked and recorded by Alabama. Based on the provided note, Alabama appears to recognize this issue and plans to address it in the future.</p> <p>ALSDE #162-165: The evidence of training is from 2018.</p> <p>In addition, the reviewers were not able to locate evidence that Alabama (a) provides minimum system requirements to schools that administer ACT Online, and (b) has contingency plans that outline strategies for managing possible technology challenges or disruptions. It is possible that the Online Manual referenced in ALSDE #169 contains such information.</p> <p>There are several different sources for the same information. Working with ACT to produce a document that includes test administration guidelines, accommodations, etc. for paper and for online that are consistent and inclusive of ACT requirements and Alabama requirements would be very helpful in ensuring that all educators receive clear and consistent information.</p>

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALSDE #164 - Email Summer Test Security Training • ALSDE #165 - Agenda for Summer Trainings – July 2018 • ALSDE #166 - ACT STC and BTC Handbook • ALSDE #167 - ACT STC and BTC PowerPoint • ALSDE #168 - ACT Online STC and BTC PowerPoint • ALSDE #169 - ACT Online STC and BTC Handbook <p>ALSDE #170 - Paper Alerts for Room Supervisors and Proctors</p>	
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Alabama provided necessary training to the appropriate staff and personnel in most recent year available; • Evidence that Alabama provides minimum system requirements to schools that administer ACT Online and has contingency plans that outline strategies for managing possible technology challenges or disruptions. 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.</p>	<p>Standardization of administration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[15]: ACT Test Administration Manual: State and District Testing <p>STATE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALSDE #139 - Alabama Student Assessment Program Integrity Handbook for Test Administration • ALSDE #171 - Monitoring Packet for State Assessments • ALSDE #172 - ACCESS Monitoring Letter • ALSDE #173 - Monitoring Letter • ALSDE #174 - Support Letter • ALSDE #175 - October Student Assessment Updates Webcast – Noted issues with monitoring and how districts can make sure they are following appropriate procedures – (slides 26-28) 	<p>ALSDE provided a detailed set of monitoring instructions and observation forms, as well as sample letters and a webinar that had several slides on monitoring and test security. The monitoring documents clearly include the ACT in this process. However, insufficient evidence was provided to demonstrate that monitoring and appropriate follow-up occurred, because the sample LEA letters provided were for other Alabama assessments. ALSDE should provide some evidence that monitoring of ACT was conducted in the most recent test administration (e.g., a schedule of visits or a follow-up letter).</p>
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State adequately monitors the administration of the ACT to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools (e.g., a schedule of visits or a follow-up letter specific to ACT). 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. • Application of test security procedures to all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS. 	<p>Prevention:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[15]: ACT Test Administration Manual: State and District Testing • Preparing facilities for the test (pp. 9-11). • Testing staff requirements (pp. 12-15). • Information about securing test materials before, during, and after testing and secure distribution of test materials (pp. 16-19, 90-93). • Instructions for test day, including admitting examinees and prohibited items (pp. 26-30). • Information about test administration procedures (pp. 30-32). • Verbal instructions for standard test administration (pp. 32-37). • Anonymous security hotline as well as ACT test security principles (p. 115). <p>Training:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[15]: ACT Test Administration Manual: State and District Testing • Test coordinator is expected to participate in training conducted by ACT (if previously untrained) and is responsible for training room supervisors and proctors (p. 12). • All staff are expected to participate in training conducted by ACT (p. 15). • Training session outline and topics for discussion for the training conducted by the test coordinator (p. 95). <p>Detection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[16]: Procedures for Investigating Testing Irregularities and Questioned Test Scores 	<p>ACT has procedures in place that are communicated to administrators – prevention and detection (investigation protocols).</p> <p>Alabama’s Student Assessment Program Integrity Handbook provides state guidance and outlines Alabama’s expectations.</p> <p>Alabama statute (#144) addresses test security and potential consequences for violations.</p> <p>While Alabama provided evidence of its documentation of irregularities for the 19-20 school year (#176), reviewers were not clear how Alabama SDE works with districts and schools to achieve resolution and/or remedy situations.</p> <p>In addition, reviewers were not clear whether ACT provides Alabama with documentation of irregularities reported or whether there was a single protocol for reporting irregularities to Alabama. ALSDE#166-169 identify ACT as the agency to call and to report irregularities. The Alabama Student Assessment Program Integrity Handbook for Test Administration includes detailed descriptions of the procedures for schools, LEAs, etc. It is not clear how Alabama-specific information and ACT specific information are integrated for use by ALSDE and whether a single point of contact within ALSDE is available for Alabama educators for questions/clarifications.</p>

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describes irregularities that may result in a review of an individual’s test scores and how the irregularities are identified and reviewed (pp. 1-2). <p>Irregularities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[15]: ACT Test Administration Manual: State and District Testing • Reporting incidents (irregularities) and consequences for violations of test security (pp. 83-89). • Irregularities and the cancelling of scores (p. 105). • Evidence #[17]: 2015 Terms and Conditions: Testing Rules and Policies for the ACT <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Non-scoring and cancelling scores (pp. 2-3). <p>Remediation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[16]: Procedures for Investigating Testing Irregularities and Questioned Test Scores • Options for examinees whose scores are reviewed (pp. 3-4). <p>Investigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[15]: ACT Test Administration Manual: State and District Testing • Expectations for staff cooperation in any investigations (p. 6). <p>STATE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALSDE #139 - Alabama Student Assessment Program Integrity Handbook for Test Administration 	
--	---	--

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Professional Test Administration Practices for Standardized Assessment (p. 3). ○ Roles and Responsibilities within Districts (pp. 5-32). ○ Guidelines for Security and Confidentiality of Assessments (p. 42). ○ Guidelines for Storage and Destruction of Test Materials (pp. 43-44). ○ System Test Security Plan (pp. 49-53). ○ School Test Security Plan (pp. 54-59). ○ State Irregularity Report (pp. 70-72). ○ Corrective Action Plan (pp. 73-75). ○ Alabama Educator Code of Ethics (pp. 76-78). ○ Alabama Ethics is Test Administration (pp. 79-80). ○ Test Security Policy (pp. 81-82). ○ Security and Confidentiality Statement for the Administering and Reporting of Student Data on the Website (pp. 83-84). ○ Policy Use of Digital Device During the Administration of a Secure Test (pp. 85-86). ○ Suggested Guidelines for the Search of Digital Devices Seized During the Administration of a Secure Test (pp. 87-88). ○ Procedures for Investigation of Alleged Test Security Violations/Irregularities (pp. 89-90). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ALSDE #176 - Irregularities for 2019-2020 ● ALSDE #164 - Email Summer Test Security Training 	
--	--	--

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

	ALSDE #144 - Administrative Code 290-4-2-.04 and 290-4-2-.05 – Test Security	
Section 2.5 Summary Statement		
<u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence of resolution and remediation plans for districts and schools, including an Alabama coordinated plan with ACT for monitoring, identification, and notification of irregularities.		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p>Testing Materials:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[15]: ACT Test Administration Manual: State and District Testing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Information about securing test materials before, during, and after testing and secure distribution of test materials (pp. 16-19, 90-93). <p>Test-related data and personally identifiable information:</p> <p>ACT has two policies for protecting student-level data and personally identifiable information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[18]: ACT Privacy Policy, which provides detail to examinees on the use and protection of data. • Evidence #[19]: ACT Information Security Policy. ACT Information Security Program Summary. The document is for internal ACT staff to protect test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information. • ALSDE #143 - Alabama ESSA State Plan- N Counts and calculations (pp. 14-15). • ALSDE #139 - Alabama Student Assessment Program Integrity Handbook for Test Administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Security and Confidentiality Statement of the Administering and Reporting of Student Data on the Website (pp. 83-84). • ALSDE #177 - ALSDE Identify Management (AIM) Screenshot • ALSDE #178 - AIM User Guide 	<p>Policies for ACT are provided. Alabama has a Data Governance Policy (#179). Student Assessment Handbook addresses security of student data.</p> <p>Reviewers noted that ALSDE seems to rely heavily on ACT; it is not clear that ALSDE has fully evaluated the intersection of ACT national data security policy and procedures and Alabama data security policy and procedures.</p> <p>Evidence #143 consists of the Alabama’s ESSA plan, as submitted to USED in October 2017. This document stipulates that the n-size is 20 – reporting n-size is 10.</p> <p>Note: # 176 for testing irregularities includes student names and ID numbers. This would qualify as a violation of privacy—this form should have been sent with that information redacted.</p>

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALSDE #179 - Data Governance Policy • ALSDE #180 - Education Directory Application Guide (p. 5) • ALSDE #181 - Email to districts about ACT Reports and SGP Reports Video being posted. • ALSDE #182 - Data Review Memo 	
Section 2.6 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of established, clear articulation of policies and procedures to protect the integrity and confidentiality of storage, access, and use of personally identifiable information. 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><u>The State’s academic assessments</u> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards; • If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards and administers alternate assessments aligned with those standards, the assessments show adequate alignment to the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content 	<p>Validity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[1a]: How ACT Assessments Align with State College and Career Readiness Standards. • Evidence #[1b]: Independent alignment study • Evidence #[1c]: ACT Alignment Updates • Evidence #[2]: ACT Technical Manual. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The technical manual for the ACT assessment includes a chapter on Validity Evidence, which provides descriptions of studies providing validity evidence for the use and interpretation of ACT Assessment test scores (Chapter 11, pp. 11.1-11.95). ○ ACT scores are comparable across National and State administrations (p. 16.11) • Evidence #[20]: ACT Writing Test Technical Report. Includes results of various studies that demonstrate overall validity of the optional Direct Writing (ACT-W) Test. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Relationship between ACT-W scores and writing-intensive college courses (pp. 13-17). • Evidence #[4]: Fairness Report for the ACT Tests. Includes information about the reviews of items and forms (pp. 3-10). • Evidence #[21]: Content Review Panel Instructions (Reading) • ALSDE #125 – ACT Alignment 2016 	<p>Validity evidence submitted is for the ACT program (its alignment to college and career readiness).</p> <p>See comments under Critical Element 2.1.</p>

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

<p>and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALSDE #126 – Third-Party Independent Alignment Study Report • ALSDE #143 - Alabama ESSA State Plan (p. 11). • ALSDE #183 - Student Assessment Webpage – ACT as Accountability • ALSDE #137 - Summative Assessment – Memo declaring ACT as the high school accountability measure. 	
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of validity based on Alabama academic content standards (Alabama Courses of Study). • Evidence of Alabama-specific intended uses and interpretations of assessment results. 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap: <u>the intended cognitive processes</u> appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>Expert judgment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[2]: ACT Technical Manual. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Information about item reviews (pp. 2.6 -2.7 and p. 2.8). • Evidence #[6]: Forms Construction Guide <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Guidelines and qualifications for review panels (pp. 2.15-2.19 and Appendix A). ○ Review of field test items (Section 3.2, pp. 2.2-2.5). • Evidence #[4]: Fairness Report for the ACT Tests. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Guidelines and qualifications for review panels (pp. 14-16). ○ Review of field test items (p. 4-10). <p>Cognitive lab.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[22]: ACT Cognitive Lab <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Study Design: pp. 4–7 ○ ELA: pp. 7–15 ○ Mathematics: pp. 16–25 ○ Science: pp. 26–31 • ALSDE #184 - HS ACT AL Science PLDs • ALSDE #185 - HS AL PLD Technical Report • ALSDE #186 - HS ACT AL ELA PLDs • ALSDE #187 - HS ACT AL Math PLDs • ALSDE #125 – ACT Alignment 2016 • ALSDE #126 – Third-Party Independent Alignment Study Report 	<p>#2 and #6 are specific to the ACT rather than Alabama academic content standards (Alabama Courses of Study).</p> <p>#4 Cognitive lab conducted by ACT used a convenience sample – lacks diversity and as such may not be generalizable to Alabama’s population. Therefore, the inferences drawn from the results may not apply to Alabama’s population.</p> <p>ALSDE #184-187. The PLD process provides some information. However, it requires a chain of inferences to conclude that the process provides sufficient evidence that the assessments tap the intended cognitive processes.</p>

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Section 3.2 Summary Statement

<u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Validity evidence specific to Alabama that the assessment taps the intended cognitive processes in the Alabama Courses of Study for each subject. |
|---|

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s <u>academic content standards</u>.</p>	<p>Subscore structures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[xx]: Peer Review Report on the ACT for Alabama <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Correlation matrices ○ Factor analysis ○ Differential item functioning <p>English and Writing Subscores:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence # [20]: ACT Writing Test Technical Report (2009). Includes results of analyses that demonstrate overall validity of the optional Direct Writing (ACT-W) Test. Relationship between ACT-W scores and writing-intensive college courses (Tables 9-12, pp. 13-17). 	<p>According to Alabama Peer Review Report (p. 6), average factor loadings were .354 for Number & Quality in Math (with 2 out of 5 items having less than .4 loadings) and .389 for Integration of Knowledge and Ideas in Reading (with 4 out of 6 items having less than .4 loadings), which suggests less than moderate association between these items and the reporting categories.</p> <p>Most of the correlation coefficients among subject scores (p. 2) were strong or moderate, except for the correlation between Writing and Math (less than .5).</p> <p>In addition, the results of the DIF analysis on 8 group comparisons (pp. 12-13) revealed 6 items using MH procedure and 19 items using STD procedure that were flagged.</p> <p>See comments in 2.1.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the Alabama’s academic content standards (Alabama Courses of Study). 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.		Requirement Previously Met
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a <u>student’s academic achievement</u>. 	<p>Overall reliability, including standard error of measurement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[2]: ACT Technical Manual. The technical manual for the ACT assessment includes a chapter on reliability evidence, (Chapter 10, pp. 10.1-10.17). Reliability evidence includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reliability and SEM for the ACT Test Scores (pp. 10.1-10.2) ○ Reliability and SEM for ACT Reporting Scores (pp. 10.2-10.4) ○ Conditional Standard Errors of Measurement for the ACT (pp. 10.5-10.6) ○ Reliability, CSEM, and Agreement Indices for the ACT Writing Test (pp. 10.6-10.8) ○ CSEM for Composite Scores (pp. 10.8-10.10) ○ CSEM for STEM and ELA Scores (pp. 10.11-10.14) • Evidence #[xx]: Peer Review Report on the ACT Assessment for Alabama <p>Classification consistency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[xx]: Peer Review Report on the ACT Assessment for Alabama (p. 10). • Evidence #[2]: ACT Technical Manual <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Classification consistency analysis (pp. 10.4-10.5) <p>Inter-rater reliability:</p>	<p>#2 10.1-10.2 Reliability coefficients are provided in the ACT Technical Manual for national administration. Reliabilities meet industry standard for overall score for reading, math, science. Writing reliabilities were not included. ELA reliabilities above 0.80</p> <p>10.2-10.4 The reporting categories for the five mathematics sub-domains that are similar to the Alabama Courses of Study sub-domains have reliabilities ranging from 0.33-0.59. These are very low reliabilities for the sub-score reporting for Alabama sub-domains.</p>

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[2]: ACT Technical Manual <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Agreement Indices for the ACT Writing Test (pp. 10.6-10.8) • Evidence #[20]: ACT Writing Test Technical Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Inter-rater reliability and measurement precision information (pp. 1-2). <p>Writing Test and Reliability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[23a]: Fall 2014 Writing Generalizability Study • Evidence #[23b]: ACT Writing Test Reliability 	
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a plan to improve the reliabilities of the component sub-tests that support the Alabama Courses of Study sub-domains in mathematics. 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For all State academic assessments,</i> assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition¹).</p> <p>For academic content assessments, the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in their design, development and analysis.</p>		Requirement Previously Met
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

¹ see page 28 of “*A State’s Guide to the U.S. Department of Education’s Assessment Peer Review Process*”, September 24, 2018 available at: www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for academic assessments , including performance for high- and low-achieving students.		Requirement Previously Met
Section 4.3 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s <u>academic achievement standards</u>.</p>		<p>Requirement Previously Met</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
If the State administers multiple forms of academic assessments within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.		Requirement Previously Met
Section 4.5 Summary Statement		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery; <u>or a native language version of the academic content assessment</u>), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 		Requirement Previously Met
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website. 	<p>Maintenance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence #[38]: Overview of Technical Advisory Committee Evidence #[5]: National Curriculum Survey (2012). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figure 1 illustrates how the National Curriculum Survey is used to update the ACT (pp. 1-2). Evidence #[2] ACT Technical Manual: The ACT technical manual discusses the ongoing review process (pp. 1.7, 2.9). 	<p>Reviewers did not find (a) evidence that Alabama has established and implemented clear and technically sound criteria for analyses of its assessment system, and (b) evidence that Alabama has made information about the technical quality of the assessment system publicly available, such as on the Alabama State Department of Education website.</p> <p>For example, evidence of membership, agendas, and minutes from Alabama’s TAC review of system is not provided.</p>
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that Alabama has established and implemented clear and technically sound criteria for analyses of its assessment system. Evidence that Alabama has made information about the technical quality of the assessment system publicly available, such as on the Alabama SDE website. 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</p> <p>If a State adopts alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and administers an alternate assessment aligned with those standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D), respectively, the State must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with an AA-AAAS, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A State definition of “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” that addresses factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior; • Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that: 	<p>ACT Accommodations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[2]: ACT Technical Manual (Chapter 4, Accessibility, pp. 4.1-4.18) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The chapter is a general overview of ACT’s process to include accessibility into the design of the assessment. ○ Table of supports (Table 4.4, pp. 4.10-4.15). • Evidence #[39]: ACT Policy for Accommodations Documentation. Includes the documentation requirements for students with disabilities seeking accommodations. • Evidence #[40]: ACT Test Accessibility and Accommodations System (TAA) User Guide. Provides information on how to request accommodations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ALSDE #144 - State Board of Education State Department of Education Administrative Code Chapter 290-4-2 (pp. 1, 2, 9) ○ ALSDE #145 - State Board of Education State Department of Education Administrative Code Chapter 290-8-9 Special Education Services (p. 505) ○ ALSDE #139 - Alabama Student Assessment Program Integrity Handbook for Test Administration [pp.1, 3, 5 (#18 and 19), 11-13, 14 (#2-3), 16 (#8), 20, 21 (#14), 26-32, 37-40, 46, 91-94, 103-104] ○ ALSDE #146 - Alabama Student Department of Education Student Assessment Program Policies 	<p>Evidence submitted for CE 5.1 appears to be sufficient.</p> <p>Guidelines for ensuring the inclusion of students with disabilities are provided in ALSDE #139, p. 37, and ALSDE #146, pp. 1-3.</p> <p>Guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with an AA-AAAS and ensuring that parents are informed are provided in ALSDE #151, p. 2 onward.</p> <p>State Board Rules (#144 and #145), along with Alabama’s Student Assessment Handbook (#139) outline state inclusion requirements for students with disabilities.</p> <p>Note: There are some inconsistencies between ACT provided information and Alabama information, online and paper, that might be addressed to ensure consistency in applying inclusion and accommodations.</p>

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provides a clear explanation of the differences between assessments aligned with grade-level academic achievement standards and those aligned with alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an AA-AAAS, such as how participation in such assessments may delay or otherwise affect the student from completing the requirements for a regular high school diploma; ● Ensure that parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child's achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards; ● Not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma; and ● Promote, consistent with requirements under the IDEA, the involvement and progress of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the general education curriculum that is based on the State's academic content standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> and Procedures for Students of Special Populations (pp.1-3) ○ ALSDE #147 - Alabama Student Assessment Program Decision Chart – 2017-2018 ○ ALSDE #148 - Alabama Student Assessment Program Decision Chart – 2018- 2019 ○ ALSDE #149 - English Learner Students Decision Chart – 2017 ○ ALSDE #150 - English Learner Students Decision Chart – 2018 ○ ALSDE # 128 - Absences During Testing Days ○ ALSDE #151 – IEP Team Decision Making Guidelines ○ ALSDE #152 – Summative Testing for Spring 2018 ○ ALSDE #153 – ALSDE English Learner Guidebook 	

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>for the grade in which the student is enrolled; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop, disseminate information on, and promote the use of appropriate accommodations to ensure that a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who does not take an AA-AAAS participates in academic instruction and assessments for the grade in which the student is enrolled. • The State has in place and monitors implementation of guidelines for IEP teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, if applicable. Such guidelines must be developed in accordance with 34 CFR § 200.6(d).² 		
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

² See the full regulation at 34 CFR § 200.6(d) (online at https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=07e168e9e7a6c5931b4549cc15547ee9&mc=true&node=se34.1.200_16&rgn=div8)

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s academic content assessments and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for ELs; • Assistance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for ELs, including to the extent practicable, assessments in the language most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do to determine the students’ mastery of skills in academic content areas until the students have achieved English language proficiency. 	<p>ACT Accommodations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[2]: ACT Technical Manual (Chapter 4, Accessibility, pp. 4.1-4.18) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The chapter is a general overview of ACT’s process to include accessibility into the design of the assessment. ○ Table of supports (Table 4.4, pp. 4.10-4.15). ○ Enhancements for English Learners (pp. 4.15-4.17) • Evidence #[40]: ACT Test Accessibility and Accommodations System (TAA) User Guide. Provides information on how to request EL supports. • Evidence #[41]: ACT Approved EL Supports Guide. Includes information on types of supports provided and how to request the supports (pp. 1-5). • Evidence #[42]: ACT Policy for English Learner Supports Documentation. Details the principles for determining supports, criteria for establishing English learner status, and procedures for implementation (pp. 3-4). ○ ALSDE #144 - State Board of Education State Department of Education Administrative Code Chapter 290-4-2 (pp. 1, 2, 9) ○ ALSDE #145 - State Board of Education State Department of Education Administrative Code Chapter 290-8-9 Special Education Services (p. 505) ○ ALSDE #139 - Alabama Student Assessment Program Integrity Handbook for Test Administration [pp.1, 3, 5 (#18 and 19), 11-13, 14 (#2-3), 16 (#8), 20, 21 (#14), 26-32, 37-40, 46, 91-94, 103-104] ○ ALSDE #146 - Alabama Student Department of Education Student Assessment Program Policies 	<p>State Board Rules (#144 and #145), along with Alabama’s Student Assessment Handbook (#139) outline state inclusion requirements for English learners. The Alabama Student Department of Education Student Assessment Program Policies document provides additional detail (#146).</p>

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	and Procedures for Students of Special Populations (pp.1-3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ALSDE #149 - English Learner Students Decision Chart – 2017 ○ ALSDE #150 - English Learner Students Decision Chart – 2018 ○ ALSDE # 128 - Absences During Testing Days 	
Section 5.2 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that appropriate accommodations, such as, interoperability with, and ability to use, assistive technology, are available to measure the <u>academic achievement</u> of students with disabilities. • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs; • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. • Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny 	<p>Accommodations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[2]: ACT Technical Manual (Chapter 4, Accessibility, pp. 4.1-4.18) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The chapter is a general overview of ACT’s process to include accessibility into the design of the assessment. ○ Table of supports (Table 4.4, pp. 4.10-4.15). • Evidence #[39]: ACT Policy for Accommodations Documentation. Includes the documentation requirements for students with disabilities seeking accommodations. • Evidence #[41]: ACT Approved EL Supports Guide. Includes information on types of supports provided and how to request the supports (pp. 1-5). • Evidence #[42]: ACT Policy for English Learner Supports Documentation. Details the principles for determining supports, criteria for establishing English learner status, and procedures for implementation (pp. 3-4). • Evidence #[40]: ACT Test Accessibility and Accommodations System (TAA) User Guide. Provides information on how to request accommodations. • Evidence #[43]: Examining the Validity of ACT Composite Scores and High School Grade Point Average for Predicting First-Year College GPA of Special-Tested Students • Evidence #[44]: “Testing Supports for English Learners” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Literature review: pp. 15–24 ○ Methods: p. 26 ○ Examinee ACT Score Performance: pp. 27–33 	<p>Evidence includes ACT Policies for Accommodations (#39, #40, #41, #42) for both students with disabilities, as well as English learners. Evidence #45 examines whether there is DIF for items taken under accommodated administrations vs non-accommodated.</p> <p>Note: There are inconsistencies between information provided by ACT and information provided by Alabama. Differences exist for online and paper regarding how students with disabilities are to be accommodated.</p> <p>It is unclear how Alabama ensures that accommodations that may be included in a student’s plan do not deny the student the same benefit as others who take the assessment. For example, it is not clear if a student who takes the ACT with accommodations will always receive a college-reportable score.</p>

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ High School Grades: pp. 35–40 ○ Predicting High School Grades from ACT Scores: pp. 40–44 ● Evidence #[45]: Differential Item Functioning Analysis 	
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence that any accommodation provided to an Alabama student does not deny the same benefit afforded to others. ● Evidence that the accommodations provided to Alabama students are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments. 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures; • Monitored for administrations of all required academic content assessments and AA-AAAS. 	<p>Accommodations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[2]: ACT Technical Manual (Chapter 4, Accessibility, pp. 4.1-4.18) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The chapter is a general overview of ACT’s process to include accessibility into the design of the assessment. ○ Table of supports (Table 4.4, pp. 4.10-4.15). • Evidence #[39]: ACT Policy for Accommodations Documentation. Includes the documentation requirements for students with disabilities seeking accommodations. • Evidence #[41]: ACT Approved EL Supports Guide. Includes information on types of supports provided and how to request the supports (pp. 1-5). • Evidence #[42]: ACT Policy for English Learner Supports Documentation. Details the principles for determining supports, criteria for establishing English learner status, and procedures for implementation (pp. 3-4). • Evidence #[40]: ACT Test Accessibility and Accommodations System (TAA) User Guide. Provides information on how to request accommodations. <p>Monitoring accommodations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[15]: The ACT Test Administration Manual: State and District Testing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Accommodations coordinator (pp. 12-13). <p>STATE:</p>	<p>Evidence of follow-up from monitoring ACT test administration for special populations is needed. Follow-up from monitoring is for other Alabama assessments.</p>

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALSDE #144 - State Board of Education State Department of Education Administrative Code Chapter 290-4-2 (pp. 1, 2, 9) • ALSDE #145 - State Board of Education State Department of Education Administrative Code Chapter 290-8-9 Special Education Services (p. 505) • ALSDE #139 - Alabama Student Assessment Program Integrity Handbook for Test Administration [pp.1, 3, 5 (#18 and 19), 11-13, 14 (#2-3), 16 (#8), 20, 21 (#14), 26-32, 37-40, 46, 91-94, 103-104] • ALSDE #146 - Alabama Student Department of Education Student Assessment Program Policies and Procedures for Students of Special Populations (pp.1-3) • ALSDE #149 - English Learner Students Decision Chart – 2017 • ALSDE #150 - English Learner Students Decision Chart – 2018 • ALSDE #153 – ALSDE English Learner Guidebook • ALSDE #172 - ACCESS Monitoring Letter • ALSDE #147 - Alabama Student Assessment Program Decision Chart – 2017-2018 ○ ALSDE #148 - Alabama Student Assessment Program Decision Chart – 2018- 2019 ○ ALSDE #151 – IEP Team Decision Making Guidelines ○ ALSDE # 188 – PreACT Accommodations Support Checklist ○ ALSDE #189 – ACT with Writing Accommodations Support Checklist ○ ALSDE #190 – Individual Accessibility and Accommodation Support Checklist 	

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ALSDE #191 – ACT WorkKeys Accessibility and Accommodations Support Checklist ○ ALSDE #192 – ACT Policy for EL Supports 	
Section 5.4 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Alabama monitors the ACT administration for special populations (e.g., summaries of results of ACT administration monitoring for most recent year of results). 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic content standards:</u> The State formally adopted <u>challenging academic achievement standards</u> in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; <p>The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (1) at least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third for lower achievement; (2) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (3) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALSDE #127 – Documentation of process to establish Alabama ACT Benchmarks (pp. 4, 5-11) • ALSDE #193 - PowerPoint Presentation – Understanding Alabama’s Accountability System – Fall 2018 (Slides 7 and 11). • ALSDE #194 - AL Proficiency Levels 2017-2018 • ALSDE #195- AL Proficiency Levels 2018-2019 • ALSDE #196 - Alabama Alternate State Participation 2018-2019 • ALSDE #184 - HS ACT AL Science PLDs • ALSDE #186 - HS ACT AL ELA PLDs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALSDE #187 - HS ACT AL Math PLDs 	<p>Reviewers were not able to find evidence in the submitted documentation that Alabama formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards (including alternate academic achievement standards) in reading/ELA, math, and science for the ACT.</p> <p>Evidence that Alabama has developed academic achievement standards is provided. Evidence that these achievement standards were officially adopted (through Board or Superintendent approval) was not located. In comments, Alabama indicates that state leadership notifies the State Board of Education.</p> <p>The Standard Setting Technical Report (#197) indicates that the recommended cut scores were approved by the TAC and ALSDE leadership on August 23, 2019. Evidence of those events would be helpful.</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Alabama formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards for the ACT in reading/ELA, math, and science.

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[197] Alabama Standard Setting 2019 Technical Report • ALSDE #127 – Documentation of process to establish Alabama ACT Benchmarks (pp. 4, 5-11) 	<p>Note: Standard Setting Technical Report (#197) documents procedures taken to establish the cut scores for the ACT for Alabama students. Round 2 for ELA displays ratings for 10 panelists rather than 12; across the rounds, the number of panelist ratings for ELA varies slightly. The majority of panelist for Science appear to be affiliated with higher education (unclear – AMSTI), while for ELA and mathematics the majority are district/school staff.</p>
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic achievement standards:</u></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards and with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards such that a student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards (1) are aligned with the State’s challenging academic content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled; (2) promote access to the general curriculum consistent with the IDEA; (3) reflect professional judgment as to the highest possible standards achievable for such students; (4) are designated in the IEP for each student for whom alternate academic achievement standards apply; and (5) are aligned to ensure that a student who meets the alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALSDE #184 - HS ACT AL Science PLDs • ALSDE #185 - HS AL PLD Technical Report • ALSDE #186 - HS ACT AL ELA PLDs • ALSDE #187 - HS ACT AL Math PLDs • ALSDE #125 – ACT Alignment 2016 • ALSDE #126 – Third-Party Independent Alignment Study Report • ALSDE #197 – AL Standard Setting for the ACT August 2019 – Technical Report 	<p>Alabama SDE has provided evidence of PLDs for each content area. The alignment of the PLDs appear to be predicated on the alignment of the ACT to the Alabama Courses of Study. The independent alignment study identified gaps in alignment and it is unclear if ACT’s proposed plan to address those gaps in ELA and mathematics is sufficient for Alabama. No plan was submitted to address the gaps identified in Science.</p> <p>See comments in CE 2.1.</p>

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment.		
Section 6.3 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the PLDs are aligned to the Alabama Courses of Study (e.g., that the gaps identified in the independent alignment study have been addressed). 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on <u>student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level³</u></p> <p>For <u>academic content assessments</u>, the State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the <u>specific academic needs of students</u>, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its academic content assessments that: 	<p>Reporting results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence #[2]: ACT Technical Manual <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student Report (p. 15.1-15.3). High School Report (p. 15.3-15.5). College Report (p. 15.5-15.7). Evidence #[45]: 2016-2017 Profile Report Evidence #[46]: State and District Record Layout <p>Interpretations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence #[5]: Using Your ACT Results Describes for students how the composite scores are calculated and explain how scores are related to the ACT College Readiness Benchmarks (pp. 2-3). Evidence #[47]: ACT Score Report Descriptions <p>STATE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ALSDE #181 - Email to districts about ACT Reports and SGP Reports Video being posted. ALSDE #182 - Data Review Memo ALSDE #198 - Official Data Import Memo ALSDE #199 – Enrollment by Ethnicity ALSDE #200 – Enrollment by Grade ALSDE #201 – Enrollment by Race ALSDE #202 – Enrollment by Subpopulation ALSDE #203 – Math Assessment ALSDE #204 – Reading Assessment ALSDE #205 – Science Assessment ALSDE #206 – ACT Profile Report 	<p>#203, #204, and #205: Public assessment results on student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level were provided.</p> <p>The ACT Technical Report includes an example of a student-level report. Interpretive guidance is provided. Although there is a copy of ‘Using your ACT results in Spanish’, it was unclear to reviewers if reports are provided in other languages or alternate formats.</p> <p>#5: Reviewers did not find evidence that the individual student reports provide information about the <u>student’s academic achievement</u> in terms of the Alabama’s grade-level academic achievement standards.</p> <p>Reviewers were not able to locate evidence that Alabama follows a process and timeline for the scoring and delivery of individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals.</p>

³ Although all students with disabilities must be included in a State’s assessment system, requirements for public reporting in ESEA section 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) apply only to children with disabilities as defined in section 602(3) of the IDEA.

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a <u>student’s academic achievement</u>; ○ Report the <u>student’s academic achievement</u> in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards; ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific <u>academic needs of students</u>; ○ Are provided in an understandable and uniform format; ○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian; ○ Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent. ● The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ALSDE #207 – AL Report Card and Supporting Data Screenshot 	

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALABAMA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the individual student reports report the student’s academic achievement in terms of Alabama’s grade-level academic achievement standards. • Evidence that individual student reports are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian. • Evidence that upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, individual student reports are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent. • Evidence that Alabama follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals. 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.