

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application "C"- Hawaii

IADA Score Summary February 2020 Averages Across Five Reviewers

		Application C State of Hawaii
	possible	
criteria	pts	
a1	10 or 5	4.6
a2	30 or 25	18
a3	0 or 10	8.2
a. Total	40	30.8
b1	5	4.2
b2	5	4.2
b3	10	8.6
b. Total	20	17
c1	5	3.8
c2	10	6.8
c. Total	15	10.6
d1	9 or 5	4.2
d2	8 or 5	4.4
d3	8 or 5	4.4
d4	0 or 10	5.4
d. Total	25	18.4
e1	12	6.6
e2	8	6
e. Total	20	12.6
Overall Total	120	89.4
Total Percent		74.5%

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Instructions:

- The Panel Monitor will provide deadlines for submitting preliminary scores and comments.
- Review and score each application independently.
- Enter preliminary scores and comments into the Preliminary TRF.
- Send completed TRF to the Panel Monitor.
- The Panel Monitor will review scores and comments and ask you to clarify or elaborate if needed, so that comments clearly reflect and justify your scores.
- All scores and comments must be completed before panel discussions can be held.
- After discussion, revise your Preliminary TRF to reflect any changes you want to make.

Writing strengths and weaknesses:

- Make clear, evaluative statements about the substance of the criterion being discussed.
- Substantiate all evaluative statements using evidence from the application narrative, evidence tables, performance measures, appendices, and/or budgets.
- You may comment on information that is missing or inconsistent with other parts of the application.
- Write for a broad audience. Avoid expressions and jargon that might not be commonly understood.

Scoring:

- You may choose to break comments down by subcriteria, which will make them easier to read and review. This is preferred but optional.
- When awarding points, you should NOT break down scores by sub-criteria. Each criterion receives one total score as directed in the TRF (for example, (a)(1)(i-ii) receives one score).
- A few criteria may not be applicable to every application. If so, follow the instructions in the TRF.

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application C Reviewer 1

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>(a) Consultation. Evidence that the SEA or consortium has developed an innovative assessment system in collaboration with--</p> <p>(1) Experts in the planning, development, implementation, and evaluation of innovative assessment systems, which may include external partners; and</p> <p>(2) Affected stakeholders in the State, or in each State in the consortium, including--</p> <p>(i) Those representing the interests of children with disabilities, English learners, and other subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act;</p> <p>(ii) Teachers, principals, and other school leaders;</p> <p>(iii) Local educational agencies (LEAs);</p> <p>(iv) Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State;</p> <p>(v) Students and parents, including parents of children described in paragraph (a)(2)(i) of this section; and</p> <p>(vi) Civil rights organizations.</p>	<p>(a)</p> <p>_____ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>__X__ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>_____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>(a)(1)</p> <p>The Hawai‘i Department of Education (HIDOE) is proposing an innovative assessment program, the Hawai‘i Comprehensive Assessment Program (HICAP), for English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics, based on (a) a shortened summative computer-adaptive test (CAT) comprised of Smarter Balanced Assessments (SBA) items, and (b) classroom-based assessments to inform instruction and learning. The summative tests will be designed to meet the federal requirements of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).</p> <p>The HIDOE’s test development contractor, Cambium Assessment (formerly, Assessment Division of the American Institutes for Research), and the Center for Assessment will serve as external partners to provide technical assistance throughout the development, administration, improvement, and continued evaluation of the HICAP. The HIDOE’s Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), a group of national experts in educational measurement, will also provide technical advice to the HIDOE regarding the HICAP.</p> <p>(a)(2)(i)(ii)(v)</p> <p>Since 2016, the HIDOE has gathered input from a broad spectrum of stakeholders, including field-level teachers, administrators, the Hawai‘i State Public Charter School Commission, legislative representatives, the Hawai‘i State Teachers Association (HSTA), and key HIDOE personnel and offices. Methods for gathering input include (a) statewide surveys of teachers and principals; (b) meetings and communications with state leaders and staff from the HIDOE curriculum, standards, English Learners, and special education offices; (c) an aspirational document for public education in Hawai‘i (Hawai‘i’s Blueprint for Public Education) crafted by the Governor’s ESSA Task Force Team, which is comprised of leaders from the public, private, and non-profit sectors; and (d) technical meetings with the external partners.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
		<p>More recently, the HIDOE engaged WestEd to provide preliminary technical support and facilitation services to in-person meetings with statewide school-level administrators and teachers and legislative and nonprofit representatives. (2019). Similarly, in a January 2020 presentation, the HIDOE gathered input from the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), an advisory panel to the HIDOE regarding education matters impacting all eligible children with disabilities,</p> <p>(a)(2)(iv and vi) The proposal does not include any specific references to gathering input from representatives of Indian tribes located in the State or from civil rights organizations.</p>
<p><u>(b)Innovative assessment system.</u> A demonstration that the innovative assessment system does or will-- (1) Meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(2)(B) of the Act, except that an innovative assessment-- (i) Need not be the same assessment administered to all public elementary and secondary school students in the State during the demonstration authority period described in 34 CFR 200.104(b)(2) or extension period described in 34 CFR 200.108 and prior to statewide use consistent with 34 CFR 200.107, if the innovative assessment system will be administered initially to all students in participating schools within a participating LEA, provided that the</p>	<p>(b)(1) __X__ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. ____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ____ Application does not</p>	<p>(b)(1) For purposes of meeting the requirements of section 1111(b)(2)(B) of the ESSA, the HIDOE will use the shortened summative CAT to meet federal accountability requirement assessments and to produce annual differentiated determinations at the individual student, student group, school, and district/state levels. Students who participate in the HICAP shortened summative CAT will be included in the State’s accountability model for both proficiency and participation. With an approved exemption from the United States Department of Education (USDOE), student participants in the HICAP will be exempt from the statewide summative assessment in the same content area(s).</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>statewide academic assessments under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act are administered to all students in any non-participating LEA or any non-participating school within a participating LEA; and</p> <p>(ii) Need not be administered annually in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in grades 9-12 in the case of reading/language arts and mathematics assessments, and at least once in grades 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12 in the case of science assessments, so long as the statewide academic assessments under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act are administered in any required grade and subject under 34 CFR 200.5(a)(1) in which the SEA does not choose to implement an innovative assessment.</p>	<p>demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(2)(i) Align with the challenging State academic content standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act, including the depth and breadth of such standards, for the grade in which a student is enrolled; and</p> <p>(ii) May measure a student’s academic proficiency and growth using items above or below the student’s grade level so long as, for</p>	<p>(b)(2)</p> <p><u> X </u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u> </u> Application only partially</p>	<p>(b)(2)(i)</p> <p>The initial item pool for the shortened summative CAT in ELA and mathematics will be populated with Smarter Balanced test items. The Hawai‘i ELA shortened summative CAT Grade 4 blueprint and the mathematics shortened summative CAT Grade 8 blueprint will mirror the content categories and DOK (Depth of Knowledge) reflected in the 2019-20 Hawai‘i Smarter Balanced summative blueprints for grade 4 ELA and grade 8 mathematics, respectively. Preliminary ELA and mathematics simulations results provided a crosswalk between the long and short summative blueprints that demonstrated that the shortened test is a nearly proportional reduction of the longer one across all relevant categories</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>purposes of meeting the requirements for reporting and school accountability under sections 1111(c) and 1111(h) of the Act and paragraphs (b)(3) and (b)(7)-(9) of this section, the State measures each student’s academic proficiency based on the challenging State academic standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled;</p>	<p>demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>and standards. The HIDOE will also work with the Center for Assessment, Cambium Assessment, and the Hawai‘i State Department of Education’s TAC, to develop technically acceptable comparable annual determinations, including pre-equating the shortened summative CAT with the same parameters as those of the SBA for administration of the HICAP in Year 1 to ensure that the shortened summative CAT scale scores are psychometrically sound. Other considerations in developing comparable annual determinations include percent of blueprint match, exposure, and use, and simulations.</p> <p>(b)(2)(ii) The shortened summative CAT will be aligned to the state content standards and provide information about student attainment of such standards at the student’s grade level. The classroom-based assessments will provide teachers the opportunity to design, develop, and score classroom-based assessments that are aligned to the State’s adopted content standards. These assessments will be administered at different time(s) during the school year to generate standards-based grades for each grade-level content standard. Through the HICAP, teachers will be able to explore the impact of a variety of classroom-based assessments, such as performance-based assessments, portfolios, project-based learning assessments, interim assessments, presentations, and learning logs, on the learning progressions of their students. In addition, teachers will be trained to use a web-based platform (WBP) to manage, design, grade, score and report the classroom-based assessments. The Center for Assessment consultants will support the HIDOE in structuring high-quality professional development opportunities to enhance teachers’ assessment practices that support instruction and learning.</p>
<p>(3) Express student results or competencies consistent with the challenging State academic achievement standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act and identify which students are not making</p>	<p>(b)(3) ____ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during</p>	<p>(b)(3) The shortened summative CATs, administered for accountability purposes, will result in an overall scale score and proficiency level for each student. The aggregated results from these assessments will be used for school accountability purposes. The performance level descriptors (PLDs) for the shortened summative CATs will remain the same as those for the full summative</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
sufficient progress toward, and attaining, grade-level proficiency on such standards;	<p>the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u> X </u> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><u> </u> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>assessment to make determinations of which students are not making sufficient progress toward, and attaining, grade-level proficiency on these standards.</p> <p>The proposal does not provide a specific plan on how the HIDOE will make sure that the PLDs will remain consistent across the shortened summative and the full summative assessments in light of the expected reduction in reliability of the shortened summative assessment.</p>
(4)(i) Generate results, including annual summative determinations as defined in paragraph (b)(7) of this section, that are valid, reliable, and comparable for all students and for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and	<p>(b)(4)</p> <p><u> X </u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p>	<p>(b)(4)(i)</p> <p>HIDOE’s approach to the proposed shortened summative CAT is to continue with the processes and procedures that have been proved on the regular Smarter Balanced CAT assessments to provide valid and reliable summative assessment results in ELA and mathematics.</p> <p>(b)(4)(ii)</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, to the results generated by the State academic assessments described in 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act for such students.</p> <p>Consistent with the SEA’s or consortium’s evaluation plan under 34 CFR 200.106(e), the SEA must plan to annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period in one of the following ways:</p> <p>(A) Administering full assessments from both the innovative and statewide assessment systems to all students enrolled in participating schools, such that at least once in any grade span (i.e., 3-5, 6-8, or 9-12) and subject for which there is an innovative assessment, a statewide assessment in the same subject would also be administered to all such students. As part of this determination, the innovative assessment and statewide assessment need not be administered to an individual student in the same school year.</p> <p>(B) Administering full assessments from both the innovative and statewide assessment systems to a</p>	<p>____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>In accordance with method (C) to demonstrate comparability, the shortened summative CAT will be reported on the same scale as the regular Smarter Balanced CAT, proficiency level determinations (PLDs) for the shortened summative CAT will be the same as those for the Smarter Balanced Assessments, and the cut scores will be mapped to the same underlying item response theory proficiency values. In addition, the test blueprint for the shortened CAT will be reduced but proportionally representative of the test blueprint of the regular Smarter Balanced CAT. Analyses will be performed to confirm that the lower test reliabilities and higher conditional standard errors of measurement expected from the use of shortened forms do not adversely affect student assessment reporting (e.g., classification accuracy and classification consistency) or school accountability (e.g., either proficiency or growth) to degrees that are unacceptable technically or to policy. Other standard analyses will be performed to ensure that the shortened CAT is comparable to the regular Smarter Balanced CAT, including differential item functioning (DIF) analyses, comparability of reliability for student groups, and scale maintenance.</p> <p>(b)(4)(iii) The shortened summative CAT will support reporting overall scores by school and statewide for subgroups, as appropriate, required by the ESSA</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>demographically representative sample of all students and subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, from among those students enrolled in participating schools, such that at least once in any grade span (i.e., 3-5, 6-8, or 9-12) and subject for which there is an innovative assessment, a statewide assessment in the same subject would also be administered in the same school year to all students included in the sample.</p> <p>(C) Including, as a significant portion of the innovative assessment system in each required grade and subject in which both an innovative and statewide assessment are administered, items or performance tasks from the statewide assessment system that, at a minimum, have been previously pilot tested or field tested for use in the statewide assessment system.</p> <p>(D) Including, as a significant portion of the statewide assessment system in each required grade and subject in which both an innovative and statewide assessment are administered, items or performance tasks from the innovative assessment system that, at a minimum, have been previously pilot tested or field</p>		

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>tested for use in the innovative assessment system.</p> <p>(E) An alternative method for demonstrating comparability that an SEA can demonstrate will provide for an equally rigorous and statistically valid comparison between student performance on the innovative assessment and the statewide assessment, including for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act;</p> <p>(ii) Generate results, including annual summative determinations as defined in paragraph (b)(7) of this section, that are valid, reliable, and comparable, for all students and for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, among participating schools and LEAs in the innovative assessment demonstration authority. Consistent with the SEA’s or consortium’s evaluation plan under 34 CFR 200.106(e), the SEA must plan to annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period;</p>		

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>(5)(i) Provide for the participation of all students, including children with disabilities and English learners;</p> <p>(ii) Be accessible to all students by incorporating the principles of universal design for learning, to the extent practicable, consistent with 34 CFR 200.2(b)(2)(ii); and</p> <p>(iii) Provide appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act;</p>	<p>(b)(5)</p> <p><u> X </u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u> </u> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><u> </u> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>(b)(5)(i) Hawai‘i has established policies that require the participation of all students, including children with disabilities, English Learners (EL), and Hawaiian immersion students. Support for the use of accessibility features and accommodations during testing is found in the Hawai‘i Board of Education Policy 105-12. This policy states that the Hawai‘i Department of Education should: “Ensure that all schools provide an inclusive and accommodating environment to meet the individual needs of students.” The BOE policy is supported by the May 24, 2019 Hawai‘i Department of Education memo, which lays out the guidelines and framework that are used for accommodation decisions during summative testing. The same guidelines will be used for both the HICAP and statewide summative test forms.</p> <p>(b)(5)(ii & iii) Both the shortened summative CAT and the classroom-based assessments will appropriately provide universal tools, designated supports, and accommodations (as verified) for students with disabilities under the Individuals with Disability Education Improvement Act (IDEA) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, including English Language Learners (ELs), to measure their academic achievement. All accommodations for the statewide testing program and HICAP will require verification and prior approval before accommodation provision for testing by referencing the student’s IEP/504 record and/or EL plan. Given the same constructs of measure, students taking the HICAP assessments will be able to use the same approved supports as are provided during statewide summative testing.</p>
<p>(6) For purposes of the State accountability system consistent with section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the Act,</p>	<p>(b)(6)</p> <p><u> X </u> Application demonstrates a plan</p>	<p>The total number of students who participate in the statewide summative assessment and the HICAP will be factored in the 95 percent participation requirement of all students and 95 percent of students in each subgroup of</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>annually measure in each participating school progress on the Academic Achievement indicator under section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the Act of at least 95 percent of all students, and 95 percent of students in each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, who are required to take such assessments consistent with paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section;</p>	<p>to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>students under ESSA. Subject to approval by USDOE, those students participating in the HICAP may be exempt from double testing in the same content area(s). Further, and also subject to the approval by USDOE, the HICAP results will not be included in the computation of student proficiency as reported in Hawai‘i’s school accountability and performance reports. Instead, HIDOE proposes to use the HICAP data, both the shortened summative CAT and classroom-based assessment data, for continued evaluation and improvement of HICAP.</p>
<p>7) Generate an annual summative determination of achievement, using the annual data from the innovative assessment, for each student in a participating school in the</p>	<p>(b)(7) __X__ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during</p>	<p>(b)(7)(i) The shortened ELA and mathematics CAT for the HICAP will cover the breadth and depth of Hawai‘i’s content standards with an overall summary score to describe a student’s degree of attainment of the standards and whether the student is performing at the student’s grade level standards.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>demonstration authority that describes--</p> <p>(i) The student’s mastery of the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act for the grade in which the student is enrolled; or</p> <p>(ii) In the case of a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed with an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Act, the student’s mastery of those standards;</p>	<p>the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>(b)(7)(ii)</p> <p>All students enrolled in grades 3-8 and 11 are required to participate in the Smarter Balanced mathematics assessment except students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who meet the criteria for the mathematics alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards Similarly, all students enrolled in grades 3-8 and 11 are required to participate in the Smarter Balanced English language arts/literacy assessment except students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who meet the criteria for the English language arts/literacy alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards and ELs who are enrolled for the first year in a U.S. school. EL students instead participate in their required English language proficiency assessment.</p> <p>The shortened summative CAT in the innovative assessment program will not be administered to students with significant cognitive disabilities. No information is provided on whether there will be an alternate assessment for the summative CAT.</p>
<p>(8) Provide disaggregated results by each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, including timely data for teachers, principals and other school leaders, students, and parents consistent with</p>	<p>(b)(8)</p> <p>__X__ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p>	<p>(b)(8)</p> <p>The shortened summative CAT will support reporting overall scores by school and statewide for subgroups, as appropriate, required by the ESSA. HICAP will provide family reports (paper) to parents and provide access to online reports to teachers, principals, and other school leaders as soon as practicable after the CAT is administered, scored and quality checked.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>34 CFR 200.8 and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(x) and (xii) and section 1111(h) of the Act, and provide results to parents in a manner consistent with paragraph (b)(4)(i) of this section and part 200.2(e);</p>	<p>____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>The classroom-based assessment will provide information about learning that is either not readily available in time to inform instruction and/or is not covered in a form that is available in the shortened summative CAT to provide deeper learning. Participating teachers will be able to share the grades and reports from the classroom-based assessments with parents throughout the school year as the teacher-created assessments are administered and scored.</p>
<p>(9) Provide an unbiased, rational, and consistent determination of progress toward the State’s long-term goals for academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(A) of the Act for all students and each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act and a comparable measure of student performance on the Academic Achievement indicator under section</p>	<p>(b)(9)</p> <p>__X__ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan</p>	<p>(b)(9)(i)</p> <p>HIDOE will verify comparability at the scale score level between the current SBA summative assessments and shortened summative CAT by grade level and subject in order to provide an unbiased, rational, and consistent determination of progress for participating and non-participating schools. For example, the shortened ELA CAT for grades 4 and 8 for the HICAP (Year 1) will be reviewed for alignment to Hawai‘i’s Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for the same grade. In addition, the HIDOE’s proposes the use of computer simulations for determining score comparability, given that the shortened CAT is almost entirely a subset of the regular CAT and is intended to be reported on the same scale.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>1111(c)(4)(B) of the Act for participating schools relative to non-participating schools so that the SEA may validly and reliably aggregate data from the system for purposes of meeting requirements for--</p> <p>(i) Accountability under sections 1003 and 1111(c) and (d) of the Act, including how the SEA will identify participating and non-participating schools in a consistent manner for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement under section 1111(c)(4)(D) of the Act; and</p> <p>(ii) Reporting on State and LEA report cards under section 1111(h) of the Act.</p>	<p>to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>_____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>HIDOE will investigate additional means for assessing score comparability with its TAC and the Center for Assessment. For example, comparability of scores between participant and non-participant schools could be evaluated through a propensity score matching study where students in the two samples are matched on key variables to create randomly equivalent groups. The HIDOE will also work with the Center for Assessment to investigate implications of differences, if any, in reliability through, for example, decision consistency analyses at the individual, student group, and school levels.</p> <p>(b)(9)ii)</p> <p>Several Hawai‘i State Board of Education policies have established a comprehensive statewide assessment and accountability program that provides annual data on academic mastery, content and performance standards, student promotion, and school and system performance reporting by benchmark grade levels and nationally representative norms. The results of the statewide assessment and accountability program are reported publicly, at least annually, while maintaining student privacy. Beginning in Year 1 of the HICAP, the results of the shortened summative CAT will be included in the statewide accountability program.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>(d) <u>Assurances.</u></p> <p>This application contains assurances that the lead SEA and each SEA applying as a consortium will:</p> <p>(1) Continue use of the statewide academic assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science required under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act--</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) In all non-participating schools; and</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(ii) In all participating schools for which such assessments will be used in addition to innovative assessments for accountability purposes under section 1111(c) of the Act consistent with paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section or for evaluation purposes consistent with 34 CFR 200.106(e) during the demonstration authority period;</p>	<p>(d)(1)</p> <p><u> X </u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u> </u> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><u> </u> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>(d)(1)</p> <p>The HIDOE’s application includes assurance that it will continue use of the statewide academic assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science required under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act—</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) In all non-participating schools; and</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(ii) In all participating schools for which such assessments will be used in addition to innovative assessments for accountability purposes under section 1111(c) of the Act consistent with paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section or for evaluation purposes consistent with 34 CFR 200.106(e) during the demonstration authority period;</p>
<p>(2) Ensure that all students and each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act in</p>	<p>(d)(2)</p> <p><u> </u> Application demonstrates a plan</p>	<p>The HIDOE will ensure that all students and each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act in participating schools are held to the same challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>participating schools are held to the same challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act as all other students, except that students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may be assessed with alternate assessments aligned with alternate academic achievement standards consistent with 34 CFR 200.6 and section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D) of the Act, and receive the instructional support needed to meet such standards;</p>	<p>to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>as all other students, except that students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may be assessed with alternate assessments aligned with alternate academic achievement standards consistent with 34 CFR 200.6 and section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D) of the Act, and receive the instructional support needed to meet such standards.</p>
<p>(3) Report the following annually to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may reasonably require:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) An update on implementation of the</p>	<p>(d)(3)</p> <p>__X__ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during</p>	<p>(d)(3)(i)</p> <p>The HDOE will ensure to report the following annually to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may reasonably require:</p> <p>(i) An update on implementation of the innovative assessment demonstration authority, including--</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>innovative assessment demonstration authority, including--</p> <p>(A) The SEA’s progress against its timeline under 34 CFR 200.106(c) and any outcomes or results from its evaluation and continuous improvement process under 34 CFR 200.106(e); and</p> <p>(B) If the innovative assessment system is not yet implemented statewide consistent with 34 CFR 200.104(a)(2), a description of the SEA’s progress in scaling up the system to additional LEAs or schools consistent with its strategies under 34 CFR 200.106(a)(3)(i), including updated assurances from participating LEAs consistent with paragraph (e)(2) of this section.</p> <p>(ii) The performance of students in participating schools at the State, LEA, and school level, for all students and disaggregated for each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, on the</p>	<p>the course of the authority period.</p> <p>_____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>_____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>A. The SEA’s progress against its timeline under 34 CFR 200.106(c) and any outcomes or results from its evaluation and continuous improvement process under 34 CFR 200.106(e); and</p> <p>B. If the innovative assessment system is not yet implemented statewide consistent with 34 CFR 200.104(a)(2), a description of the SEA’s progress in scaling up the system to additional LEAs or schools consistent with its strategies under 34 CFR 200.106(a)(3)(i), including updated assurances from participating LEAs consistent with paragraph (e)(2) of this section.</p> <p>(ii) The performance of students in participating schools at the State, LEA, and school level, for all students and disaggregated for each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, on the innovative assessment, including academic achievement and participation data required to be reported consistent with section 1111(h) of the Act, except that such data may not reveal any personally identifiable information.</p> <p>(iii) If the innovative assessment system is not yet implemented statewide, school demographic information, including enrollment and student achievement information, for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, among participating schools and LEAs and for any schools or LEAs that will participate for the first time in the following year, and a description of how the participation of any additional schools or LEAs in that year contributed to progress toward achieving high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse LEAs in the State consistent with the SEA’s benchmarks described in 34 CFR 200.106(a)(3)(iii).</p> <p>(iv) Feedback from teachers, principals and other school leaders, and other stakeholders consulted under paragraph (a)(2) of this section, including parents and students, from participating schools and LEAs about their satisfaction with the innovative assessment system.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>innovative assessment, including academic achievement and participation data required to be reported consistent with section 1111(h) of the Act, except that such data may not reveal any personally identifiable information. 18 (iii) If the innovative assessment system is not yet implemented statewide, school demographic information, including enrollment and student achievement information, for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, among participating schools and LEAs and for any schools or LEAs that will participate for the first time in the following year, and a description of how the participation of any additional schools or LEAs in that year contributed to progress toward achieving high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse LEAs in the State consistent</p>		

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>with the SEA’s benchmarks described in 34 CFR 200.106(a)(3)(iii). (iv) Feedback from teachers, principals and other school leaders, and other stakeholders consulted under paragraph (a)(2) of this section, including parents and students, from participating schools and LEAs about their satisfaction with the innovative assessment system;</p>		
<p>(4) Ensure that each participating LEA informs parents of all students in participating schools about the innovative assessment, including the grades and subjects in which the innovative assessment will be administered, and, consistent with section 1112(e)(2)(B) of the Act, at the beginning of each school year during which an innovative assessment will be implemented. Such information must be--</p> <p>(i) In an understandable and uniform format; (ii) To the extent practicable, written in a language that parents can understand or, if</p>	<p>(d)(4) <u> X </u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u> </u> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement</i></p>	<p>(d)(4) The HDOE will ensure that each participating LEA informs parents of all students in participating schools about the innovative assessment, including the grades and subjects in which the innovative assessment will be administered, and, consistent with section 1112(e)(2)(B) of the Act, at the beginning of each school year during which an innovative assessment will be implemented. Such information must be--</p> <p>(i) In an understandable and uniform format; (ii) To the extent practicable, written in a language that parents can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent with limited English proficiency, be orally translated for such parent; and (iii) Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act, provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent with limited English proficiency, be orally translated for such parent; and</p> <p>(iii) Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act, provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent; and</p>	<p><i>were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(5) Coordinate with and provide information to, as applicable, the Institute of Education Sciences for purposes of the progress report described in section 1204(c) of the Act and ongoing dissemination of information under section 1204(m) of the Act.</p>	<p>(d)(5)</p> <p>__X__ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>(d)(5)</p> <p>The HIDOE will ensure to coordinate with and provide information to, as applicable, the Institute of Education Sciences for purposes of the progress report described in section 1204(c) of the Act and ongoing dissemination of information under section 1204(m) of the Act.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p><u>(e) Initial implementation in a subset of LEAs or schools. If the innovative assessment system will initially be administered in a subset of LEAs or schools in a State--</u> (1) A description of each LEA, and each of its participating schools, that will initially participate, including demographic information and its most recent LEA report card under section 1111(h)(2) of the Act; and (2) An assurance from each participating LEA, for each year that the LEA is participating, that the LEA will comply with all requirements of this section.</p>	<p>(e) __X__ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. ____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ____ Application does not demonstrate a plan</p>	<p>(e)(1) The HICAP will be implemented to a subset of tested grades in Hawai‘i’s public schools in the initial five years of the IADA. Throughout the IADA period, the HIDOE will ensure that the subsets of participants will represent the geographic differences of Hawai‘i’s public schools and the ethnic diversity of Hawai‘i’s public school students. Profiles of the schools and students are included in the proposal.</p> <p>(e)(2) The required assurances include signed letters of support for the HICAP from the State Superintendent of Hawai‘i, the Chairperson of the Hawai‘i Board of Education, HIDOE Complex Area Superintendents, Executive Director of the Hawai‘i State Public Charter School Commission, HIDOE school principals, President of the Hawai‘i State Teachers Association, and President of the Hawai‘i State Parent Teacher Student Association.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i> OR This requirement is not applicable to this application</p>	
<p><u>(f)Application from a consortium of SEAs.</u> If an application for the innovative assessment demonstration authority is submitted by a consortium of SEAs-- (1) A description of the governance structure of the consortium, including-- (i) The roles and responsibilities of each member SEA, which may include a description of affiliate members, if applicable, and must include a description of financial responsibilities of member SEAs; (ii) How the member SEAs will manage and, at their discretion, share intellectual property developed by the consortium as a group; and (iii) How the member SEAs will consider requests from SEAs to join or leave the consortium and ensure</p>	<p>(f) ____ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. ____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ____ Application does not demonstrate a plan</p>	<p>Not applicable. Hawai’i is not applying as part of a consortium of SEAs.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>that changes in membership do not affect the consortium’s ability to implement the innovative assessment demonstration authority consistent with the requirements and selection criteria in this section and 34 CFR 200.106.</p> <p>(2) While the terms of the association with affiliate members are defined by each consortium, consistent with 34 CFR 200.104(b)(1) and paragraph (f)(1)(i) of this section, for an affiliate member to become a full member of the consortium and to use the consortium’s innovative assessment system under the demonstration authority, the consortium must submit a revised application to the Secretary for approval, consistent with the requirements of this section and 34 CFR 200.106 and subject to the limitation under 34 CFR 200.104(d).</p>	<p>to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>This requirement is not applicable to this application</p>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>(a) Project narrative. The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s plan for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the plan, the Secretary considers--</p> <p>(a)(1) ; (5 points if factor (3) is applicable; 10 points if factor (3) is inapplicable) The rationale for developing or selecting the particular innovative assessment system to be implemented under the demonstration authority, including--</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) The distinct purpose of each assessment that is part of the innovative</p>	(a)(1):	5	<p>One important factor driving the HIDOE’s IADA proposal is the concern expressed by surveyed teachers and principals across the state that the testing time involved in the administration of the Smarter Balanced Assessments (SBA) should be reduced along with the need to consider authentic assessment alternatives to the SBA, such as performance assessments, portfolios, and other demonstrations of mastery of academic standards.</p> <p>In response to these concerns, the HIDOE is proposing an innovative assessment in ELA and mathematics made up of a shortened summative</p>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>assessment system and how the system will advance the design and delivery of large-scale, statewide academic assessments in innovative ways; and</p> <p>(ii) The extent to which the innovative assessment system as a whole will promote high-quality instruction, mastery of challenging State academic standards, and improved student outcomes, including for each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act; (5 points if factor (3) is applicable; 10 points if factor (3) is inapplicable)</p>			<p>and classroom-based assessments. The shortened summative CAT will be administered at the end of the school year, and will be used to decrease the time required for standardized testing, and to meet federal accountability requirements. The classroom-based assessments will be administered at various times during the school year. Results will be used to provide teachers with information to support instruction and guide students in their learning. To this end, the classroom-based assessments will be grounded in cognitive development theory about how learning progresses across grades and competence develops over time to allow for more innovative and fine-grained measurement of student progress toward the State standards.</p> <p>(a)(ii) An essential component of the HICAP proposal is to have teachers meaningfully engaged in its development. The HDOE anticipates that teachers will have the opportunity to design and administer classroom-based assessments of their choosing that</p>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
			<p>can provide useful instructional information to support student learning throughout the school year. To help in this endeavor, the HIDOE will use a two-pronged approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers will be trained to use an online system or web-based platform (WBP) to support their application of the standards-based grading and reporting features. The WBP comes with item authoring capabilities, test administration tools, and Common Core State Standards to be used as criteria for grading. The Center for Assessment will create professional development opportunities to enhance teachers’ assessment literacy and capacity for professional practice. <p>Through this approach, the HIDOE expects to improve the HIDOE’s capacity to promote high-quality instruction, mastery of challenging State academic standards, and improved student outcomes, including for each subgroup of students.</p>	
(a)(2) (25 points if factor (3) is applicable; 30 points if factor (3)	(a)(2):	20	(a)(2)(i)	The proposal does not include any information about the use of a

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>is inapplicable) The plan the SEA or consortium, in consultation with any external partners, if applicable, has to--</p> <p>(i) Develop and use standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, methods, or other strategies for scoring innovative assessments throughout the demonstration authority period, consistent with relevant nationally recognized professional and technical standards, to ensure inter-rater reliability and comparability of innovative assessment results consistent with 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4)(ii), which may include evidence of inter-rater reliability; and</p> <p>(ii) Train evaluators to use such strategies, if applicable; (25 points if factor (3) is applicable; 30 points if factor (3) is inapplicable) and</p>			<p>The proposed shortened summative assessments will consist of Smarter Balanced ELA and mathematics test questions that are aligned to Hawai‘i’s state-adopted content standards and constitute a blueprint-conforming set. To ensure adherence to relevant nationally recognized psychometric standards, the HIDOE will continue using the same processes and procedures that have been proved on the regular Smarter Balanced CAT assessments to provide valid and reliable summative assessment results. In addition, HIDOE will work with its partners to establish comparability of the assessed content along several lines, including blueprint, coverage of standards, achievement level descriptors, reporting categories, and test scores.</p> <p>(2)(a)(ii) The HIDOE will work with the Center for Assessment to train participating teachers on how to develop items for both the shortened summative CATs and the classroom-based assessments. To this end, the Center will work with participating teachers and policy stakeholders to</p>	<p>framework, such as an Evidence-Centered Design process, to help organize activities typically involved in large-scale assessment design, such as application of principles of universal design, technical reviews, and development of scoring guidelines.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
			develop test maps that assess the full range of the State standards for the initial two grade levels (grade 4 for ELA and grade 8 for mathematics) as the basis to enhance teachers’ understanding of alignment of items and assessments to content standards, competency in aligning grading practices to the principles of standards-based grading and reporting, and professional judgement to appropriately evaluate student results from the classroom-based assessments against the state-adopted content standards.	
(a)(3) (10 points, if applicable) If the system will initially be administered in a subset of schools or LEAs in a State-- (i) The strategies the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, will use to scale the innovative assessment to all schools statewide, with a rationale for selecting those strategies; (ii) The strength of the SEA’s or consortium’s criteria that will be used to determine LEAs and schools that will initially participate and when to approve additional LEAs and schools, if	(a)(3):	7	(a)(3)(i) The HICAP will be implemented to a subset of tested grades in Hawai‘i’s public schools during the five years of the IADA. In Year 1 (2020-2021), HICAP will include approximately 100 ELA teachers and 25 mathematics teachers and an estimated number of 2,000 students in grade 4 students and 2,000 in grade 8 who are representative of the geographic differences and the ethnic diversity of Hawai‘i’s public school students. (a)(3)(ii)	The proposal does not provide specific information related to annual benchmarks to track consistent implementation across participating schools and whether schools taking part in the innovative assessment are demonstrating shifts in instructional practices.

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>applicable, to participate during the requested demonstration authority period; and</p> <p>(iii) The SEA’s plan, including each SEA in a consortium, for how it will ensure that, during the demonstration authority period, the inclusion of additional LEAs and schools continues to reflect high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse LEAs and schools, or contributes to progress toward achieving such implementation across demographically diverse LEAs and schools, including diversity based on enrollment of subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act and student achievement. The plan must also include annual benchmarks toward achieving high-quality and consistent implementation across participating schools that are, as a group, demographically similar to the State as a whole during the demonstration authority period, using the demographics of initially participating schools as a baseline.</p> <p>(10 points, if applicable)</p>			<p>This initial student sample size will be expanded to 10,000 and 14,000 in three grade levels in Years 2 and 3, respectively, and 22,000 in grades 4-8 and 11 in Years 4 and 5.</p> <p>Throughout the IADA period, HIDOE will ensure that the subset of the HICAP participants will continue to represent the geographic differences and the ethnic diversity of Hawai‘i’s public school students. In addition, teacher participants will be selected based on their interest in learning and applying innovative approaches to assessment and learning, and their commitment to learning and enhancing their skill sets in assessment strategies and practices.</p> <p>(a)(3)(iii)</p>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
Total (out of 40) Criteria (a) (auto-total):	32			
(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support. (Up to 20 points total) (b)(1) (5 points) The extent and depth of prior experience that the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, and its LEAs have in developing and implementing the components of the innovative assessment system. An SEA may also describe the prior experience of any external partners that will be participating in or supporting its demonstration authority in implementing those components. In evaluating the extent and depth of prior experience, the Secretary considers— (i) The success and track record of efforts to implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items aligned to the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act in LEAs planning to participate; and (ii) The SEA’s or LEA’s development or use of--	(b)(1):	5	(b)(1)(i) For over a decade, the HIDOE has been working with its external partners in designing innovative statewide assessments used for accountability purposes, including initiatives on computer adaptive tests (CAT) that involved teacher input as well as machine-scoring of items for both the general and alternate student populations. Additionally, Hawaii’s participation in the development and implementation of the innovative SBA assessments has provided the opportunity to HIDOE staff to learn about supporting statewide computer-based testing, developing innovative assessment items, and establishing comparability of tests. (b)(1)(iA) The HIDOE requires students with an Individualized Education Program (IEP) and/or an EL Plan to receive appropriate accommodations as specified in the IEP or the EL Plan and as used routinely in the classroom. For each test administration, staff training on the	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>(A) Effective supports and appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR part 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act for administering innovative assessments to all students, including English learners and children with disabilities, which must include professional development for school staff on providing such accommodations;</p> <p>(B) Effective and high-quality supports for school staff to implement innovative assessments and innovative assessment items, including professional development; and</p> <p>(C) Standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, methods, or other strategies for scoring innovative assessments, with documented evidence of the validity, reliability, and comparability of annual summative determinations of achievement, consistent with 34</p>			<p>delivery of accommodations is provided and required prior to the administration. These same requirements and processes will be implemented for the HICAP assessments. The HIDOE will also conduct monitoring visits at the participating schools following the same procedures and protocols used for the statewide summative assessments to monitor the administration of the shortened summative assessment according to policies and regulations.</p> <p>(b)(1)(iB) The Center for Assessment will assist HIDOE in adapting Smarter Balanced test specifications to ensure a quality item development process for the shortened summative assessments. The Center for Assessment will also work with participating teachers and policy stakeholders to develop items and test maps that assess the full range of the State standards for both the summative and classroom-based assessments as the basis for professional development to empower teachers to design and administer their own assessments to</p>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
CFR part 200.105(b)(4) and (7). (5 points)			<p>obtain useful information to support instruction and student learning.</p> <p>(b)(1)(iC) The item pool for the shortened summative CATs will be comprised of Smarter Balanced items that have been field tested and reviewed for bias, sensitivity and alignment to the content standards. Due to the reduction in the number of test questions of the shortened summative CAT, HIDOE will work with the Center for Assessment, Cambium Assessment, and the Hawai‘i State Department of Education’s TAC, to develop technically acceptable comparable annual determinations, including pre-equating the shortened summative CAT with the same parameters as those of the SBA for administration of the HICAP in Year 1 to ensure that the shortened summative CAT scale scores are psychometrically sound. Other considerations in developing comparable annual determinations include percent of blueprint match, exposure, and use, and simulations.</p>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>(b)(2) (5 points) The extent and depth of SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, and LEA capacity to implement the innovative assessment system considering the availability of technological infrastructure; State and local laws; dedicated and sufficient staff, expertise, and resources; and other relevant factors. An SEA or consortium may also describe how it plans to enhance its capacity by collaborating with external partners that will be participating in or supporting its demonstration authority. In evaluating the extent and depth of capacity, the Secretary considers--</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) The SEA’s analysis of how capacity influenced the success of prior efforts to develop and implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items; and</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(ii) The strategies the SEA is using, or will use, to mitigate risks, including those identified in its analysis, and support successful implementation</p>	(b)(2):	5	<p>(b)(2)(i) The HIDOE and its nationally-recognized partners specializing in all aspects of assessment-related projects, bring together extensive resources and technical experience to the success of the IADA proposal. With the adoption of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), HIDOE has been developing its implementation of CAT and machine-scoring initiatives in consultation with these test development contractors for the past ten years.</p> <p>(b)(2)(ii) HIDOE’s assessment and administration vendors will provide ongoing psychometric support for the duration of the demonstration period to handle issues that may arise during each phase of summative and classroom-based assessment development. In addition to the HIDOE state-level staff, additional capacity and expertise will be brought to the project through its TAC, the Center for Assessment, and other partners.</p>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
of the innovative assessment. (5 points)			Since the HICAP will rely on the use of technology by both teachers and students, the HIDOE’s Assessment Section will work with school-level staff to ensure that participating teachers and their students have access to computers that have a reliable Internet connection and can be used for instruction during the school year. Test vendors will provide customer support (phone and email) to respond to questions from the field regarding access and technical support, and will be responsible for online test setup and secure access, monitoring, and maintaining systems that, in the event of power or internet failure, capture student answers and store them for upload when connectivity is restored.	
(b)(3) (10 points) The extent and depth of State and local support for the application for demonstration authority in each SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, as demonstrated by signatures from the following: (i) Superintendents (or equivalent) of LEAs, including participating	(b)(3):	8	(b)(3)(i and ii) Letters of support with signatures from the Chairperson of the Hawai‘i Board of Education, HIDOE Complex Area Superintendents, Executive Director of the Hawai‘i State Public Charter School Commission, HIDOE school principals, President of the Hawai‘i State Teachers Association, and	(b)(3)(iii)(iv) The proposal does not provide evidence of support from other affected stakeholders, such as labor organizations, civil rights organizations, and business organizations.

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority period.</p> <p>(ii) Presidents of local school boards (or equivalent, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority.</p> <p>(iii) Local teacher organizations (including labor organizations, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority.</p> <p>(iv) Other affected stakeholders, such as parent organizations, civil rights organizations, and business organizations.</p> <p>(10 points)</p>			<p>President of the Hawai‘i State Parent Teacher Student Association underscore the high level of commitment of each participant to the implementation and success of the IADA proposal.</p> <p>(b)(3)(iii)(iv) The proposal does not provide evidence of support from other affected stakeholders, such as labor organizations, civil rights organizations, and business organizations.</p>	
Total (out of 20) Criteria (b) (auto-total):		18		
<p>(c) Timeline and budget. (Up to 15 points)</p> <p>The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s timeline and budget for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the</p>	(c)(1):	3	<p>(c)(1)(i) The HIDOE has identified a five-year plan to implement the HICAP in ELA and mathematics by grade level. In Year 1 (SY2020-21), for example, the HIDOE will develop blueprints for the shortened</p>	<p>(c)(1)(ii) The HIDOE’s five year plan does not provide information on identifying staff with clearly defined roles and responsibilities to lead and manage project activities. This ensures the existence of an appropriate structure</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>quality of the timeline and budget, the Secretary considers-- (c)(1) (5 points). The extent to which the timeline reasonably demonstrates that each SEA will implement the system statewide by the end of the requested demonstration authority period, including a description of--</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The activities to occur in each year of the requested demonstration authority period; (ii) The parties responsible for each activity; and (iii) If applicable, how a consortium’s member SEAs will implement activities at different paces and how the consortium will implement interdependent activities, so long as each non-affiliate member SEA begins using the innovative assessment in the same school year consistent with 34 CFR part 200.104(b)(2); (5 points) and 			<p>summative CATs in grade 4 ELA and grade 8 mathematics, and administer and automatically score these assessments, develop test coordinator and administrator instructions and guidelines, disseminate HICAP system, communications materials, develop and implement professional development program and training sessions for participating teachers and school leaders, and collect data to evaluate results. The plan identifies similar key activities for Years 2 through 5 of the IADA period.</p> <p>(c)(1)(iii) Not applicable. The HDOE’s proposal will not be implemented through a consortium.</p>	<p>that has the capacity to provide overall leadership and oversight of completion of activities and of the deliverables resulting from these activities.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>(c)(2) (10 points).The adequacy of the project budget for the duration of the requested demonstration authority period, including Federal, State, local, and non-public sources of funds to support and sustain, as applicable, the activities in the timeline under paragraph (c)(1) of this section, including--</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) How the budget will be sufficient to meet the expected costs at each phase of the SEA’s planned expansion of its innovative assessment system; and (ii) The degree to which funding in the project budget is contingent upon future appropriations at the State or local level or additional commitments from non-public sources of funds. (10 points) 	(c)(2):	7	<p>(c)(2)(i) In addition to IADA funding, if awarded, HIDOE will leverage existing state and federal funding sources for student assessment and related staff support structures to develop, pilot, and scale the new HICAP innovative assessment.</p> <p>(c)(2)(ii) The HIDOE’s budget estimated for the initial years of the demonstration authority period appears to be sufficient, given HIDOE’s plan to begin the proposal with a subset of students in grade 4 ELA and grade 8 mathematics in Year 1 (2020-21), before expanding the HICAP assessments to additional grade levels and schools. Beyond Year 1, HIDOE plans to pursue additional funding to pilot and scale the HICAP, given that the HIDOE will also need to continue administration of current Smarter Balanced assessments in all schools in the subject areas not included in this request and in non-participating schools in ELA and mathematics, as well as other statewide assessments, such as English language assessments and assessments aligned</p>	<p>While the HIDOE, as described in (d)(1), is devoting staff in various offices to plan professional development opportunities for educators who participate in the HICAP, the proposal does not provide specific information on comprehensive plans to support implementation of the innovative assessment on an ongoing basis with internal capacity throughout the IADA period, such as realignment of FTEs and allocation of resources. The proposed budget does not include either information on how the HIDOE intends to integrate and sustain the proposed training and guiding resources into a systematic program of professional development of sufficient quality, intensity and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of the proposed services.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application "C"-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
			to alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.	
Total (out of 15) Criteria (c):	<u>10</u>			
(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents. (Up to 25 points) The quality of the SEA or consortium's plan to provide supports that can be delivered consistently at scale to educators, students, and parents to enable successful implementation of the innovative assessment system and improve instruction and student outcomes. In determining the quality of supports, the Secretary considers-- (d)(1) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 9 points if factor (4) is inapplicable). The extent to which the SEA or consortium has developed, provided, and will continue to provide training to LEA and school staff, including teachers, principals, and other school leaders, that will familiarize them with the innovative assessment system and develop teacher capacity to implement instruction that is informed by the	(d)(1):	5	(d)(1) The HIDOE staff in the Offices of Curriculum and Instructional Design and Student Support Services, along with the Assessment and Accountability Branch staff, have begun planning professional development opportunities for educators who participate in the HICAP to support implementation of the IADA proposal. For example, using a variety of in-person, online modules and facilitated virtual support modalities, trainings and support will be provided for teachers, principals, school leaders, and other support staff related to the summative and classroom-based assessment concepts and practice, item/test development (including the use of the Web-based platform), standards-based grading and reporting, formative assessment practices, accessibility, and several other topics.	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
innovative assessment system and its results;				
(d)(2) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 8 points if factor (4) is inapplicable) The strategies the SEA or consortium has developed and will use to familiarize students and parents with the innovative assessment system;	(d)(2):	5	(d)(2) HIDOE will pursue a variety of parent and student outreach approaches, such as in-person stakeholder meetings or online webinars to hear feedback from parents and students about the innovative assessment model and how it can best meet their needs and the use of a dedicated portal to inform educators and interested community groups about HICAP through informational brochures, guides, and training modules to explain the innovative assessment model.	
(d)(3) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 8 points if factor (4) is inapplicable) The strategies the SEA will use to ensure that all students and each subgroup of students under section 1111(c)(2) of the Act in participating schools receive the support, including appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR part 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act,	(d)(3):	5	(d)(3) The HIDOE provides parents with a hardcopy report (“Family Report”) of student performance on the statewide summative assessments. The HICAP family report will maintain the format and detail that has been provided on HIDOE’s reports since the first administration of statewide computer adaptive tests in SY 2010-11.	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
needed to meet the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act; and			<p>The HDOE will also provide access to a WBP to give parents, teachers and students’ access to “user-friendly” standards-based grading and reporting in real time. The information provided will be specific and actionable and indicate academic strengths or areas of need. Teachers may then engage students in conversation about standards and expectations, and parents in conversations about how they may provide targeted support at home.</p> <p>Test vendors will ensure that their test delivery systems allow for the provision of accommodations such as text-to-speech, large print and other accessibility features as appropriate for students. For students who are unable to access the online platform, a system of test delivery in a paper format will be available.</p>	
(d)(4) (10 points if applicable). If the system includes assessment items that are locally developed or locally scored, the strategies and safeguards (e.g., test blueprints, item and task specifications, rubrics, scoring tools, documentation of quality control	(d)(4):	7	(d)(4) The HICAP item pool for the shortened summative CATs will be comprised of Smarter Balanced items that have been field tested and reviewed for bias, sensitivity and alignment to the content standards. The Center for Assessment,	The proposal does not provide information on how to evaluate the engagement of students and the benefits of the new item types included the classroom-based assessments through cognitive labs with students.

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>procedures, inter-rater reliability checks, audit plans) the SEA or consortium has developed, or plans to develop, to validly and reliably score such items, including how the strategies engage and support teachers and other staff in designing, developing, implementing, and validly and reliably scoring high-quality assessments; how the safeguards are sufficient to ensure unbiased, objective scoring of assessment items; and how the SEA will use effective professional development to aid in these efforts (10 points if applicable)</p>			<p>Cambium Assessment, Hawai‘i’s TAC, content experts, and Hawai‘i educators will provide support and guidance in the development and scoring of the shortened summative CATs.</p> <p>The HDOE’s Assessment Section will partner with curriculum and educational specialists, experts in developing classroom-based assessment types, and the WBP vendor, to provide high-quality professional development opportunities to enhance teachers’ assessment literacy and capacity for professional practice on building, administering, scoring and evaluating classroom-based assessments that are aligned to the State’s content standards and incorporate principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and associated supports and tools. Participating teachers will also receive training on a standards-based electronic grading system that can link content, lessons, and standards to show and monitor the progress of individual students or subgroups over time.</p>	<p>The proposal does not include specific information on the frequency and duration of the professional development offerings focused on the different assessments and their uses, and whether these offerings will be available on demand or at established dates. This has implications about the capacity of the system to provide this service to educators to meet their immediate and/or long-term targeted professional development needs.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
Total (out of 25) Criteria (d):	22			
<p>(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement. (Up to 20 points) The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s plan to annually evaluate its implementation of innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers—</p> <p>(e)(1) (12 points) The strength of the proposed evaluation of the innovative assessment system included in the application, including whether the evaluation will be conducted by an independent, experienced third party, and the likelihood that the evaluation will sufficiently determine the system’s validity, reliability, and comparability to the statewide assessment system consistent with the requirements of 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4) and (9); and</p>	(e)(1):	8	<p>(e)(1) The HIDOE and external partners will evaluate the shortened summative with respect to such criteria as whether meeting proficiency in the shortened summative CAT participants compares to meeting proficiency for non-participants for the statewide summative assessment; whether the shortened summative meets industry standards for test development; and whether the design and delivery of the shortened summative meets the principles of universal design for accessibility and supports for English Learners and students with disabilities.</p> <p>The HIDOE will employ an independent evaluator to conduct annual evaluations of the effectiveness of the classroom-based assessments to inform instruction with respect to the effectiveness of the professional development training in enhancing participants’ knowledge of the principles and practices of developing classroom-based assessments, the usability of the WBP in supporting the</p>	<p>The evaluation plan for the reliability of the classroom-based assessments is focused only on one type of reliability (inter-rater.) The plan for the shortened summative assessment does not include activities to address whether the steps taken to mitigate the loss of reliability of this assessment due to the use of fewer items are effective.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			development of materials, and adherence to industry standards related to validity and reliability.	
<p>(e)(2) (8 points) The SEA’s or consortium’s plan for continuous improvement of the innovative assessment system, including its process for--</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) Using data, feedback, evaluation results, and other information from participating LEAs and schools to make changes to improve the quality of the innovative assessment; and</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(ii) Evaluating and monitoring implementation of the innovative assessment system in participating LEAs and schools annually.</p>	(e)(2):	8	<p>(e)(2)(i) After each year of the demonstration period, the HIDOE and external partners will meet to review the evaluation results. This would ensure the continuous improvement of the innovative assessment with respect to test design and development, delivery, scoring and reporting, acceptance, professional development, communication to stakeholders, scaling, and other technical issues.</p> <p>(e)(2)(ii) Periodic input to the Hawai‘i State Board of Education and the TAC will be provided to ensure continuous improvement, and that the HIDOE is on track to complete the statewide expansion of the HICAP. Additional communications regarding updates of the HICAP will be provided to HIDOE offices and community leaders and educators via the HIDOE website, media sources, and various public education advocacy organizations.</p>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application "C"-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
Total (out of 20) Criteria (e): (auto-total)	<u>16</u>		
Total (a+b+c+d+e) (auto-total)	<u>98</u>		

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Instructions:

- The Panel Monitor will provide deadlines for submitting preliminary scores and comments.
- Review and score each application independently.
- Enter preliminary scores and comments into the Preliminary TRF.
- Send completed TRF to the Panel Monitor.
- The Panel Monitor will review scores and comments and ask you to clarify or elaborate if needed, so that comments clearly reflect and justify your scores.
- All scores and comments must be completed before panel discussions can be held.
- After discussion, revise your Preliminary TRF to reflect any changes you want to make.

Writing strengths and weaknesses:

- Make clear, evaluative statements about the substance of the criterion being discussed.
- Substantiate all evaluative statements using evidence from the application narrative, evidence tables, performance measures, appendices, and/or budgets.
- You may comment on information that is missing or inconsistent with other parts of the application.
- Write for a broad audience. Avoid expressions and jargon that might not be commonly understood.

Scoring:

- You may choose to break comments down by subcriteria, which will make them easier to read and review. This is preferred but optional.
- When awarding points, you should NOT break down scores by sub-criteria. Each criterion receives one total score as directed in the TRF (for example, (a)(1)(i-ii) receives one score).
- A few criteria may not be applicable to every application. If so, follow the instructions in the TRF.

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application C Reviewer 2

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>(a)Consultation. Evidence that the SEA or consortium has developed an innovative assessment system in collaboration with--</p> <p>(1) Experts in the planning, development, implementation, and evaluation of innovative assessment systems, which may include external partners; and</p> <p>(2) Affected stakeholders in the State, or in each State in the consortium, including--</p> <p>(i) Those representing the interests of children with disabilities, English learners, and other subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act;</p> <p>(ii) Teachers, principals, and other school leaders;</p> <p>(iii) Local educational agencies (LEAs);</p> <p>(iv) Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State;</p> <p>(v) Students and parents, including parents of children described in paragraph (a)(2)(i) of this section; and</p> <p>(vi) Civil rights organizations.</p>	<p>(a)</p> <p><u> X </u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u> </u> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><u> </u> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>Hawai'i appears to engage with stakeholder groups through a number of venues, including statewide surveys, an aspirational document from the governor, in-person meetings, and informal meetings. Engaged groups included local residents, HIDOE staff from curriculum, standards, English Learners, and special education offices, and national measurement experts.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p><u>(b)Innovative assessment system.</u> A demonstration that the innovative assessment system does or will-- (1) Meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(2)(B) of the Act, except that an innovative assessment-- (i) Need not be the same assessment administered to all public elementary and secondary school students in the State during the demonstration authority period described in 34 CFR 200.104(b)(2) or extension period described in 34 CFR 200.108 and prior to statewide use consistent with 34 CFR 200.107, if the innovative assessment system will be administered initially to all students in participating schools within a participating LEA, provided that the statewide academic assessments under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act are administered to all students in any non-participating LEA or any non-participating school within a participating LEA; and (ii) Need not be administered annually in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in grades 9-12 in the case of reading/language arts and mathematics assessments, and at least once in grades 3-5, 6-9, and 10-</p>	<p>(b)(1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>Hawai'i ensures all students not taking the HIDAC take the statewide assessment. Students taking the innovative assessment also take a shortened form of the computer-adaptive statewide assessment.</p> <p>Students who participate in the innovative assessment in one content area will take the statewide assessment in the other content area.</p> <p>The State indicates that subject to USDOE approval student participants in HICAP will be exempt from statewide summative assessment in some content areas.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>12 in the case of science assessments, so long as the statewide academic assessments under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act are administered in any required grade and subject under 34 CFR 200.5(a)(1) in which the SEA does not choose to implement an innovative assessment.</p>		
<p>(2)(i) Align with the challenging State academic content standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act, including the depth and breadth of such standards, for the grade in which a student is enrolled; and (ii) May measure a student’s academic proficiency and growth using items above or below the student’s grade level so long as, for purposes of meeting the requirements for reporting and school accountability under sections 1111(c) and 1111(h) of the Act and paragraphs (b)(3) and (b)(7)-(9) of this section, the State measures each student’s academic proficiency based on the challenging State academic standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled;</p>	<p>(b)(2) ____ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. __X__ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during</p>	<p>The HICAP is designed to be a shortened form of the statewide computer adaptive test. The blueprint of the shortened test is designed to be proportional in content coverage to the blueprint for the statewide test. The same performance level descriptors (PLDs) and cut scores will be used.</p> <p>Hawai’i acknowledges that the statewide test will be less reliable.</p> <p>The reliability of results and validity of inferences (e.g., classification accuracy, school accountability) from the new test will be evaluated using analyses such as computer simulation, DIF analyses, and propensity score matching.</p> <p>Assuming the statewide assessment was developed to maximize accuracy and efficiency, it seems unlikely a shortened form will be equally accurate.</p> <p>Hawai’i does not mention independent alignment studies to the content standards to ensure the new test is aligned. Depth of coverage could be a concern.</p> <p>Marginal reliabilities for the ELA reporting categories, based on the computer simulation, are unacceptably low (0.34 – 0.69). Scores from scales this unreliable should not be reported. Reliability for the shortened summative test, .86, is below expected for large stakes decision-making.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>Marginal reliabilities for mathematics are slightly better than for ELA, resulting in the same concerns.</p>
<p>(3) Express student results or competencies consistent with the challenging State academic achievement standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act and identify which students are not making sufficient progress toward, and attaining, grade-level proficiency on such standards;</p>	<p>(b)(3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p>	<p>The innovative test is designed to be a shortened form of the statewide computer adaptive test. The blueprint of the shortened test is designed to be proportional in content coverage to the blueprint for the statewide test. The same performance level descriptors (PLDs) and cut scores will be used.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i>	
<p>(4)(i) Generate results, including annual summative determinations as defined in paragraph (b)(7) of this section, that are valid, reliable, and comparable for all students and for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, to the results generated by the State academic assessments described in 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act for such students.</p> <p>Consistent with the SEA’s or consortium’s evaluation plan under 34 CFR 200.106(e), the SEA must plan to annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period in one of the following ways:</p> <p>(A) Administering full assessments from both the innovative and statewide assessment systems to all students enrolled in participating schools, such that at least once in any grade span (i.e., 3-5, 6-8, or 9-12)</p>	<p>(b)(4)</p> <p><u> X </u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u> </u> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><u> </u> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or</i></p>	<p>(i-ii) The plan for ensuring validity, reliability, and comparability is addressed. The State leans heavily on the shortened CAT being derived from the full length statewide assessment, and from using the same procedures used to develop the statewide assessment. The process has been started through simulation studies. Alignment, technical quality, and comparability will all be addressed, although it is unclear whether any of the evaluation will be independent.</p> <p>(A) The plan for piloting and rolling out the new assessment simultaneously is well articulated.</p> <p>(B) The plan for obtaining a demographically representative sample is not included.</p> <p>(C-D) The plan for assessing individuals in the innovative assessment system using items from the same test bank as the full statewide assessment is well-articulated.</p> <p>(E) The plan for establishing comparability relies on the inclusion of items from the current assessment. Hawai’i indicates reviews of alignment (breadth and depth) and implications of reduced reliability will both be conducted.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>and subject for which there is an innovative assessment, a statewide assessment in the same subject would also be administered to all such students. As part of this determination, the innovative assessment and statewide assessment need not be administered to an individual student in the same school year.</p> <p>(B) Administering full assessments from both the innovative and statewide assessment systems to a demographically representative sample of all students and subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, from among those students enrolled in participating schools, such that at least once in any grade span (i.e., 3-5, 6-8, or 9-12) and subject for which there is an innovative assessment, a statewide assessment in the same subject would also be administered in the same school year to all students included in the sample.</p> <p>(C) Including, as a significant portion of the innovative assessment system in each required grade and subject in which both an innovative and statewide assessment are administered, items or performance tasks from the statewide assessment</p>	<p><i>addressed by the application).</i></p>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>system that, at a minimum, have been previously pilot tested or field tested for use in the statewide assessment system.</p> <p>(D) Including, as a significant portion of the statewide assessment system in each required grade and subject in which both an innovative and statewide assessment are administered, items or performance tasks from the innovative assessment system that, at a minimum, have been previously pilot tested or field tested for use in the innovative assessment system.</p> <p>(E) An alternative method for demonstrating comparability that an SEA can demonstrate will provide for an equally rigorous and statistically valid comparison between student performance on the innovative assessment and the statewide assessment, including for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act;</p> <p>(ii) Generate results, including annual summative determinations as defined in paragraph (b)(7) of this section, that are valid, reliable, and comparable, for all students and for each subgroup of students described</p>		

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, among participating schools and LEAs in the innovative assessment demonstration authority. Consistent with the SEA’s or consortium’s evaluation plan under 34 CFR 200.106(e), the SEA must plan to annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period;</p>		
<p>(5)(i) Provide for the participation of all students, including children with disabilities and English learners; (ii) Be accessible to all students by incorporating the principles of universal design for learning, to the extent practicable, consistent with 34 CFR 200.2(b)(2)(ii); and (iii) Provide appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act;</p>	<p>(b)(5) __X__ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. ____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ____ Application does not</p>	<p>(i) Students with disabilities and English learners are addressed. (ii) A plan for appropriately addressing accessibility using universal design is included. (iii) A plan for appropriately providing accommodations is addressed.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(6) For purposes of the State accountability system consistent with section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the Act, annually measure in each participating school progress on the Academic Achievement indicator under section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the Act of at least 95 percent of all students, and 95 percent of students in each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, who are required to take such assessments consistent with paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section;</p>	<p>(b)(6)</p> <p><u> X </u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u> </u> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><u> </u> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during</p>	<p>Hawai'i proposes HICAP results will be reported and factored into 95 percent participation. The results will not be included in computation of student proficiency in school accountability and performance reports. This plan is subject to approval by USDOE.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>7) Generate an annual summative determination of achievement, using the annual data from the innovative assessment, for each student in a participating school in the demonstration authority that describes--</p> <p>(i) The student’s mastery of the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act for the grade in which the student is enrolled; or</p> <p>(ii) In the case of a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed with an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Act, the student’s mastery of those standards;</p>	<p>(b)(7) <u> X </u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u> </u> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><u> </u> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p>	<p>Hawai’i will report from the innovative assessment using the same proficiency levels that are used in the current statewide assessment. Using a shortened form of the full assessment, based on the same blueprint, is intended to ensure these levels reflect mastery of the state content standards. The State plans to evaluate comparability once the innovative assessment is piloted.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i>	
<p>(8) Provide disaggregated results by each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, including timely data for teachers, principals and other school leaders, students, and parents consistent with 34 CFR 200.8 and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(x) and (xii) and section 1111(h) of the Act, and provide results to parents in a manner consistent with paragraph (b)(4)(i) of this section and part 200.2(e);</p>	<p>(b)(8) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or</i></p>	<p>Provision of disaggregated results is planned for a wide variety of different subgroups.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<i>addressed by the application).</i>	
<p>(9) Provide an unbiased, rational, and consistent determination of progress toward the State’s long-term goals for academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(A) of the Act for all students and each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act and a comparable measure of student performance on the Academic Achievement indicator under section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the Act for participating schools relative to non-participating schools so that the SEA may validly and reliably aggregate data from the system for purposes of meeting requirements for--</p> <p>(i) Accountability under sections 1003 and 1111(c) and (d) of the Act, including how the SEA will identify participating and non-participating schools in a consistent manner for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement under section 1111(c)(4)(D) of the Act; and</p> <p>(ii) Reporting on State and LEA report cards under section 1111(h) of the Act.</p>	<p>(b)(9)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>The plan for ensuring validity, reliability, and comparability is addressed. The State leans heavily on the test bank for the new assessment being a representative sample of the test bank from the current assessment. The State recognizes the new test will be less reliable. HDOE will work with the Center for Assessment to investigate the validity implications of having less reliable scores on the new assessment.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>(d) <u>Assurances.</u></p> <p>This application contains assurances that the lead SEA and each SEA applying as a consortium will:</p> <p>(1) Continue use of the statewide academic assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science required under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act--</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) In all non-participating schools; and</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(ii) In all participating schools for which such assessments will be used in addition to innovative assessments for accountability purposes under section 1111(c) of the Act consistent with paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section or for evaluation purposes consistent with 34 CFR 200.106(e) during the demonstration authority period;</p>	<p>(d)(1)</p> <p><u> X </u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u> </u> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><u> </u> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>Hawai’i provided a form signed by Dr. Christina M. Kishimoto, Superintendent, Hawai’i Department of Education, 1-15-2020.</p>
<p>(2) Ensure that all students and each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act in</p>	<p>(d)(2)</p> <p><u> X </u> Application demonstrates a plan</p>	<p>Hawai’i provided a form signed by Dr. Christina M. Kishimoto, Superintendent, Hawai’i Department of Education, 1-15-2020.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>participating schools are held to the same challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act as all other students, except that students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may be assessed with alternate assessments aligned with alternate academic achievement standards consistent with 34 CFR 200.6 and section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D) of the Act, and receive the instructional support needed to meet such standards;</p>	<p>to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(3) Report the following annually to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may reasonably require:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) An update on implementation of the</p>	<p>(d)(3)</p> <p>__ X __ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during</p>	<p>Hawai'i provided a form signed by Dr. Christina M. Kishimoto, Superintendent, Hawai'i Department of Education, 1-15-2020.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>innovative assessment demonstration authority, including--</p> <p>(A) The SEA’s progress against its timeline under 34 CFR 200.106(c) and any outcomes or results from its evaluation and continuous improvement process under 34 CFR 200.106(e); and</p> <p>(B) If the innovative assessment system is not yet implemented statewide consistent with 34 CFR 200.104(a)(2), a description of the SEA’s progress in scaling up the system to additional LEAs or schools consistent with its strategies under 34 CFR 200.106(a)(3)(i), including updated assurances from participating LEAs consistent with paragraph (e)(2) of this section.</p> <p>(ii) The performance of students in participating schools at the State, LEA, and school level, for all students and disaggregated for each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, on the</p>	<p>the course of the authority period.</p> <p>_____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>_____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>innovative assessment, including academic achievement and participation data required to be reported consistent with section 1111(h) of the Act, except that such data may not reveal any personally identifiable information. 18 (iii) If the innovative assessment system is not yet implemented statewide, school demographic information, including enrollment and student achievement information, for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, among participating schools and LEAs and for any schools or LEAs that will participate for the first time in the following year, and a description of how the participation of any additional schools or LEAs in that year contributed to progress toward achieving high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse LEAs in the State consistent</p>		

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application "C"-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>with the SEA's benchmarks described in 34 CFR 200.106(a)(3)(iii). (iv) Feedback from teachers, principals and other school leaders, and other stakeholders consulted under paragraph (a)(2) of this section, including parents and students, from participating schools and LEAs about their satisfaction with the innovative assessment system;</p>		
<p>(4) Ensure that each participating LEA informs parents of all students in participating schools about the innovative assessment, including the grades and subjects in which the innovative assessment will be administered, and, consistent with section 1112(e)(2)(B) of the Act, at the beginning of each school year during which an innovative assessment will be implemented. Such information must be--</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) In an understandable and uniform format; (ii) To the extent practicable, written in a language that parents can understand or, if</p>	<p>(d)(4) ___ X ___ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>___ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement</i></p>	<p>Hawai'i provided a form signed by Dr. Christina M. Kishimoto, Superintendent, Hawai'i Department of Education, 1-15-2020.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent with limited English proficiency, be orally translated for such parent; and</p> <p>(iii) Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act, provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent; and</p>	<p><i>were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(5) Coordinate with and provide information to, as applicable, the Institute of Education Sciences for purposes of the progress report described in section 1204(c) of the Act and ongoing dissemination of information under section 1204(m) of the Act.</p>	<p>(d)(5)</p> <p>_X__Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>Hawai'i provided a form signed by Dr. Christina M. Kishimoto, Superintendent, Hawai'i Department of Education, 1-15-2020.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>___ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p><u>(c)Initial implementation in a subset of LEAs or schools. If the innovative assessment system will initially be administered in a subset of LEAs or schools in a State--</u> (1) A description of each LEA, and each of its participating schools, that will initially participate, including demographic information and its most recent LEA report card under section 1111(h)(2) of the Act; and (2) An assurance from each participating LEA, for each year that the LEA is participating, that the LEA will comply with all requirements of this section.</p>	<p>(e) __X__ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. ___ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ___ Application does not demonstrate a plan</p>	<p>Hawai’i indicates the initial subset of the HICAP participants will represent the geographic differences of Hawai’i’s public schools and the ethnic diversity of Hawai’i’s public school students.</p> <p>Hawai’i provides a rich demographic description of schools in which the assessment would be piloted.</p> <p>Hawai’i provides letters from HIDOE school principals.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i> OR This requirement is not applicable to this application</p>	
<p><u>(f)Application from a consortium of SEAs.</u> If an application for the innovative assessment demonstration authority is submitted by a consortium of SEAs-- (1) A description of the governance structure of the consortium, including-- (i) The roles and responsibilities of each member SEA, which may include a description of affiliate members, if applicable, and must include a description of financial responsibilities of member SEAs; (ii) How the member SEAs will manage and, at their discretion, share intellectual property developed by the consortium as a group; and (iii) How the member SEAs will consider requests from SEAs to join or leave the consortium and ensure</p>	<p>(f) ____ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. ____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ____ Application does not demonstrate a plan</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>that changes in membership do not affect the consortium’s ability to implement the innovative assessment demonstration authority consistent with the requirements and selection criteria in this section and 34 CFR 200.106.</p> <p>(2) While the terms of the association with affiliate members are defined by each consortium, consistent with 34 CFR 200.104(b)(1) and paragraph (f)(1)(i) of this section, for an affiliate member to become a full member of the consortium and to use the consortium’s innovative assessment system under the demonstration authority, the consortium must submit a revised application to the Secretary for approval, consistent with the requirements of this section and 34 CFR 200.106 and subject to the limitation under 34 CFR 200.104(d).</p>	<p>to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>This requirement is not applicable to this application</p>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>(a) Project narrative. The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s plan for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the plan, the Secretary considers--</p> <p>(a)(1) ; (5 points if factor (3) is applicable; 10 points if factor (3) is inapplicable) The rationale for developing or selecting the particular innovative assessment system to be implemented under the demonstration authority, including--</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) The distinct purpose of each assessment that is part of the innovative</p>	<p>(a)(1):</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>The reasons for implementing the HICAP based on half computer-adaptive testing and half classroom-based assessments are reasonable. Hawai’i cites Popham (2006) indicating classroom-based assessment can be meaningful and actionable for students. The goals in part are to reduce standardized testing and add more meaningful information for classrooms. The plan for ensuring comparability with the full statewide CAT is enumerated (blueprint, coverage of standards, evidence statements, achievement level descriptors, reporting categories).</p>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>assessment system and how the system will advance the design and delivery of large-scale, statewide academic assessments in innovative ways; and</p> <p>(ii) The extent to which the innovative assessment system as a whole will promote high-quality instruction, mastery of challenging State academic standards, and improved student outcomes, including for each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act; (5 points if factor (3) is applicable; 10 points if factor (3) is inapplicable)</p>				
<p>(a)(2) (25 points if factor (3) is applicable; 30 points if factor (3) is inapplicable) The plan the SEA or consortium, in consultation with any external partners, if applicable, has to--</p> <p>(i) Develop and use standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, methods, or other</p>	(a)(2):	12	<p>The plan surrounding the shortened CAT portion of the HICAP is articulated, and is based on keeping many aspects of the full length form consistent (blueprint, coverage of standards, evidence statements, achievement level descriptors, reporting categories). If the achievement level descriptors do not</p>	<p>Evaluation of the psychometrics of the classroom-based portion of the HICAP is not addressed. This is likely to be a big challenge for this part of the new assessment.</p> <p>Hawai'i acknowledges that the statewide test will be less reliable.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>strategies for scoring innovative assessments throughout the demonstration authority period, consistent with relevant nationally recognized professional and technical standards, to ensure inter-rater reliability and comparability of innovative assessment results consistent with 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4)(ii), which may include evidence of inter-rater reliability; and (ii) Train evaluators to use such strategies, if applicable; (25 points if factor (3) is applicable; 30 points if factor (3) is inapplicable) and</p>			<p>work for the HICAP, a new standard setting will be pursued.</p> <p>Hawai’i discusses evaluating the reliability and validity evidence of the HICAP. The State will partner with their TAC, the Center for Assessment, and Cambium to evaluate psychometrics and comparability of the shortened form.</p> <p>The reliability of results and validity of inferences (e.g., classification accuracy, school accountability) from the new test will be evaluated using analyses such as computer simulation, DIF analyses, and propensity score matching.</p>	<p>Assuming the statewide assessment was developed to maximize accuracy and efficiency, it seems unlikely a shortened form will be equally accurate.</p> <p>Marginal reliabilities for the ELA reporting categories, based on the computer simulation, are unacceptably low (0.34 – 0.69). Scores from scales this unreliable should not be reported. Reliability for the shortened summative test, .86, is below expected for large stakes decision-making.</p> <p>Marginal reliabilities for mathematics are slightly better than for ELA, resulting in the same concerns.</p>
<p>(a)(3) (10 points, if applicable) If the system will initially be administered in a subset of schools or LEAs in a State--</p> <p>(i) The strategies the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, will use to scale the innovative assessment to all</p>	(a)(3):	10	<p>The steps for the rollout of the proposed assessment are provided in great detail, including the details for sampling across ethnicities, disability statuses, socioeconomic statuses, and English learner statuses. The State will assess 4,000 students in the first year of the</p>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>schools statewide, with a rationale for selecting those strategies;</p> <p>(ii) The strength of the SEA’s or consortium’s criteria that will be used to determine LEAs and schools that will initially participate and when to approve additional LEAs and schools, if applicable, to participate during the requested demonstration authority period; and</p> <p>(iii) The SEA’s plan, including each SEA in a consortium, for how it will ensure that, during the demonstration authority period, the inclusion of additional LEAs and schools continues to reflect high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse LEAs and schools, or contributes to progress toward achieving such implementation across demographically diverse LEAs and schools, including diversity based on enrollment of subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act and student achievement. The plan must also include annual benchmarks toward achieving high-quality and consistent implementation across</p>			<p>project, and will gradually increase participants to 22,000 in Years 4 and 5.</p>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
participating schools that are, as a group, demographically similar to the State as a whole during the demonstration authority period, using the demographics of initially participating schools as a baseline. (10 points, if applicable)				
Total (out of 40) Criteria (a) (auto-total):		27		
(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support. (Up to 20 points total) (b)(1) (5 points) The extent and depth of prior experience that the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, and its LEAs have in developing and implementing the components of the innovative assessment system. An SEA may also describe the prior experience of any external partners that will be participating in or supporting its demonstration authority in implementing those components. In evaluating the extent and depth of prior experience, the Secretary considers— (i) The success and track record of efforts to implement innovative assessments or innovative	(b)(1):	3	<p>The prior experience argument is based on administering prior iterations of the Smarter Balanced assessments and interim assessments. The Smarter Balanced end-of-year assessments, like the proposed HICAP, include both CAT and performance tasks in ELA. The interim assessments are online fixed forms.</p> <p>A detailed plan of teacher training to develop, administer, score, and interpret the classroom-based assessments is provided. Plans for 10 training sessions are provided.</p>	<p>Hawai'i indicates a vendor will work with the state to improve capability to administer and score the assessments consistently. It would be better if the process for ensuring consistency (e.g., resolving rater discrepancies, training, decision rules) and for evaluating consistency (e.g., internal consistency, inter-rater reliability, score stability) were described here. A big concern about classroom-based assessments is how consistently they can be scored.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>assessment items aligned to the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act in LEAs planning to participate; and</p> <p>(ii) The SEA’s or LEA’s development or use of--</p> <p>(A) Effective supports and appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR part 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act for administering innovative assessments to all students, including English learners and children with disabilities, which must include professional development for school staff on providing such accommodations;</p> <p>(B) Effective and high-quality supports for school staff to implement innovative assessments and innovative assessment items, including professional development; and</p>				

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
(C) Standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, methods, or other strategies for scoring innovative assessments, with documented evidence of the validity, reliability, and comparability of annual summative determinations of achievement, consistent with 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4) and (7). (5 points)				
(b)(2) (5 points) The extent and depth of SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, and LEA capacity to implement the innovative assessment system considering the availability of technological infrastructure; State and local laws; dedicated and sufficient staff, expertise, and resources; and other relevant factors. An SEA or consortium may also describe how it plans to enhance its capacity by collaborating with external partners that will be participating in or supporting its demonstration authority. In evaluating the extent and depth of capacity, the Secretary considers-- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The SEA’s analysis of how capacity influenced the success of prior efforts to develop and implement 	(b)(2):	3	The argument for infrastructure to support the shortened CAT portion of HICAP is well supported, based on the state’s success in already using the full length form.	<p>Hawai’i indicates the classroom-based assessments will be created, graded, scored, and reported using a WBP. The Assessment Section of the Office of Information Technology Services will enable connections to various student information systems. Much more detail is needed on LEA capacity to administer this portion of the HICAP, a task which will be more complicated.</p> <p>The plans for mitigating risks are largely deferred to test vendors.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>innovative assessments or innovative assessment items; and</p> <p>(ii) The strategies the SEA is using, or will use, to mitigate risks, including those identified in its analysis, and support successful implementation of the innovative assessment. (5 points)</p>				
<p>(b)(3) (10 points) The extent and depth of State and local support for the application for demonstration authority in each SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, as demonstrated by signatures from the following:</p> <p>(i) Superintendents (or equivalent) of LEAs, including participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority period.</p> <p>(ii) Presidents of local school boards (or equivalent, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority.</p>	(b)(3):	10	Letters of support are provided from the chairperson of the Board of Education, superintendents, the executive director of the charter school commission, principals, the teachers association, and the parent-teacher-student association.	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
(iii) Local teacher organizations (including labor organizations, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority. (iv) Other affected stakeholders, such as parent organizations, civil rights organizations, and business organizations. (10 points)				
Total (out of 20) Criteria (b) (auto-total):		16		
(c) Timeline and budget. (Up to 15 points) The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s timeline and budget for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the timeline and budget, the Secretary considers-- (c)(1) (5 points). The extent to which the timeline reasonably demonstrates that each SEA will implement the system statewide by the end of the requested demonstration authority period, including a description of--	(c)(1):	4	The timeline reasonably demonstrates the activities to occur in each year and the parties responsible for each activity.	The parties responsible for each activity are unclear.

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>(i) The activities to occur in each year of the requested demonstration authority period;</p> <p>(ii) The parties responsible for each activity; and</p> <p>(iii) If applicable, how a consortium’s member SEAs will implement activities at different paces and how the consortium will implement interdependent activities, so long as each non-affiliate member SEA begins using the innovative assessment in the same school year consistent with 34 CFR part 200.104(b)(2); (5 points) and</p>				
<p>(c)(2) (10 points).The adequacy of the project budget for the duration of the requested demonstration authority period, including Federal, State, local, and non-public sources of funds to support and sustain, as applicable, the activities in the timeline under paragraph (c)(1) of this section, including--</p>	(c)(2):	10	<p>The budget is sufficient to meet expected costs.</p> <p>HIDOE receives nearly \$4 million from federal sources and approximately \$9 million from state sources to support statewide assessment. HIDOE, its partners, and its vendor will pursue additional funding.</p>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application "C"-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
(i) How the budget will be sufficient to meet the expected costs at each phase of the SEA's planned expansion of its innovative assessment system; and (ii) The degree to which funding in the project budget is contingent upon future appropriations at the State or local level or additional commitments from non-public sources of funds. (10 points)				
Total (out of 15) Criteria (c):	<u>14</u>			
(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents. (Up to 25 points) The quality of the SEA or consortium's plan to provide supports that can be delivered consistently at scale to educators, students, and parents to enable successful implementation of the innovative assessment system and improve instruction and student outcomes. In determining the quality of supports, the Secretary considers-- (d)(1) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 9 points if factor (4)	(d)(1):	5	A detailed plan of teacher training to develop, administer, score, and interpret the classroom-based assessments is provided. Plans for 10 training sessions are provided.	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
is inapplicable). The extent to which the SEA or consortium has developed, provided, and will continue to provide training to LEA and school staff, including teachers, principals, and other school leaders, that will familiarize them with the innovative assessment system and develop teacher capacity to implement instruction that is informed by the innovative assessment system and its results;				
(d)(2) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 8 points if factor (4) is inapplicable) The strategies the SEA or consortium has developed and will use to familiarize students and parents with the innovative assessment system;	(d)(2):	5	Information is shared through multiple sources within the department, educational networks, and media outlets. The plan includes stakeholder meetings, informational materials, and live access to reporting.	
(d)(3) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 8 points if factor (4) is inapplicable) The strategies the SEA will use to ensure that all students and each subgroup of students under section 1111(c)(2) of the Act in participating schools receive the support, including appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR part 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act,	(d)(3):	5	The plan for administering appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities, English learners, and students with 504 plans is specified. On-site visits will be used to affirm consistency between plans and accommodations provided.	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
needed to meet the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act; and				
(d)(4) (10 points if applicable). If the system includes assessment items that are locally developed or locally scored, the strategies and safeguards (e.g., test blueprints, item and task specifications, rubrics, scoring tools, documentation of quality control procedures, inter-rater reliability checks, audit plans) the SEA or consortium has developed, or plans to develop, to validly and reliably score such items, including how the strategies engage and support teachers and other staff in designing, developing, implementing, and validly and reliably scoring high-quality assessments; how the safeguards are sufficient to ensure unbiased, objective scoring of assessment items; and how the SEA will use effective professional development to aid in these efforts (10 points if applicable)	(d)(4):	5	Hawai'i will partner with experts in classroom-based assessments, as well as the web-based platform vendor, to provide training for designing this portion of the assessment.	The quality-control steps for developing assessments that will yield reliable scores, from which valid inferences can be drawn, is primarily deferred to the vendor. This information is critical to the quality of the proposal.
Total (out of 25) Criteria (d):	20			
(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement. (Up to 20 points)	(e)(1):	4	HIDOE, the Center for Assessment, and Cambium will evaluate the assessments based on the Standards	Cambium assisted in developing the shortened form of the CAT. A stronger model would have the

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s plan to annually evaluate its implementation of innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers—</p> <p>(e)(1) (12 points) The strength of the proposed evaluation of the innovative assessment system included in the application, including whether the evaluation will be conducted by an independent, experienced third party, and the likelihood that the evaluation will sufficiently determine the system’s validity, reliability, and comparability to the statewide assessment system consistent with the requirements of 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4) and (9); and</p>			<p>for Educational and Psychological Testing. Cambium will evaluate the psychometrics and comparability of the shortened CAT. An independent evaluator will be hired to evaluate the classroom-based assessments.</p>	<p>psychometrics evaluated by a party that was not involved in developing the assessment.</p> <p>The only type of reliability mentioned for the independent evaluator to consider, for the classroom-based assessments, is inter-rater reliability. This plan only addresses one type of reliability and no types of validity. Internal consistency, stability, content validity, validity based on response processes, internal structure validity, and relations with other variables could be addressed for the classroom-based assessments, which do not seem to be held to the same standards as the short form of the CAT.</p>
<p>(e)(2) (8 points) The SEA’s or consortium’s plan for continuous improvement of the innovative assessment system, including its process for--</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) Using data, feedback, evaluation results, and other information from participating LEAs and</p>	<p>(e)(2):</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>HIDOE will review data, stakeholder feedback, evaluation results, and new research to improve HICAP.</p> <p>Ongoing, internal evaluation will be performed by the Center for Assessment and by Cambium Assessment.</p>	<p>Evaluation appears to be entirely internal for the shortened CAT, by HIDOE or by contractors hired to develop the assessment. An external evaluation component would be preferred.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
schools to make changes to improve the quality of the innovative assessment; and (ii) Evaluating and monitoring implementation of the innovative assessment system in participating LEAs and schools annually.				
Total (out of 20) Criteria (e): (auto-total)	<u>9</u>			
Total (a+b+c+d+e) (auto-total)	<u>86</u>			

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Instructions:

- The Panel Monitor will provide deadlines for submitting preliminary scores and comments.
- Review and score each application independently.
- Enter preliminary scores and comments into the Preliminary TRF.
- Send completed TRF to the Panel Monitor.
- The Panel Monitor will review scores and comments and ask you to clarify or elaborate if needed, so that comments clearly reflect and justify your scores.
- All scores and comments must be completed before panel discussions can be held.
- After discussion, revise your Preliminary TRF to reflect any changes you want to make.

Writing strengths and weaknesses:

- Make clear, evaluative statements about the substance of the criterion being discussed.
- Substantiate all evaluative statements using evidence from the application narrative, evidence tables, performance measures, appendices, and/or budgets.
- You may comment on information that is missing or inconsistent with other parts of the application.
- Write for a broad audience. Avoid expressions and jargon that might not be commonly understood.

Scoring:

- You may choose to break comments down by subcriteria, which will make them easier to read and review. This is preferred but optional.
- When awarding points, you should NOT break down scores by sub-criteria. Each criterion receives one total score as directed in the TRF (for example, (a)(1)(i-ii) receives one score).
- A few criteria may not be applicable to every application. If so, follow the instructions in the TRF.

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application C Reviewer 3

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>(a) Consultation. Evidence that the SEA or consortium has developed an innovative assessment system in collaboration with--</p> <p>(1) Experts in the planning, development, implementation, and evaluation of innovative assessment systems, which may include external partners; and</p> <p>(2) Affected stakeholders in the State, or in each State in the consortium, including--</p> <p>(i) Those representing the interests of children with disabilities, English learners, and other subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act;</p> <p>(ii) Teachers, principals, and other school leaders;</p> <p>(iii) Local educational agencies (LEAs);</p> <p>(iv) Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State;</p> <p>(v) Students and parents, including parents of children described in paragraph (a)(2)(i) of this section; and</p> <p>(vi) Civil rights organizations.</p>	<p>(a)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p><u>(b) Innovative assessment system.</u> A demonstration that the innovative assessment system does or will-- (1) Meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(2)(B) of the Act, except that an innovative assessment-- (i) Need not be the same assessment administered to all public elementary and secondary school students in the State during the demonstration authority period described in 34 CFR 200.104(b)(2) or extension period described in 34 CFR 200.108 and prior to statewide use consistent with 34 CFR 200.107, if the innovative assessment system will be administered initially to all students in participating schools within a participating LEA, provided that the statewide academic assessments under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act are administered to all students in any non-participating LEA or any non-participating school within a participating LEA; and (ii) Need not be administered annually in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in grades 9-12 in the case of reading/language arts and mathematics assessments, and at least once in grades 3-5, 6-9, and 10-</p>	<p>(b)(1) <u> X </u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <u> </u> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> <u> </u> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>The Application meets the regulatory requirement.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>12 in the case of science assessments, so long as the statewide academic assessments under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act are administered in any required grade and subject under 34 CFR 200.5(a)(1) in which the SEA does not choose to implement an innovative assessment.</p>		
<p>(2)(i) Align with the challenging State academic content standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act, including the depth and breadth of such standards, for the grade in which a student is enrolled; and (ii) May measure a student’s academic proficiency and growth using items above or below the student’s grade level so long as, for purposes of meeting the requirements for reporting and school accountability under sections 1111(c) and 1111(h) of the Act and paragraphs (b)(3) and (b)(7)-(9) of this section, the State measures each student’s academic proficiency based on the challenging State academic standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled;</p>	<p>(b)(2) ____ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. ____X Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during</p>	<p>The Application calls for a shortened summative CAT. If the number of items are reduced, how will the revised assessment meet the blueprint and align to the depth, breadth and complexity of the state standards? Is an alignment study planned for the shortened CAT? The SEA will need to demonstrate that the proposed shortened assessment will be able to measure the full depth and breadth across the state standards. The Application states that the direct assessment of writing is reduced on the shortened summative CAT since the removal of the writing performance task is eliminated. How will this impact coverage and does it impact the achievement standards? If the achievement standards changes, will it impact the cut scores. Will the assessment maintain challenging academic standards? The Application does not make it clear that items allow for a range of ways for students to demonstrate knowledge and mastery of the standards.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(3) Express student results or competencies consistent with the challenging State academic achievement standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act and identify which students are not making sufficient progress toward, and attaining, grade-level proficiency on such standards;</p>	<p>(b)(3) ____ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. ____X Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p>	<p>The Application does include information about results and students making progress. The Application does not provide examples of how the standards reflect grade level proficiency for all grades. The Application does not provide a rationale of what is going to be done to confirm the cut scores are able to be maintained or need adjusted.</p> <p>The Application is not planning on a standard setting unless there is a lack of evidence of comparability between the innovative and the full summative assessment. The Application states that the proficiency level determinations (PLDs) for the shortened summative CAT will be the same as those for the existing assessment (Smarter Balanced) and cut scores will be mapped to the same underlying item response theory (IRT) proficiency (or theta) values.</p> <p>Standard setting is a critical to defining the levels of achievement which relies on several methods. The Application does not include the original standard setting method and how cut scores were established. The Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & American Council on Measurement in Education, 1999) suggest soundness criteria, such as: “When proposed score interpretations involve one or more cutscores, the rationale and procedures used for establishing cut scores should be clearly documented” (p. 59). Further, adequate precision in regions of score scales where cut points are established is prerequisite to reliable classification of examinees into categories.” (p. 59). Cut scores that do not yield reliable classifications of</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i>	students can have significant repercussions for students and their families; fallible student-level classifications can provide an inaccurate sense of an educational system’s quality and the progress it is making towards educating its students. Is there a plan to provide an evaluation of the cut scores to make the scores themselves comparable across years?
<p>(4)(i) Generate results, including annual summative determinations as defined in paragraph (b)(7) of this section, that are valid, reliable, and comparable for all students and for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, to the results generated by the State academic assessments described in 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act for such students.</p> <p>Consistent with the SEA’s or consortium’s evaluation plan under 34 CFR 200.106(e), the SEA must plan to annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period in one of the following ways:</p> <p>(A) Administering full assessments from both the innovative and statewide assessment systems to all students enrolled in participating schools, such that at least once in any grade span (i.e., 3-5, 6-8, or 9-12)</p>	<p>(b)(4)</p> <p>___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>__x__Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or</i></p>	<p>The Application does provide in year one to administer full assessments from both the innovative and statewide assessment systems to a demographically representative sample of all students and subgroups.</p> <p>The Application does not have a plan to address how to determine if teacher assessments generate results that are valid, reliable, and comparable, for all students and for each subgroup of students.</p> <p>The Application does provide an alternative method for demonstrating comparability of scores that will provide for an equally rigorous and statistically valid comparison between student performance on the innovative assessment and the statewide assessment. The regulatory requirement is that the SEA must plan to annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period.</p> <p>The Application provides ways they plan to address comparability of the results on the shortened summative CAT will be valid, reliable, and comparable. However there is no plan to address each subgroup of students. The Application does not provide how item analysis will be conducted to determine if new shortened forms will be examined for group differences.</p> <p>The regulatory requirement requires the SEA demonstrate how it will provide for an equally rigorous and statistically valid comparison between student performance on the innovative assessment and the statewide assessment, including for each subgroup of students. While several strategies are proposed they are not specifically differentiated for subgroup analyses. Are there other forms of the shortened assessment comparable (e.g. braille)? Will there be a shortened CAT braille form?</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>and subject for which there is an innovative assessment, a statewide assessment in the same subject would also be administered to all such students. As part of this determination, the innovative assessment and statewide assessment need not be administered to an individual student in the same school year.</p> <p>(B) Administering full assessments from both the innovative and statewide assessment systems to a demographically representative sample of all students and subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, from among those students enrolled in participating schools, such that at least once in any grade span (i.e., 3-5, 6-8, or 9-12) and subject for which there is an innovative assessment, a statewide assessment in the same subject would also be administered in the same school year to all students included in the sample.</p> <p>(C) Including, as a significant portion of the innovative assessment system in each required grade and subject in which both an innovative and statewide assessment are administered, items or performance tasks from the statewide assessment</p>	<p><i>addressed by the application).</i></p>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>system that, at a minimum, have been previously pilot tested or field tested for use in the statewide assessment system.</p> <p>(D) Including, as a significant portion of the statewide assessment system in each required grade and subject in which both an innovative and statewide assessment are administered, items or performance tasks from the innovative assessment system that, at a minimum, have been previously pilot tested or field tested for use in the innovative assessment system.</p> <p>(E) An alternative method for demonstrating comparability that an SEA can demonstrate will provide for an equally rigorous and statistically valid comparison between student performance on the innovative assessment and the statewide assessment, including for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act;</p> <p>(ii) Generate results, including annual summative determinations as defined in paragraph (b)(7) of this section, that are valid, reliable, and comparable, for all students and for each subgroup of students described</p>		

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, among participating schools and LEAs in the innovative assessment demonstration authority. Consistent with the SEA’s or consortium’s evaluation plan under 34 CFR 200.106(e), the SEA must plan to annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period;</p>		
<p>(5)(i) Provide for the participation of all students, including children with disabilities and English learners; (ii) Be accessible to all students by incorporating the principles of universal design for learning, to the extent practicable, consistent with 34 CFR 200.2(b)(2)(ii); and (iii) Provide appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act;</p>	<p>(b)(5) ___ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. ___ x ___ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ___ Application does not</p>	<p>The Application does not contain the principles of universal design for the array of teacher developed assessments. How will the inclusion of all learners be addressed? The Application did not include a plan to provide appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities and English learners. Where is the documentation for how universal design has been considered for this assessment?</p> <p>The Application does not include a plan to consider if the shortened CAT will consider accessibility of items and item parameters of subgroups are used to creating the shortened CAT. Does a shortened version of the test account for UDL for learning? How do the items selected for assessment design aligned to instructional learning practices, or support accessibility for all students? Does it include a variety of response options? The Application is unclear in regards to whether the short CAT will include a braille version of the test.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(6) For purposes of the State accountability system consistent with section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the Act, annually measure in each participating school progress on the Academic Achievement indicator under section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the Act of at least 95 percent of all students, and 95 percent of students in each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, who are required to take such assessments consistent with paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section;</p>	<p>(b)(6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during</p>	<p>The Application meets the regulatory requirement.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>7) Generate an annual summative determination of achievement, using the annual data from the innovative assessment, for each student in a participating school in the demonstration authority that describes--</p> <p>(i) The student’s mastery of the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act for the grade in which the student is enrolled; or</p> <p>(ii) In the case of a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed with an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Act, the student’s mastery of those standards;</p>	<p>(b)(7)</p> <p><u> </u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u> X </u> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><u> </u> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p>	<p>The Application does not address how mastery of challenging standards are included, e.g. writing. Will the academic achievement standards be impacted by the reduced blueprint coverage? Will the annual summative generate a determination in year one? The application does not provide any plan to address the coverage of academic achievement standards are accurate once performance tasks are removed from the blueprint, e.g. research, inquiry and writing in ELA. See comments in section 3.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i>	
<p>(8) Provide disaggregated results by each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, including timely data for teachers, principals and other school leaders, students, and parents consistent with 34 CFR 200.8 and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(x) and (xii) and section 1111(h) of the Act, and provide results to parents in a manner consistent with paragraph (b)(4)(i) of this section and part 200.2(e);</p>	<p>(b)(8) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or</i></p>	<p>The Application meets the regulatory requirements.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<i>addressed by the application).</i>	
<p>(9) Provide an unbiased, rational, and consistent determination of progress toward the State’s long-term goals for academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(A) of the Act for all students and each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act and a comparable measure of student performance on the Academic Achievement indicator under section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the Act for participating schools relative to non-participating schools so that the SEA may validly and reliably aggregate data from the system for purposes of meeting requirements for--</p> <p>(i) Accountability under sections 1003 and 1111(c) and (d) of the Act, including how the SEA will identify participating and non-participating schools in a consistent manner for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement under section 1111(c)(4)(D) of the Act; and</p> <p>(ii) Reporting on State and LEA report cards under section 1111(h) of the Act.</p>	<p>(b)(9) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>The Application meets the regulatory requirements.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>(d) <u>Assurances.</u></p> <p>This application contains assurances that the lead SEA and each SEA applying as a consortium will:</p> <p>(1) Continue use of the statewide academic assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science required under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act--</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) In all non-participating schools; and</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(ii) In all participating schools for which such assessments will be used in addition to innovative assessments for accountability purposes under section 1111(c) of the Act consistent with paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section or for evaluation purposes consistent with 34 CFR 200.106(e) during the demonstration authority period;</p>	<p>(d)(1)</p> <p><u> X </u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u> </u> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><u> </u> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>The Application meets the regulatory requirements.</p>
<p>(2) Ensure that all students and each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act in</p>	<p>(d)(2)</p> <p><u> </u> Application demonstrates a plan</p>	<p>The Application does not identify how to ensure all students and subgroup are held to the same “challenging standards” and receive the instructional support needed to meet such standards. The shortened CAT will eliminate performance</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>participating schools are held to the same challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act as all other students, except that students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may be assessed with alternate assessments aligned with alternate academic achievement standards consistent with 34 CFR 200.6 and section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D) of the Act, and receive the instructional support needed to meet such standards;</p>	<p>to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u> x </u> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><u> </u> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>tasks and impact depth of knowledge. The Application does not contain a plan to address that the challenging academic standards assessed by classroom tests are maintained for all students and each subgroup.</p>
<p>(3) Report the following annually to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may reasonably require:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) An update on implementation of the</p>	<p>(d)(3)</p> <p><u> x </u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during</p>	<p>The Application meets the regulatory requirements.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>innovative assessment demonstration authority, including--</p> <p>(A) The SEA’s progress against its timeline under 34 CFR 200.106(c) and any outcomes or results from its evaluation and continuous improvement process under 34 CFR 200.106(e); and</p> <p>(B) If the innovative assessment system is not yet implemented statewide consistent with 34 CFR 200.104(a)(2), a description of the SEA’s progress in scaling up the system to additional LEAs or schools consistent with its strategies under 34 CFR 200.106(a)(3)(i), including updated assurances from participating LEAs consistent with paragraph (e)(2) of this section.</p> <p>(ii) The performance of students in participating schools at the State, LEA, and school level, for all students and disaggregated for each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, on the</p>	<p>the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>innovative assessment, including academic achievement and participation data required to be reported consistent with section 1111(h) of the Act, except that such data may not reveal any personally identifiable information. 18</p> <p>(iii) If the innovative assessment system is not yet implemented statewide, school demographic information, including enrollment and student achievement information, for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, among participating schools and LEAs and for any schools or LEAs that will participate for the first time in the following year, and a description of how the participation of any additional schools or LEAs in that year contributed to progress toward achieving high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse LEAs in the State consistent</p>		

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>with the SEA’s benchmarks described in 34 CFR 200.106(a)(3)(iii). (iv) Feedback from teachers, principals and other school leaders, and other stakeholders consulted under paragraph (a)(2) of this section, including parents and students, from participating schools and LEAs about their satisfaction with the innovative assessment system;</p>		
<p>(4) Ensure that each participating LEA informs parents of all students in participating schools about the innovative assessment, including the grades and subjects in which the innovative assessment will be administered, and, consistent with section 1112(e)(2)(B) of the Act, at the beginning of each school year during which an innovative assessment will be implemented. Such information must be--</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) In an understandable and uniform format; (ii) To the extent practicable, written in a language that parents can understand or, if</p>	<p>(d)(4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement</i></p>	<p>The Application meets the regulatory requirement.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent with limited English proficiency, be orally translated for such parent; and</p> <p>(iii) Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act, provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent; and</p>	<p><i>were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(5) Coordinate with and provide information to, as applicable, the Institute of Education Sciences for purposes of the progress report described in section 1204(c) of the Act and ongoing dissemination of information under section 1204(m) of the Act.</p>	<p>(d)(5)</p> <p><u> X </u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>The Application meets this regulatory requirement.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p><u>(c)Initial implementation in a subset of LEAs or schools. If the innovative assessment system will initially be administered in a subset of LEAs or schools in a State--</u> (1) A description of each LEA, and each of its participating schools, that will initially participate, including demographic information and its most recent LEA report card under section 1111(h)(2) of the Act; and (2) An assurance from each participating LEA, for each year that the LEA is participating, that the LEA will comply with all requirements of this section.</p>	<p>(e) ____X____ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. ____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ____ Application does not demonstrate a plan</p>	<p>The Application meets this regulatory requirement.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>This requirement is not applicable to this application</p>	
<p><u>(f)Application from a consortium of SEAs.</u> If an application for the innovative assessment demonstration authority is submitted by a consortium of SEAs--</p> <p>(1) A description of the governance structure of the consortium, including--</p> <p>(i) The roles and responsibilities of each member SEA, which may include a description of affiliate members, if applicable, and must include a description of financial responsibilities of member SEAs;</p> <p>(ii) How the member SEAs will manage and, at their discretion, share intellectual property developed by the consortium as a group; and</p> <p>(iii) How the member SEAs will consider requests from SEAs to join or leave the consortium and ensure</p>	<p>(f)</p> <p>____Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____Application does not demonstrate a plan</p>	<p>NA</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>that changes in membership do not affect the consortium’s ability to implement the innovative assessment demonstration authority consistent with the requirements and selection criteria in this section and 34 CFR 200.106.</p> <p>(2) While the terms of the association with affiliate members are defined by each consortium, consistent with 34 CFR 200.104(b)(1) and paragraph (f)(1)(i) of this section, for an affiliate member to become a full member of the consortium and to use the consortium’s innovative assessment system under the demonstration authority, the consortium must submit a revised application to the Secretary for approval, consistent with the requirements of this section and 34 CFR 200.106 and subject to the limitation under 34 CFR 200.104(d).</p>	<p>to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i> OR This requirement is not applicable to this application</p>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>(a) Project narrative. The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s plan for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the plan, the Secretary considers--</p> <p>(a)(1) ; (5 points if factor (3) is applicable; 10 points if factor (3) is inapplicable) The rationale for developing or selecting the particular innovative assessment system to be implemented under the demonstration authority, including--</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) The distinct purpose of each assessment that is part of the innovative</p>	(a)(1):	4/5	<p>The Application contains a rationale for selecting the shortened summative CAT to reduce testing burden.</p>	<p>The Application includes a dissonance between the Theory of Action and the proposed plan. The Application states “Quality instruction is a component of the proposed system”. Then later in the application states “The classroom-based assessments are intended to inform instruction, not to meet federal accountability purposes.</p> <p>The Application does not contain a rationale in the theory of action to recognize how professional assessment development in assessment literacy will lead to improved instruction. The Application is discussing formative</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
assessment system and how the system will advance the design and delivery of large-scale, statewide academic assessments in innovative ways; and (ii) The extent to which the innovative assessment system as a whole will promote high-quality instruction, mastery of challenging State academic standards, and improved student outcomes, including for each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act; (5 points if factor (3) is applicable; 10 points if factor (3) is inapplicable)				<p>assessment practices but does not use the term nor is the literature on formative practices referenced. There is a body of research on formative assessment practices which would have better supported this application.</p> <p>Teachers will be expected to create classroom-based assessments including performance assessments, portfolios, project-based learning assessments, semi-secured interim assessments, presentations, learning logs, etc. All of these types of assessment would use varying perspectives for UDL. The expectation to require educators to create classroom assessments is an additional burden. How much time will teachers be provided to meet this expectation? How will the classroom based assessments be reviewed or evaluated? Is there specific training to develop quality classroom assessments and how this will be evaluated to improve student outcomes, including student subgroups?</p> <p>Planned methods of evaluation are not provided and the goals of the Application are unclear. The Application for example, states one</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
				<p>goal is “Teachers are engaged in the design, development, and scoring of assessment items and in the reporting of results”. How will this “engagement” be evaluated? The Application states a goal in the <i>Theory of Action</i> to improve <i>Professional Capacity Building</i>: “Teachers are provided with curriculum and instructional materials and given rich professional development and other supports and resources needed to effectively instruct on the standards”. Which goal will be measured? Will the state evaluate engagement in assessment or evaluate effective instruction? These are two different outcomes. How will these outcomes be related to the purposes of the goals in Hawaii’s blueprint: Reflect and communicate the essence of Hawai‘i, its unique history, culture, values, and beliefs?</p>
<p>(a)(2) (25 points if factor (3) is applicable; 30 points if factor (3) is inapplicable) The plan the SEA or consortium, in consultation with any external partners, if applicable, has to--</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) Develop and use standardized and calibrated</p>	(a)(2):	18/25	<p>The Application proposes a shortened summative CAT designed to be completed in one class period each for ELA and for mathematics using the same test delivery system (TDS).</p>	<p>The Application does not ensure reliability and comparability of innovative assessment results. The plan addresses does not clearly recognize the depth, breadth and complexity of the standards meet the current blueprint for the shortened form. The Application acknowledges</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
tools, rubrics, methods, or other strategies for scoring innovative assessments throughout the demonstration authority period, consistent with relevant nationally recognized professional and technical standards, to ensure inter-rater reliability and comparability of innovative assessment results consistent with 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4)(ii), which may include evidence of inter-rater reliability; and (ii) Train evaluators to use such strategies, if applicable; (25 points if factor (3) is applicable; 30 points if factor (3) is inapplicable) and				<p>lower test reliability. What are the plans to mitigate this if this occurs after year one.</p> <p>The loss of performance tasks is eliminated for writing with a plan to replace this with classroom based assessments. How will this be evaluated for validity and reliability? Mathematics grade 8 claim one proposes a reduction of items in DOKs 2 and higher from 7 to 3 and claims 2&4 DOK of 3 or higher is reduced from 4 to 2. This means the DOK of items will not measure higher levels of cognitive complexity. The reduced expectation is lowering the level of expectation/ challenge.</p> <p>Claim 3 reliability is lowered to 0.38. Lower reliabilities at the claim level are to be expected given the number of items in the blueprint. The summative test will be measuring item at lowered levels of complexity. Summative assessments should be reflective of the full depth, breadth, and complexity of grade level content standards to which they are aligned. How will the shortened version maintain depth of the standards and reliability concerns?</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
				If the teacher created tests become part of a report how will you ensure these are related to the claims or review the results?
<p>(a)(3) (10 points, if applicable) If the system will initially be administered in a subset of schools or LEAs in a State--</p> <p>(i) The strategies the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, will use to scale the innovative assessment to all schools statewide, with a rationale for selecting those strategies;</p> <p>(ii) The strength of the SEA’s or consortium’s criteria that will be used to determine LEAs and schools that will initially participate and when to approve additional LEAs and schools, if applicable, to participate during the requested demonstration authority period; and</p> <p>(iii) The SEA’s plan, including each SEA in a consortium, for how it will ensure that, during the demonstration authority period, the inclusion of additional LEAs and schools continues to reflect high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse LEAs and</p>	(a)(3):	8/10	The Application provides a plan for implementation to scale the innovative assessment to all schools statewide.	The Application does not indicate a plan to include annual benchmarks toward achieving high-quality and consistent implementation across participating schools that are, as a group, demographically similar to the State as a whole during the demonstration authority period. The Application provides student participants will be selected based on characteristics reflecting the demographic diversity of Hawaii’s students and the different geographic locations of public schools. Does this include all subgroups (economic disadvantage and disabilities)? The Application is focusing recruitment on educators instead of LEAs. How will the LEA be involved in supporting the plan?

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
schools, or contributes to progress toward achieving such implementation across demographically diverse LEAs and schools, including diversity based on enrollment of subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act and student achievement. The plan must also include annual benchmarks toward achieving high-quality and consistent implementation across participating schools that are, as a group, demographically similar to the State as a whole during the demonstration authority period, using the demographics of initially participating schools as a baseline. (10 points, if applicable)				
Total (out of 40) Criteria (a) (auto-total):	30/40			
(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support. (Up to 20 points total) (b)(1) (5 points) The extent and depth of prior experience that the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, and its LEAs have in developing and implementing the components of the innovative assessment system. An SEA may	(b)(1):	4/5	The Application provides prior experience with implementing the components of the summative assessment system by the vendor.	The Application does not include how effective has the state been in the provision of supports and accommodations to ELs and students with disabilities. How does the plan include administering innovative assessments to all students, including English learners and children with disabilities, including professional development for school staff on

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>also describe the prior experience of any external partners that will be participating in or supporting its demonstration authority in implementing those components. In evaluating the extent and depth of prior experience, the Secretary considers—</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) The success and track record of efforts to implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items aligned to the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act in LEAs planning to participate; and</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(ii) The SEA’s or LEA’s development or use of--</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">(A) Effective supports and appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR part 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act for administering innovative assessments to all students, including English learners and children with disabilities,</p>				<p>providing supports and accommodations? How do you ensure consistency of supports/accommodations for shortened CAT and the teacher developed assessments? Are these linked to instructional supports and accommodations?</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>which must include professional development for school staff on providing such accommodations;</p> <p>(B) Effective and high-quality supports for school staff to implement innovative assessments and innovative assessment items, including professional development; and</p> <p>(C) Standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, methods, or other strategies for scoring innovative assessments, with documented evidence of the validity, reliability, and comparability of annual summative determinations of achievement, consistent with 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4) and (7). (5 points)</p>				
<p>(b)(2) (5 points) The extent and depth of SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, and LEA capacity to implement the innovative assessment system considering the availability of technological infrastructure; State and local laws; dedicated and sufficient staff, expertise, and resources; and other relevant factors. An SEA or consortium may also describe how</p>	(b)(2):	4/5	The Application includes the current status of the SEA’s success of prior efforts to develop and implement assessments or innovative assessment items. strategies the SEA	The Application does not include a process to mitigate risks and support successful implementation.

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>it plans to enhance its capacity by collaborating with external partners that will be participating in or supporting its demonstration authority. In evaluating the extent and depth of capacity, the Secretary considers--</p> <p>(i) The SEA’s analysis of how capacity influenced the success of prior efforts to develop and implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items; and</p> <p>(ii) The strategies the SEA is using, or will use, to mitigate risks, including those identified in its analysis, and support successful implementation of the innovative assessment. (5 points)</p>				
<p>(b)(3) (10 points)The extent and depth of State and local support for the application for demonstration authority in each SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, as demonstrated by signatures from the following:</p> <p>(i) Superintendents (or equivalent) of LEAs, including participating</p>	(b)(3):	8/10	The Application included support for the application.	The Application did not include Local teacher organizations (including labor organizations, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority. Given the amount of commitment from educators it is important to know they are in support of the assessment requirements. How will teachers be compensated for this

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority period.</p> <p>(ii) Presidents of local school boards (or equivalent, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority.</p> <p>(iii) Local teacher organizations (including labor organizations, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority.</p> <p>(iv) Other affected stakeholders, such as parent organizations, civil rights organizations, and business organizations.</p> <p>(10 points)</p>				<p>time investment? The only public education advocacy organizations was a PTO endorsement. What about other advocacy groups that support English learners?</p>
Total (out of 20) Criteria (b) (auto-total):		16/20		
<p>(c) Timeline and budget. (Up to 15 points)</p> <p>The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s timeline and budget for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the</p>	(c)(1):	3/5	<p>The Application has a budget that covers the shortened CAT assessment.</p>	<p>The budget does not include the detailed budget for professional development for educators, face to face, modules, online training, etc. How will all of the ten proposed areas of professional development requirements be accomplished for</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>quality of the timeline and budget, the Secretary considers-- (c)(1) (5 points). The extent to which the timeline reasonably demonstrates that each SEA will implement the system statewide by the end of the requested demonstration authority period, including a description of--</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The activities to occur in each year of the requested demonstration authority period; (ii) The parties responsible for each activity; and (iii) If applicable, how a consortium’s member SEAs will implement activities at different paces and how the consortium will implement interdependent activities, so long as each non-affiliate member SEA begins using the innovative assessment in the same school year consistent with 34 CFR part 200.104(b)(2); (5 points) and 				<p>\$900,000? Where did this number come from? This seems a low estimate for two face to face training (travel, substitutes, etc.), and 8 sessions delivered facilitated or virtual. Is there a contingency plan to meet the additional funds that are pursued? Is this a sustainable plan? Who will be responsible for these activities?</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>(c)(2) (10 points).The adequacy of the project budget for the duration of the requested demonstration authority period, including Federal, State, local, and non-public sources of funds to support and sustain, as applicable, the activities in the timeline under paragraph (c)(1) of this section, including--</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) How the budget will be sufficient to meet the expected costs at each phase of the SEA’s planned expansion of its innovative assessment system; and</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(ii) The degree to which funding in the project budget is contingent upon future appropriations at the State or local level or additional commitments from non-public sources of funds. (10 points)</p>	(c)(2):	7/10	The Application provides a proposed budget.	The Application states the budget is feasible and allows time to seek and identify more significant funding sources as use of the innovative assessment expands to additional grade levels and schools. Is the possibility of additional funding required to support the goals contained in the application. Which parts of the application will need additional support during the authority period?
Total (out of 15) Criteria (c):	10/15			
<p>(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents. (Up to 25 points)</p> <p>The quality of the SEA or consortium’s plan to provide supports that can be delivered consistently at scale to educators,</p>	(d)(1):	4/5	The Application identifies training to LEA and school staff, including teachers, principals, and other school leaders, that will familiarize them with the innovative assessment system. The Application includes	The Application is not clear in how professional development for test development improves instruction.

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
students, and parents to enable successful implementation of the innovative assessment system and improve instruction and student outcomes. In determining the quality of supports, the Secretary considers-- (d)(1) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 9 points if factor (4) is inapplicable). The extent to which the SEA or consortium has developed, provided, and will continue to provide training to LEA and school staff, including teachers, principals, and other school leaders, that will familiarize them with the innovative assessment system and develop teacher capacity to implement instruction that is informed by the innovative assessment system and its results;			ways parents will be informed about the assessment system.	
(d)(2) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 8 points if factor (4) is inapplicable) The strategies the SEA or consortium has developed and will use to familiarize students and parents with the innovative assessment system;	(d)(2):	4/5	The Application includes the develop report cards and make them publicly available, e-mail invitation to parents on advisory groups, and gather feedback from parents.	The Application does not include outreach to parents who may be rural, without internet capabilities to participate in feedback activities.
(d)(3) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 8 points if factor (4) is inapplicable) The strategies	(d)(3):	3/5	The Application includes supports and accommodations for the shortened CAT assessment system.	The Application does not include a plan to show how educators are currently trained or how they will

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
the SEA will use to ensure that all students and each subgroup of students under section 1111(c)(2) of the Act in participating schools receive the support, including appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR part 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act, needed to meet the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act; and				ensure that all students will receive the supports and accommodations they’re entitled to receive for the classroom based assessments? Will classroom assessments will be reported? The Application does not address how classroom based assessments will ensure that student subgroups will receive support including accommodations.
(d)(4) (10 points if applicable). If the system includes assessment items that are locally developed or locally scored, the strategies and safeguards (e.g., test blueprints, item and task specifications, rubrics, scoring tools, documentation of quality control procedures, inter-rater reliability checks, audit plans) the SEA or consortium has developed, or plans to develop, to validly and reliably score such items, including how the strategies engage and support teachers and other staff in designing, developing, implementing, and validly and reliably scoring high-quality assessments; how the safeguards	(d)(4):	5/10	The shortened summative CAT will be used for accountability.	The classroom based assessments will be scored by educators and used to inform instruction. The Application on page 374 indicates a hybrid reporting includes claim level reporting from the classroom based assessments. What steps will you take to assure inter-rater reliability? The quality of classroom based assessments does not have any evaluation of reliability and validity. What are the steps you will take to ensure unbiased scoring will occur. How is effective professional development evaluated for outcomes for improve instruction?

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
are sufficient to ensure unbiased, objective scoring of assessment items; and how the SEA will use effective professional development to aid in these efforts (10 points if applicable)				
Total (out of 25) Criteria (d):	16/25			
(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement. (Up to 20 points) The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s plan to annually evaluate its implementation of innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers— (e)(1) (12 points) The strength of the proposed evaluation of the innovative assessment system included in the application, including whether the evaluation will be conducted by an independent, experienced third party, and the likelihood that the evaluation will sufficiently determine the system’s validity, reliability, and comparability to the statewide assessment system consistent with the requirements of 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4) and (9); and	(e)(1):	8/12	The Application includes an evaluation plan. The shortened summative CAT will be internally evaluated by support staff from Cambium Assessment, the Hawai‘i TAC, and HIDOE curriculum and educational measurement specialists, with respect to technical quality. An independent evaluator will investigate the effectiveness of the classroom based assessments to inform instruction.	The Application does not account for an external alignment study for the shortened summative CAT. Confirmation of test events to address the review the alignments. The evaluation of the blueprint to sufficiently determine the system’s validity, reliability, and comparability to the statewide assessment system is critical. Is there a plan to address the possibility that the shortened CAT might not be reliable for specific subgroups? How is the validity and reliability for classroom based assessments addressed?

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application "C"-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
(e)(2) (8 points) The SEA's or consortium's plan for continuous improvement of the innovative assessment system, including its process for-- (i) Using data, feedback, evaluation results, and other information from participating LEAs and schools to make changes to improve the quality of the innovative assessment; and (ii) Evaluating and monitoring implementation of the innovative assessment system in participating LEAs and schools annually.	(e)(2):	6/8	The Application includes feedback from several sources of information annually.	The Application does not include a plan to systematically evaluate and monitoring the implementation of the innovative assessment system in participating LEAs and schools for the entire grant period. How will this include both the shortened CAT versus the classroom based assessments? The monitoring plan is not detailed?
Total (out of 20) Criteria (e): (auto-total)	<u>14/20</u>			
Total (a+b+c+d+e) 30+16+10+16+14 (auto-total)	<u>86</u>			

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application C Reviewer 4

Instructions:

- The Panel Monitor will provide deadlines for submitting preliminary scores and comments.
- Review and score each application independently.
- Enter preliminary scores and comments into the Preliminary TRF.
- Send completed TRF to the Panel Monitor.
- The Panel Monitor will review scores and comments and ask you to clarify or elaborate if needed, so that comments clearly reflect and justify your scores.
- All scores and comments must be completed before panel discussions can be held.
- After discussion, revise your Preliminary TRF to reflect any changes you want to make.

Writing strengths and weaknesses:

- Make clear, evaluative statements about the substance of the criterion being discussed.
- Substantiate all evaluative statements using evidence from the application narrative, evidence tables, performance measures, appendices, and/or budgets.
- You may comment on information that is missing or inconsistent with other parts of the application.
- Write for a broad audience. Avoid expressions and jargon that might not be commonly understood.

Scoring:

- You may choose to break comments down by subcriteria, which will make them easier to read and review. This is preferred but optional.
- When awarding points, you should NOT break down scores by sub-criteria. Each criterion receives one total score as directed in the TRF (for example, (a)(1)(i-ii) receives one score).

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

- A few criteria may not be applicable to every application. If so, follow the instructions in the TRF.

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
(a) Consultation. Evidence that the SEA or consortium has developed an innovative assessment system in collaboration with-- (1) Experts in the planning, development, implementation, and evaluation of innovative assessment systems, which may include external partners; and (2) Affected stakeholders in the State, or in each State in the consortium, including-- (i) Those representing the interests of children with disabilities, English learners, and other subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act; (ii) Teachers, principals, and other school leaders; (iii) Local educational agencies (LEAs); (iv) Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State; (v) Students and parents, including parents of children described in paragraph (a)(2)(i) of this section; and (vi) Civil rights organizations.	(a) <u>X</u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. ____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i>	There is strong evidence of collaboration by HIDOE with all of the required education and community partners.

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p><u>(b)Innovative assessment system.</u> A demonstration that the innovative assessment system does or will-- (1) Meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(2)(B) of the Act, except that an innovative assessment-- (i) Need not be the same assessment administered to all public elementary and secondary school students in the State during the demonstration authority period described in 34 CFR 200.104(b)(2) or extension period described in 34 CFR 200.108 and prior to statewide use consistent with 34 CFR 200.107, if the innovative assessment system will be administered initially to all students in participating schools within a participating LEA, provided that the statewide academic assessments under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act are administered to all students in any non-participating LEA or any non-participating school within a participating LEA; and (ii) Need not be administered annually in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in grades 9-12 in the case of reading/language arts and</p>	<p>(b)(1) ____ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u>X</u> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>There is evidence that HDOE’s proposal meets most of these expectations with respect to its general assessment and ESSA requirements.</p> <p>However, it is not clear how educators who serve students with significant cognitive disabilities will benefit from similar changes in policy and practice? This appears to be a systems coherence challenge for the proposal with regard to IDEA assessment requirements.</p> <p>It is highly unlikely that the PLDs will not need to be reevaluated after the shortened test blueprint is implemented. The shortened summative assessment cannot possibly represent the full depth, breadth, and complexity of the standards compared to the current approach.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>mathematics assessments, and at least once in grades 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12 in the case of science assessments, so long as the statewide academic assessments under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act are administered in any required grade and subject under 34 CFR 200.5(a)(1) in which the SEA does not choose to implement an innovative assessment.</p>		
<p>(2)(i) Align with the challenging State academic content standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act, including the depth and breadth of such standards, for the grade in which a student is enrolled; and (ii) May measure a student’s academic proficiency and growth using items above or below the student’s grade level so long as, for purposes of meeting the requirements for reporting and school accountability under sections 1111(c) and 1111(h) of the Act and paragraphs (b)(3) and (b)(7)-(9) of this section, the State measures each student’s academic proficiency based on the challenging State academic standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled;</p>	<p>(b)(2) ____ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <u>X</u> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ____ Application does not demonstrate a plan</p>	<p>This reviewer shares HIDOE’s concern about assessing writing and mathematics reasoning. Removing the writing PT from the ELA assessment and the math reasoning PT from the math assessment will have deleterious consequences for instruction. For better or worse, systems are responsive to accountability. Entirely removing productive writing and meta-analysis of math reasoning, not just items about writing or math content, are important and concerning losses in this proposal. Relying on classroom assessment to meet state writing and math reasoning goals is questionable at best. How will HIDOE place a “heavy emphasis” on writing or mathematics reasoning in classroom assessment contexts where assessment of these aspects may not be required or of sufficient quality? In addition, the removal of productive writing and math reasoning will indubitably have an impact upon the accuracy of the Performance Level Descriptors (PLDs). HIDOE should review the impact of the shortened blueprint upon the PLDs as part of this process.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(3) Express student results or competencies consistent with the challenging State academic achievement standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act and identify which students are not making sufficient progress toward, and attaining, grade-level proficiency on such standards;</p>	<p>(b)(3) <u>X</u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <u> </u> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> <u> </u> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during</p>	<p>HIDOE’s proposal should eventually be able to address this expectation given the commitment to review and refinement of materials and of practices present in the timeline.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(4)(i) Generate results, including annual summative determinations as defined in paragraph (b)(7) of this section, that are valid, reliable, and comparable for all students and for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, to the results generated by the State academic assessments described in 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act for such students.</p> <p>Consistent with the SEA’s or consortium’s evaluation plan under 34 CFR 200.106(e), the SEA must plan to annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period in one of the following ways: (A) Administering full assessments from both the innovative and statewide assessment systems to all students enrolled in participating</p>	<p>(b)(4) ____ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u>X</u> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p>	<p>The impact of the shortened blueprint in comparison to HIDOE’s general approach, is not sufficient to match the reliability and validity demands in this requirement. The sampling plan does not specifically address the student groups required in ESSA. There may also be impacts upon the district and school improvement identification process that required further consideration in this area.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>schools, such that at least once in any grade span (i.e., 3-5, 6-8, or 9-12) and subject for which there is an innovative assessment, a statewide assessment in the same subject would also be administered to all such students. As part of this determination, the innovative assessment and statewide assessment need not be administered to an individual student in the same school year.</p> <p>(B) Administering full assessments from both the innovative and statewide assessment systems to a demographically representative sample of all students and subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, from among those students enrolled in participating schools, such that at least once in any grade span (i.e., 3-5, 6-8, or 9-12) and subject for which there is an innovative assessment, a statewide assessment in the same subject would also be administered in the same school year to all students included in the sample.</p> <p>(C) Including, as a significant portion of the innovative assessment system in each required grade and subject in which both an innovative and statewide assessment are</p>	<p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>administered, items or performance tasks from the statewide assessment system that, at a minimum, have been previously pilot tested or field tested for use in the statewide assessment system.</p> <p>(D) Including, as a significant portion of the statewide assessment system in each required grade and subject in which both an innovative and statewide assessment are administered, items or performance tasks from the innovative assessment system that, at a minimum, have been previously pilot tested or field tested for use in the innovative assessment system.</p> <p>(E) An alternative method for demonstrating comparability that an SEA can demonstrate will provide for an equally rigorous and statistically valid comparison between student performance on the innovative assessment and the statewide assessment, including for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act;</p> <p>(ii) Generate results, including annual summative determinations as defined in paragraph (b)(7) of this section, that are valid, reliable, and</p>		

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
comparable, for all students and for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, among participating schools and LEAs in the innovative assessment demonstration authority. Consistent with the SEA’s or consortium’s evaluation plan under 34 CFR 200.106(e), the SEA must plan to annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period;		
(5)(i) Provide for the participation of all students, including children with disabilities and English learners; (ii) Be accessible to all students by incorporating the principles of universal design for learning, to the extent practicable, consistent with 34 CFR 200.2(b)(2)(ii); and (iii) Provide appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act;	<p>(b)(5) <input type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>HIDOE’s plan ensures the participation of most students with appropriate accommodations with regard to the summative CAT. It is not clear whether the shortened blueprint will be provided in Braille for students who are blind, or if HIDOE plans to administer the full Braille assessment for students participating in the shortened CAT.</p> <p>Continued evaluation of the supports provided for the classroom-based assessments will be required if HIDOE elects to eventually implement results from said assessments for accountability purposes.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(6) For purposes of the State accountability system consistent with section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the Act, annually measure in each participating school progress on the Academic Achievement indicator under section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the Act of at least 95 percent of all students, and 95 percent of students in each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, who are required to take such assessments consistent with paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section;</p>	<p>(b)(6) <u>X</u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____ Application does not demonstrate a plan</p>	<p>The proposal appears to be responsive to these requirements.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>7) Generate an annual summative determination of achievement, using the annual data from the innovative assessment, for each student in a participating school in the demonstration authority that describes--</p> <p>(i) The student’s mastery of the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act for the grade in which the student is enrolled; or</p> <p>(ii) In the case of a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed with an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Act, the student’s mastery of those standards;</p>	<p>(b)(7)</p> <p>_____ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u>X</u> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>_____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during</p>	<p>The question of the accuracy of the annual summative determination of achievement at the student level remains.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(8) Provide disaggregated results by each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, including timely data for teachers, principals and other school leaders, students, and parents consistent with 34 CFR 200.8 and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(x) and (xii) and section 1111(h) of the Act, and provide results to parents in a manner consistent with paragraph (b)(4)(i) of this section and part 200.2(e);</p>	<p>(b)(8) <u>X</u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <u> </u> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> <u> </u> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p>	<p>The HIDEOE proposal meets this expectation.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i>	
<p>(9) Provide an unbiased, rational, and consistent determination of progress toward the State’s long-term goals for academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(A) of the Act for all students and each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act and a comparable measure of student performance on the Academic Achievement indicator under section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the Act for participating schools relative to non-participating schools so that the SEA may validly and reliably aggregate data from the system for purposes of meeting requirements for--</p> <p>(i) Accountability under sections 1003 and 1111(c) and (d) of the Act, including how the SEA will identify participating and non-participating schools in a consistent manner for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement under section 1111(c)(4)(D) of the Act; and</p> <p>(ii) Reporting on State and LEA report cards under section 1111(h) of the Act.</p>	<p>(b)(9) <u>X</u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or</i></p>	<p>The HIDOE proposal meets this expectation.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application "C"-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<i>addressed by the application).</i>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>(d) <u>Assurances.</u></p> <p>This application contains assurances that the lead SEA and each SEA applying as a consortium will:</p> <p>(1) Continue use of the statewide academic assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science required under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act--</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) In all non-participating schools; and</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(ii) In all participating schools for which such assessments will be used in addition to innovative assessments for accountability purposes under section 1111(c) of the Act consistent with paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section or for evaluation purposes consistent with 34 CFR 200.106(e) during the demonstration authority period;</p>	<p>(d)(1)</p> <p><u>X</u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>_____Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>_____Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>The HIDOE proposal includes all of these assurances.</p>
<p>(2) Ensure that all students and each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act in</p>	<p>(d)(2)</p> <p>_____Application demonstrates a plan</p>	<p>Though the plan suggests that it will monitor and review these data, it is not clear how/whether the shortened CAT will be sufficient to measure the full depth, breadth and complexity of Hawai'i's adopted content standards in ELA</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>participating schools are held to the same challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act as all other students, except that students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may be assessed with alternate assessments aligned with alternate academic achievement standards consistent with 34 CFR 200.6 and section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D) of the Act, and receive the instructional support needed to meet such standards;</p>	<p>to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u>X</u> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>___ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>and mathematics. The argument that the general assessment, which looks at the full spectrum of reading, language, research, and writing, is comparable to the shortened test blueprint requires further review and is unlikely.</p>
<p>(3) Report the following annually to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may reasonably require:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) An update on implementation of the</p>	<p>(d)(3)</p> <p><u>X</u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during</p>	<p>The HIDOE proposal includes these requirements.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>innovative assessment demonstration authority, including--</p> <p>(A) The SEA’s progress against its timeline under 34 CFR 200.106(c) and any outcomes or results from its evaluation and continuous improvement process under 34 CFR 200.106(e); and</p> <p>(B) If the innovative assessment system is not yet implemented statewide consistent with 34 CFR 200.104(a)(2), a description of the SEA’s progress in scaling up the system to additional LEAs or schools consistent with its strategies under 34 CFR 200.106(a)(3)(i), including updated assurances from participating LEAs consistent with paragraph (e)(2) of this section.</p> <p>(ii) The performance of students in participating schools at the State, LEA, and school level, for all students and disaggregated for each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, on the</p>	<p>the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>innovative assessment, including academic achievement and participation data required to be reported consistent with section 1111(h) of the Act, except that such data may not reveal any personally identifiable information. 18</p> <p>(iii) If the innovative assessment system is not yet implemented statewide, school demographic information, including enrollment and student achievement information, for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, among participating schools and LEAs and for any schools or LEAs that will participate for the first time in the following year, and a description of how the participation of any additional schools or LEAs in that year contributed to progress toward achieving high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse LEAs in the State consistent</p>		

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>with the SEA’s benchmarks described in 34 CFR 200.106(a)(3)(iii). (iv) Feedback from teachers, principals and other school leaders, and other stakeholders consulted under paragraph (a)(2) of this section, including parents and students, from participating schools and LEAs about their satisfaction with the innovative assessment system;</p>		
<p>(4) Ensure that each participating LEA informs parents of all students in participating schools about the innovative assessment, including the grades and subjects in which the innovative assessment will be administered, and, consistent with section 1112(e)(2)(B) of the Act, at the beginning of each school year during which an innovative assessment will be implemented. Such information must be--</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) In an understandable and uniform format; (ii) To the extent practicable, written in a language that parents can understand or, if</p>	<p>(d)(4) <u>X</u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement</i></p>	<p>The family communications are mentioned within the timeline. However, the content, scope, and language sufficiency of such communications have not been elaborated. A sample letter of the type of communication expected would have allowed for more substantial review of this requirement.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent with limited English proficiency, be orally translated for such parent; and</p> <p>(iii) Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act, provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent; and</p>	<p><i>were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(5) Coordinate with and provide information to, as applicable, the Institute of Education Sciences for purposes of the progress report described in section 1204(c) of the Act and ongoing dissemination of information under section 1204(m) of the Act.</p>	<p>(d)(5)</p> <p><u>X</u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>The HIDEOE proposal demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>_____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p><u>(c)Initial implementation in a subset of LEAs or schools. If the innovative assessment system will initially be administered in a subset of LEAs or schools in a State--</u> (1) A description of each LEA, and each of its participating schools, that will initially participate, including demographic information and its most recent LEA report card under section 1111(h)(2) of the Act; and (2) An assurance from each participating LEA, for each year that the LEA is participating, that the LEA will comply with all requirements of this section.</p>	<p>(e) <u>X</u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. _____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> _____ Application does not demonstrate a plan</p>	<p>The HIDOE proposal includes a plan to meet this requirement and the requisite documentation (demographics, report cards, and assurances).</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>This requirement is not applicable to this application</p>	
<p><u>(f)Application from a consortium of SEAs.</u> If an application for the innovative assessment demonstration authority is submitted by a consortium of SEAs--</p> <p>(1) A description of the governance structure of the consortium, including--</p> <p>(i) The roles and responsibilities of each member SEA, which may include a description of affiliate members, if applicable, and must include a description of financial responsibilities of member SEAs;</p> <p>(ii) How the member SEAs will manage and, at their discretion, share intellectual property developed by the consortium as a group; and</p> <p>(iii) How the member SEAs will consider requests from SEAs to join or leave the consortium and ensure</p>	<p>(f)</p> <p>____Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____Application does not demonstrate a plan</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>that changes in membership do not affect the consortium’s ability to implement the innovative assessment demonstration authority consistent with the requirements and selection criteria in this section and 34 CFR 200.106.</p> <p>(2) While the terms of the association with affiliate members are defined by each consortium, consistent with 34 CFR 200.104(b)(1) and paragraph (f)(1)(i) of this section, for an affiliate member to become a full member of the consortium and to use the consortium’s innovative assessment system under the demonstration authority, the consortium must submit a revised application to the Secretary for approval, consistent with the requirements of this section and 34 CFR 200.106 and subject to the limitation under 34 CFR 200.104(d).</p>	<p>to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i> OR This requirement is not applicable to this application</p>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>(a) Project narrative. The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s plan for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the plan, the Secretary considers--</p> <p>(a)(1) ; (5 points if factor (3) is applicable; 10 points if factor (3) is inapplicable) The rationale for developing or selecting the particular innovative assessment system to be implemented under the demonstration authority, including--</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) The distinct purpose of each assessment that is part of the innovative</p>	(a)(1):	4	The goals elaborated by HDOE and its commitment to learning for all students is highly visible and present in the proposal.	This reviewer cautions against the use of any classroom assessments for accountability purposes. There is no need to incorporate classroom assessment practices, assessments for learning, in the accountability space (which should be assessments of learning). There are several reasons that this is not advisable: 1) this will eliminate teacher and student access to items, as they must now be secure; 2) this will likely result in a scope and sequence for curricula, which may not be an intended outcome; 3) this may increase testing time, on the whole, due to the number of transitions required. Classroom assessment practices are important

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
assessment system and how the system will advance the design and delivery of large-scale, statewide academic assessments in innovative ways; and (ii) The extent to which the innovative assessment system as a whole will promote high-quality instruction, mastery of challenging State academic standards, and improved student outcomes, including for each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act; (5 points if factor (3) is applicable; 10 points if factor (3) is inapplicable)				<p>because they can be individualized for relevance for each student and their context. It is exactly this flexibility that makes classroom assessment almost impossible to standardize. The HIDOE may not be using assessment types for the right purposes if this is the desired path, which is a critical aspect of creating balanced assessment systems. Statewide summative assessments are primarily intended to identify systems-level outcomes at the classroom, school, and district levels (depending upon <i>n</i>-size sufficiency). The most important aspect, in terms of their use at the systems level, is comparability. Comparability rests on standardization, which is almost impossible to assure in a flexible classroom assessment context. This peer advises that HIDOE keep the two goals that they have for this project separate. Assessment for learning should absolutely be a focus for states, but it should not be part of state accountability systems.</p> <p>HIDOE may better accomplish its goals if those two initiatives are separated entirely, including the removal of the reporting of student</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
				<p>grades for interim assessments, or it may result in many years of lost time and serve to create more confusion and undermine your efforts at developing assessment literacy.</p> <p>Finally, allowing for three opportunities to participate in the summative assessment during an extended test window is a questionable approach, given the state’s dedication to decreasing testing time and also decreasing the emphasis upon summative assessments.</p>
<p>(a)(2) (25 points if factor (3) is applicable; 30 points if factor (3) is inapplicable) The plan the SEA or consortium, in consultation with any external partners, if applicable, has to--</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) Develop and use standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, methods, or other strategies for scoring innovative assessments throughout the demonstration authority</p>	(a)(2):	20	The proposal from HIDOE includes substantial involvement of HIDOE staff, measurement consultants, and engagement of Hawai`i teachers.	<p>It appears that the primary goal of the proposal is to shorten testing time on the summative, but this project has tremendous potential to increase testing time. HIDOE should dedication some attention to ensuring that it is maximizing the use of the data being generated by the proposal to help guide systems-level decisions regarding curricula and instruction.</p> <p>As mentioned above, more clarity is required with regard to scoring, consistency, and the role of</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>period, consistent with relevant nationally recognized professional and technical standards, to ensure inter-rater reliability and comparability of innovative assessment results consistent with 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4)(ii), which may include evidence of inter-rater reliability; and (ii) Train evaluators to use such strategies, if applicable; (25 points if factor (3) is applicable; 30 points if factor (3) is inapplicable) and</p>				<p>classroom-based assessments, many of which are flexible (not standardized) by design in order to be effective.</p> <p>The fact that HIDOE plans to report results from the shortened blueprint and the classroom-based assessments is concerning, as there is likely to be little defensible comparability between the two systems given the flexible nature of classroom assessment.</p>
<p>(a)(3) (10 points, if applicable) If the system will initially be administered in a subset of schools or LEAs in a State-- (i) The strategies the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, will use to scale the innovative assessment to all schools statewide, with a rationale for selecting those strategies; (ii) The strength of the SEA’s or consortium’s criteria that will be</p>	(a)(3):	7	<p>The HIDOE proposal leverages an implementation science perspective, starting small with early adopters who are committed to moving the project forward.</p>	<p>HIDOE’s recruitment strategy targets teachers. It is unlikely that teachers will be able to commit to such an effort without support from their administration (i.e, at least the principal and superintendent). It is recommended that HIDOE’s communication and recruitment strategy include superintendents and principals from the beginning to ensure a sustainable approach is effected.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>used to determine LEAs and schools that will initially participate and when to approve additional LEAs and schools, if applicable, to participate during the requested demonstration authority period; and</p> <p>(iii) The SEA’s plan, including each SEA in a consortium, for how it will ensure that, during the demonstration authority period, the inclusion of additional LEAs and schools continues to reflect high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse LEAs and schools, or contributes to progress toward achieving such implementation across demographically diverse LEAs and schools, including diversity based on enrollment of subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act and student achievement. The plan must also include annual benchmarks toward achieving high-quality and consistent implementation across participating schools that are, as a group, demographically similar to the State as a whole during the demonstration authority period,</p>				

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
using the demographics of initially participating schools as a baseline. (10 points, if applicable)				
Total (out of 40) Criteria (a) (auto-total):	<u>31</u>			
(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support. (Up to 20 points total) (b)(1) (5 points) The extent and depth of prior experience that the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, and its LEAs have in developing and implementing the components of the innovative assessment system. An SEA may also describe the prior experience of any external partners that will be participating in or supporting its demonstration authority in implementing those components. In evaluating the extent and depth of prior experience, the Secretary considers— (i) The success and track record of efforts to implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items aligned to the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the	(b)(1):	4	The staff whom HIDOE plans to support this work is qualified to do so.	<p>When considering systems capacity, it is recommended that HIDOE take a close look at what they are asking teachers to do (in this case learn how to develop items that are aligned to standards) and whether that is the best (in this case the most direct, efficient, and cost effective) way to move student learning forward.</p> <p>There is some question about how professional development will be specific enough to move teacher practice with a shortened CAT? What information will HIDOE have access to that will actually define patterns of instructional strengths and weaknesses over time? The shortened blueprint may eliminate the relevance of the most important aspect of the Smarter Balanced approach to summative assessment, in the form of claim and target-level reporting that can be used to help educators review longitudinal data and identify curricular and instructional needs.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>Act in LEAs planning to participate; and</p> <p>(ii) The SEA’s or LEA’s development or use of--</p> <p>(A) Effective supports and appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR part 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act for administering innovative assessments to all students, including English learners and children with disabilities, which must include professional development for school staff on providing such accommodations;</p> <p>(B) Effective and high-quality supports for school staff to implement innovative assessments and innovative assessment items, including professional development; and</p> <p>(C) Standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, methods, or other strategies for scoring innovative assessments, with documented evidence of the validity, reliability,</p>				

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
and comparability of annual summative determinations of achievement, consistent with 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4) and (7). (5 points)				
(b)(2) (5 points) The extent and depth of SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, and LEA capacity to implement the innovative assessment system considering the availability of technological infrastructure; State and local laws; dedicated and sufficient staff, expertise, and resources; and other relevant factors. An SEA or consortium may also describe how it plans to enhance its capacity by collaborating with external partners that will be participating in or supporting its demonstration authority. In evaluating the extent and depth of capacity, the Secretary considers-- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The SEA’s analysis of how capacity influenced the success of prior efforts to develop and implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items; and (ii) The strategies the SEA is using, or will use, to 	(b)(2):	4	The HODOE and defined consultancy have the capacity to move this work, as do its teachers.	<p>HODOE did not elaborate strategies that it will take to mitigate risks that are present in the proposal, such as what it will do in the event that the shortened CAT is not comparable to the general assessment.</p> <p>The question is whether this is the best work to be doing and whether it leverages the state’s role and the role of classroom assessment appropriately. Teacher capacity deserves a department-wide discussion, as asking teachers to develop items means that they will not be able to engage in professional development targeted to directly improving instruction at the same time.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
mitigate risks, including those identified in its analysis, and support successful implementation of the innovative assessment. (5 points)				
(b)(3) (10 points) The extent and depth of State and local support for the application for demonstration authority in each SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, as demonstrated by signatures from the following: (i) Superintendents (or equivalent) of LEAs, including participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority period. (ii) Presidents of local school boards (or equivalent, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority. (iii) Local teacher organizations (including labor organizations, where applicable), including within participating LEAs	(b)(3):	8	The proposal from HDOE has deep and widespread support from all required education and community partners.	There was no documentation of business community or advocacy support.

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>in the first year of the demonstration authority.</p> <p>(iv) Other affected stakeholders, such as parent organizations, civil rights organizations, and business organizations.</p> <p>(10 points)</p>				
Total (out of 20) Criteria (b) (auto-total):	<u>16</u>			
<p>(c) Timeline and budget. (Up to 15 points)</p> <p>The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s timeline and budget for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the timeline and budget, the Secretary considers--</p> <p>(c)(1) (5 points). The extent to which the timeline reasonably demonstrates that each SEA will implement the system statewide by the end of the requested demonstration authority period, including a description of--</p> <p>(i) The activities to occur in each year of the requested demonstration authority period;</p>	(c)(1):	4	<p>The HODOE’s proposal timeline appears to be feasible and are informed by local considerations.</p>	<p>The proposal does not elaborate which HODOE staff will be dedicated, and what levels, in order to support all of the vendor work that is planned.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
(ii) The parties responsible for each activity; and (iii) If applicable, how a consortium’s member SEAs will implement activities at different paces and how the consortium will implement interdependent activities, so long as each non-affiliate member SEA begins using the innovative assessment in the same school year consistent with 34 CFR part 200.104(b)(2); (5 points) and				
(c)(2) (10 points). The adequacy of the project budget for the duration of the requested demonstration authority period, including Federal, State, local, and non-public sources of funds to support and sustain, as applicable, the activities in the timeline under paragraph (c)(1) of this section, including-- (i) How the budget will be sufficient to meet the expected costs at each phase of the SEA’s planned expansion of its	(c)(2):	7	The HIDEOE’s proposal budget appears to be relatively feasible and informed by local considerations.	More categorical detail regarding the budget is also needed for a comprehensive evaluation. The budget should also include project deliverables. HIDEOE should evaluate the plan if they are not able to secure additional funding, as well.

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>innovative assessment system; and</p> <p>(ii) The degree to which funding in the project budget is contingent upon future appropriations at the State or local level or additional commitments from non-public sources of funds. (10 points)</p>				
Total (out of 15) Criteria (c):	<u>11</u>			
<p>(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents. (Up to 25 points)</p> <p>The quality of the SEA or consortium’s plan to provide supports that can be delivered consistently at scale to educators, students, and parents to enable successful implementation of the innovative assessment system and improve instruction and student outcomes. In determining the quality of supports, the Secretary considers--</p> <p>(d)(1) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 9 points if factor (4) is inapplicable). The extent to which the SEA or consortium has developed, provided, and will continue to provide training to LEA and school staff, including</p>	(d)(1):	3	<p>The HIDEOE proposal addresses a thoughtful approach to delivering the professional development outlined in its plan, which should be consistent and scalable.</p>	<p>The development of a web-based platform (WBP) where teachers can learn how to develop assessment items may impede efficient achievement of HIDEOE’s stated goals. Why not use the interim system that is already available within Smarter Balanced, which supports teacher agency and increases efficiency while allowing teachers to focus on instruction – not assessment? While this work is certainly likely to develop teacher knowledge of the standards, it will not transform instruction by osmosis. We must be careful about how teachers use their time and privilege the time spent on improving instruction directly. If HIDEOE is truly committed to student learning, it must focus all effort outside of the system</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
teachers, principals, and other school leaders, that will familiarize them with the innovative assessment system and develop teacher capacity to implement instruction that is informed by the innovative assessment system and its results;				that is already provided by Smarter Balanced (which includes a substantial interim system) on formative assessment practices. Focusing on teacher knowledge of item development may be a siren song that will impede Hawai'i's progress in moving the needle on student learning. How does the WBP support student and teacher agency?
(d)(2) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 8 points if factor (4) is inapplicable) The strategies the SEA or consortium has developed and will use to familiarize students and parents with the innovative assessment system;	(d)(2):	4	The plan addresses communication with parents and students.	It is not clear how webinar content will be provided to parents who are English learners.
(d)(3) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 8 points if factor (4) is inapplicable) The strategies the SEA will use to ensure that all students and each subgroup of students under section 1111(c)(2) of the Act in participating schools receive the support, including appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR part 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act, needed to meet the challenging	(d)(3):	4	The plan includes all of the supports that are available within its current assessment system for the CAT components. The plan also includes on-site visits for monitoring accommodations provision for the CAT.	It is unclear what types of supports will be feasible within the WBP items; more evidence should be submitted as the learning proceeds. The results from the classroom assessments should not be used for any accountability purposes, until access, and thus comparability, can be fully established.

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act; and				
(d)(4) (10 points if applicable). If the system includes assessment items that are locally developed or locally scored, the strategies and safeguards (e.g., test blueprints, item and task specifications, rubrics, scoring tools, documentation of quality control procedures, inter-rater reliability checks, audit plans) the SEA or consortium has developed, or plans to develop, to validly and reliably score such items, including how the strategies engage and support teachers and other staff in designing, developing, implementing, and validly and reliably scoring high-quality assessments; how the safeguards are sufficient to ensure unbiased, objective scoring of assessment items; and how the SEA will use effective professional development to aid in these efforts (10 points if applicable)	(d)(4):	4	The plan includes several data-based approaches that can help to review whether development and scoring procedures are resulting in consistency.	The plan does not include frameworks for PD, item development, or scoring rubric templates or development procedures that might have allowed for a more substantial review of this expectation.
Total (out of 25) Criteria (d):	15			
(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement. (Up to 20 points) The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s plan to annually	(e)(1):	7	The plan includes an evaluation by an independent evaluator, which should help ensure that results will be objective and actionable.	The evaluator is not identified, nor is it possible to identify the required skills and experience that will be

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>evaluate its implementation of innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers—</p> <p>(e)(1) (12 points) The strength of the proposed evaluation of the innovative assessment system included in the application, including whether the evaluation will be conducted by an independent, experienced third party, and the likelihood that the evaluation will sufficiently determine the system’s validity, reliability, and comparability to the statewide assessment system consistent with the requirements of 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4) and (9); and</p>				<p>required of the position (a job description would have been helpful).</p> <p>Though stated as values throughout the proposal, the questions that are listed to be part of an independent evaluation of the HICAP do not address changes in the quality of instruction, nor student learning, or student or teacher agency. Are questions in these areas not priorities for HIDOE in this work?</p>
<p>(e)(2) (8 points) The SEA’s or consortium’s plan for continuous improvement of the innovative assessment system, including its process for--</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) Using data, feedback, evaluation results, and other information from participating LEAs and schools to make changes</p>	(e)(2):	4	<p>The HIDOE proposal will be reviewed by staff, teachers, and measurement experts consistently throughout development and implementation, which might inform all future efforts in a continuous improvement model.</p>	<p>The primary challenge is how the evaluation of the classroom assessments will be conducted and what criteria will be used for that purpose. Without criteria, it is difficult to determine what will be monitored.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application "C"-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
to improve the quality of the innovative assessment; and (ii) Evaluating and monitoring implementation of the innovative assessment system in participating LEAs and schools annually.				
Total (out of 20) Criteria (e): (auto-total)	<u>11</u>			
Total (a+b+c+d+e) (auto-total)	<u>(31 + 16 + 11 + 15 + 11)</u> 84/120			

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application C Reviewer 5

Instructions:

- The Panel Monitor will provide deadlines for submitting preliminary scores and comments.
- Review and score each application independently.
- Enter preliminary scores and comments into the Preliminary TRF.
- Send completed TRF to the Panel Monitor.
- The Panel Monitor will review scores and comments and ask you to clarify or elaborate if needed, so that comments clearly reflect and justify your scores.
- All scores and comments must be completed before panel discussions can be held.
- After discussion, revise your Preliminary TRF to reflect any changes you want to make.

Writing strengths and weaknesses:

- Make clear, evaluative statements about the substance of the criterion being discussed.
- Substantiate all evaluative statements using evidence from the application narrative, evidence tables, performance measures, appendices, and/or budgets.
- You may comment on information that is missing or inconsistent with other parts of the application.
- Write for a broad audience. Avoid expressions and jargon that might not be commonly understood.

Scoring:

- You may choose to break comments down by subcriteria, which will make them easier to read and review. This is preferred but optional.
- When awarding points, you should NOT break down scores by sub-criteria. Each criterion receives one total score as directed in the TRF (for example, (a)(1)(i-ii) receives one score).

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

- A few criteria may not be applicable to every application. If so, follow the instructions in the TRF.

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
(a) Consultation. Evidence that the SEA or consortium has developed an innovative assessment system in collaboration with-- (1) Experts in the planning, development, implementation, and evaluation of innovative assessment systems, which may include external partners; and (2) Affected stakeholders in the State, or in each State in the consortium, including-- (i) Those representing the interests of children with disabilities, English learners, and other subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act; (ii) Teachers, principals, and other school leaders; (iii) Local educational agencies (LEAs); (iv) Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State; (v) Students and parents, including parents of children described in paragraph (a)(2)(i) of this section; and (vi) Civil rights organizations.	(a) ____ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. _X_ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i>	The State has consulted many psychometric and assessment experts in developing the current application, including their own TAC. The State’s Department of Education, HDOE, met with groups of teachers, administrators, legislators, and the State’s teachers association while preparing the IADA application. The State also used a research group to survey state residents about education, in general, in the State. Even though the application pointed out the large percentage of Asian Pacific Island students, including Native Hawaiians, no documentation was found that the state specifically sought feedback from representatives of Native Hawaiian groups, nor students and parents, in particular, nor civil rights organizations. However, it is noted that the survey of residents most likely included many members of these groups.

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p><u>(b)Innovative assessment system.</u> A demonstration that the innovative assessment system does or will-- (1) Meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(2)(B) of the Act, except that an innovative assessment-- (i) Need not be the same assessment administered to all public elementary and secondary school students in the State during the demonstration authority period described in 34 CFR 200.104(b)(2) or extension period described in 34 CFR 200.108 and prior to statewide use consistent with 34 CFR 200.107, if the innovative assessment system will be administered initially to all students in participating schools within a participating LEA, provided that the statewide academic assessments under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act are administered to all students in any non-participating LEA or any non-participating school within a participating LEA; and (ii) Need not be administered annually in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in grades 9-12 in the case of reading/language arts and</p>	<p>(b)(1) _X_ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>The State has provided a detailed plan of when the proposed shortened summative assessments will be administered (a part of HICAP). The plan details when the new assessments will be phased in and will only start in a few participating schools, also delineated.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>mathematics assessments, and at least once in grades 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12 in the case of science assessments, so long as the statewide academic assessments under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act are administered in any required grade and subject under 34 CFR 200.5(a)(1) in which the SEA does not choose to implement an innovative assessment.</p>		
<p>(2)(i) Align with the challenging State academic content standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act, including the depth and breadth of such standards, for the grade in which a student is enrolled; and (ii) May measure a student’s academic proficiency and growth using items above or below the student’s grade level so long as, for purposes of meeting the requirements for reporting and school accountability under sections 1111(c) and 1111(h) of the Act and paragraphs (b)(3) and (b)(7)-(9) of this section, the State measures each student’s academic proficiency based on the challenging State academic standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled;</p>	<p>(b)(2) __Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. _X_ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ____ Application does not demonstrate a plan</p>	<p>The HICAP’s shortened summative CAT will be developed using Smarter Balanced test items and follow blueprints based on the existing assessments. Student scores will be aligned to the same challenging academic standards already in use. The State provided results of simulation studies for ELA grade 4 and math grade 8, which demonstrated score comparability across the current and proposed shortened assessments, as well as the expected increase in conditional standard error measurement because of decrease in test length. However, the State did not provide evidence that the reduction of the length of the CAT would maintain assessment of the academic content standards to the same depth and breadth.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(3) Express student results or competencies consistent with the challenging State academic achievement standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act and identify which students are not making sufficient progress toward, and attaining, grade-level proficiency on such standards;</p>	<p>(b)(3) ___ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. _X_ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ___ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during</p>	<p>The State will continue to identify student performance with the existing achievement standards and will thus continue to identify students not making sufficient progress toward, and attaining, grade-level proficiency on their standards. However, if the revised assessments are substantially different in length from the current assessments, the State needs to provide evidence that the identification of students toward making progress is comparable in under both versions.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(4)(i) Generate results, including annual summative determinations as defined in paragraph (b)(7) of this section, that are valid, reliable, and comparable for all students and for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, to the results generated by the State academic assessments described in 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act for such students.</p> <p>Consistent with the SEA’s or consortium’s evaluation plan under 34 CFR 200.106(e), the SEA must plan to annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period in one of the following ways:</p> <p>(A) Administering full assessments from both the innovative and statewide assessment systems to all students enrolled in participating</p>	<p>(b)(4) <u> X </u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u> </u> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><u> </u> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p>	<p>The State will develop the shortened CAT using items from the Smarter Balanced item pool, so that the comparability of the existing assessment and the proposed shortened CAT can be established, by placing scores for the two versions on a common scale. The State will evaluate the comparability annually.</p> <p>Students participating in the pilot study will not have to take the current assessment in the same content area.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>schools, such that at least once in any grade span (i.e., 3-5, 6-8, or 9-12) and subject for which there is an innovative assessment, a statewide assessment in the same subject would also be administered to all such students. As part of this determination, the innovative assessment and statewide assessment need not be administered to an individual student in the same school year.</p> <p>(B) Administering full assessments from both the innovative and statewide assessment systems to a demographically representative sample of all students and subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, from among those students enrolled in participating schools, such that at least once in any grade span (i.e., 3-5, 6-8, or 9-12) and subject for which there is an innovative assessment, a statewide assessment in the same subject would also be administered in the same school year to all students included in the sample.</p> <p>(C) Including, as a significant portion of the innovative assessment system in each required grade and subject in which both an innovative and statewide assessment are</p>	<p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>administered, items or performance tasks from the statewide assessment system that, at a minimum, have been previously pilot tested or field tested for use in the statewide assessment system.</p> <p>(D) Including, as a significant portion of the statewide assessment system in each required grade and subject in which both an innovative and statewide assessment are administered, items or performance tasks from the innovative assessment system that, at a minimum, have been previously pilot tested or field tested for use in the innovative assessment system.</p> <p>(E) An alternative method for demonstrating comparability that an SEA can demonstrate will provide for an equally rigorous and statistically valid comparison between student performance on the innovative assessment and the statewide assessment, including for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act;</p> <p>(ii) Generate results, including annual summative determinations as defined in paragraph (b)(7) of this section, that are valid, reliable, and</p>		

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
comparable, for all students and for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, among participating schools and LEAs in the innovative assessment demonstration authority. Consistent with the SEA’s or consortium’s evaluation plan under 34 CFR 200.106(e), the SEA must plan to annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period;		
(5)(i) Provide for the participation of all students, including children with disabilities and English learners; (ii) Be accessible to all students by incorporating the principles of universal design for learning, to the extent practicable, consistent with 34 CFR 200.2(b)(2)(ii); and (iii) Provide appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act;	(b)(5) _X_ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. ___ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i>	Existing procedures and policies to provide accommodations and accessibility supports for the current assessments will be used with the proposed HICAP shortened CAT, allowing participation of all students, including students with disabilities and English learners.

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application "C"-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>___ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(6) For purposes of the State accountability system consistent with section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the Act, annually measure in each participating school progress on the Academic Achievement indicator under section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the Act of at least 95 percent of all students, and 95 percent of students in each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, who are required to take such assessments consistent with paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section;</p>	<p>(b)(6) _X_ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. ___ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ___ Application does not demonstrate a plan</p>	<p>The State asserted that it will continue to meet this requirement.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>7) Generate an annual summative determination of achievement, using the annual data from the innovative assessment, for each student in a participating school in the demonstration authority that describes--</p> <p>(i) The student’s mastery of the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act for the grade in which the student is enrolled; or</p> <p>(ii) In the case of a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed with an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Act, the student’s mastery of those standards;</p>	<p>(b)(7)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during</p>	<p>For students assessed with the shortened summative CAT and classroom-based assessments of the HICAP, their performance measured using four proficiency levels (p. 34) will be provided annually, at the end of the school year. Reports will be provided to parents, as well as teachers, principals, and other school leaders. However, if the revised assessments are substantially different in length from the current assessments, the State needs to provide evidence that the identification of students’ mastery of the academic standards is comparable in under both versions.</p> <p>This application is not related to alternate assessments.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(8) Provide disaggregated results by each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, including timely data for teachers, principals and other school leaders, students, and parents consistent with 34 CFR 200.8 and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(x) and (xii) and section 1111(h) of the Act, and provide results to parents in a manner consistent with paragraph (b)(4)(i) of this section and part 200.2(e);</p>	<p>(b)(8) <u> X </u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <u> </u> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> <u> </u> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p>	<p>The disaggregated results by school level and statewide for subgroups, such as economically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, English Learners, and major race and ethnic groups, etc., will be provided at the end of the school year. Similar to the score reports for the statewide summative assessments, the HICAP Family Reports (paper) will be provided to parents. Electronic access to the online HICAP reports will be offered to teachers, principals, and other school leaders.</p> <p>In addition, the results from the HICAP classroom-based assessments, administered at various times during the year, will be shared with parents throughout the year.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i>	
<p>(9) Provide an unbiased, rational, and consistent determination of progress toward the State’s long-term goals for academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(A) of the Act for all students and each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act and a comparable measure of student performance on the Academic Achievement indicator under section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the Act for participating schools relative to non-participating schools so that the SEA may validly and reliably aggregate data from the system for purposes of meeting requirements for--</p> <p>(i) Accountability under sections 1003 and 1111(c) and (d) of the Act, including how the SEA will identify participating and non-participating schools in a consistent manner for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement under section 1111(c)(4)(D) of the Act; and</p> <p>(ii) Reporting on State and LEA report cards under section 1111(h) of the Act.</p>	<p>(b)(9)</p> <p><u> X </u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u> </u> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><u> </u> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or</i></p>	<p>During the authority period, the State will evaluate comparability, annually, between the current assessment and the HICAP shortened CAT. However, the state will not incorporate the results of the HICAP classroom-based scores into their annual accountability numbers.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<i>addressed by the application).</i>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>(d) <u>Assurances.</u></p> <p>This application contains assurances that the lead SEA and each SEA applying as a consortium will:</p> <p>(1) Continue use of the statewide academic assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science required under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act--</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) In all non-participating schools; and</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(ii) In all participating schools for which such assessments will be used in addition to innovative assessments for accountability purposes under section 1111(c) of the Act consistent with paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section or for evaluation purposes consistent with 34 CFR 200.106(e) during the demonstration authority period;</p>	<p>(d)(1)</p> <p><u> X </u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u> </u> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><u> </u> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>State provided a signed “Assurances” document. Students not taking the pilot assessment will take the current assessment.</p>
<p>(2) Ensure that all students and each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act in</p>	<p>(d)(2)</p> <p><u> </u> Application demonstrates a plan</p>	<p>The State provided a signed “Assurances” document and the proposed HICAP shortened CAT will be designed to align with the existing achievement standards and align with performance levels. However, the State needs to</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>participating schools are held to the same challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act as all other students, except that students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may be assessed with alternate assessments aligned with alternate academic achievement standards consistent with 34 CFR 200.6 and section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D) of the Act, and receive the instructional support needed to meet such standards;</p>	<p>to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u> X </u> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><u> </u> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>demonstrate that the shortened assessment without performance tasks actually does align with the existing achievement standards and performance levels.</p> <p>The existing assessments for students with significant cognitive disabilities will continue unchanged.</p>
<p>(3) Report the following annually to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may reasonably require:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) An update on implementation of the</p>	<p>(d)(3)</p> <p><u> X </u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during</p>	<p>State provided a signed “Assurances” document.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>innovative assessment demonstration authority, including--</p> <p>(A) The SEA’s progress against its timeline under 34 CFR 200.106(c) and any outcomes or results from its evaluation and continuous improvement process under 34 CFR 200.106(e); and</p> <p>(B) If the innovative assessment system is not yet implemented statewide consistent with 34 CFR 200.104(a)(2), a description of the SEA’s progress in scaling up the system to additional LEAs or schools consistent with its strategies under 34 CFR 200.106(a)(3)(i), including updated assurances from participating LEAs consistent with paragraph (e)(2) of this section.</p> <p>(ii) The performance of students in participating schools at the State, LEA, and school level, for all students and disaggregated for each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, on the</p>	<p>the course of the authority period.</p> <p>__ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>___ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>innovative assessment, including academic achievement and participation data required to be reported consistent with section 1111(h) of the Act, except that such data may not reveal any personally identifiable information. 18</p> <p>(iii) If the innovative assessment system is not yet implemented statewide, school demographic information, including enrollment and student achievement information, for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, among participating schools and LEAs and for any schools or LEAs that will participate for the first time in the following year, and a description of how the participation of any additional schools or LEAs in that year contributed to progress toward achieving high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse LEAs in the State consistent</p>		

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>with the SEA’s benchmarks described in 34 CFR 200.106(a)(3)(iii). (iv) Feedback from teachers, principals and other school leaders, and other stakeholders consulted under paragraph (a)(2) of this section, including parents and students, from participating schools and LEAs about their satisfaction with the innovative assessment system;</p>		
<p>(4) Ensure that each participating LEA informs parents of all students in participating schools about the innovative assessment, including the grades and subjects in which the innovative assessment will be administered, and, consistent with section 1112(e)(2)(B) of the Act, at the beginning of each school year during which an innovative assessment will be implemented. Such information must be--</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) In an understandable and uniform format; (ii) To the extent practicable, written in a language that parents can understand or, if 	<p>(d)(4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement</i></p>	<p>In addition to the signed “Assurances” document provided by the State, the timeline includes plans to develop and disseminate educator and family communications materials about the HICAP system.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent with limited English proficiency, be orally translated for such parent; and</p> <p>(iii) Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act, provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent; and</p>	<p><i>were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(5) Coordinate with and provide information to, as applicable, the Institute of Education Sciences for purposes of the progress report described in section 1204(c) of the Act and ongoing dissemination of information under section 1204(m) of the Act.</p>	<p>(d)(5)</p> <p><u>X</u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>State provided a signed “Assurances” document.</p> <p>In addition, the State writes that it will conduct an annual evaluation and review.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p><u>(c)Initial implementation in a subset of LEAs or schools. If the innovative assessment system will initially be administered in a subset of LEAs or schools in a State--</u> (1) A description of each LEA, and each of its participating schools, that will initially participate, including demographic information and its most recent LEA report card under section 1111(h)(2) of the Act; and (2) An assurance from each participating LEA, for each year that the LEA is participating, that the LEA will comply with all requirements of this section.</p>	<p>(e) __X__ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____ Application does not demonstrate a plan</p>	<p>In addition to the signed “Assurances” document provided, the State application included details of the expected demographic make-up of the initial pilot schools, as well as how accountability results will be reported. It is reasonable to assume that the State will continue the required reporting.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i> OR This requirement is not applicable to this application</p>	
<p><u>(f)Application from a consortium of SEAs.</u> If an application for the innovative assessment demonstration authority is submitted by a consortium of SEAs-- (1) A description of the governance structure of the consortium, including-- (i) The roles and responsibilities of each member SEA, which may include a description of affiliate members, if applicable, and must include a description of financial responsibilities of member SEAs; (ii) How the member SEAs will manage and, at their discretion, share intellectual property developed by the consortium as a group; and (iii) How the member SEAs will consider requests from SEAs to join or leave the consortium and ensure</p>	<p>(f) ____Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. ____Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ____Application does not demonstrate a plan</p>	<p>This requirement is not applicable to this application</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>that changes in membership do not affect the consortium’s ability to implement the innovative assessment demonstration authority consistent with the requirements and selection criteria in this section and 34 CFR 200.106.</p> <p>(2) While the terms of the association with affiliate members are defined by each consortium, consistent with 34 CFR 200.104(b)(1) and paragraph (f)(1)(i) of this section, for an affiliate member to become a full member of the consortium and to use the consortium’s innovative assessment system under the demonstration authority, the consortium must submit a revised application to the Secretary for approval, consistent with the requirements of this section and 34 CFR 200.106 and subject to the limitation under 34 CFR 200.104(d).</p>	<p>to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i> OR This requirement is not applicable to this application</p>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application "C"-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>(a) Project narrative. The quality of the SEA's or consortium's plan for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the plan, the Secretary considers--</p> <p>(a)(1) ; (5 points if factor (3) is applicable; 10 points if factor (3) is inapplicable) The rationale for developing or selecting the particular innovative assessment system to be implemented under the demonstration authority, including--</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) The distinct purpose of each assessment that is part of the innovative</p>	(a)(1):	5	<p>The rationale for the proposed innovative assessment, the HICAP, is to capitalize on benefits of two kinds of assessments: a summative CAT and classroom-based assessments delivered throughout the year. Part of the impetus behind the change is based on feedback from stakeholders about the current State assessment system.</p> <p>The proposed assessment model is a combination of the shortened CAT and the classroom-based assessments. The classroom-based assessments, in particular, will inform instruction throughout the year.</p>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>assessment system and how the system will advance the design and delivery of large-scale, statewide academic assessments in innovative ways; and</p> <p>(ii) The extent to which the innovative assessment system as a whole will promote high-quality instruction, mastery of challenging State academic standards, and improved student outcomes, including for each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act; (5 points if factor (3) is applicable; 10 points if factor (3) is inapplicable)</p>				
<p>(a)(2) (25 points if factor (3) is applicable; 30 points if factor (3) is inapplicable) The plan the SEA or consortium, in consultation with any external partners, if applicable, has to--</p> <p>(i) Develop and use standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, methods, or other</p>	(a)(2):	20	The application includes details on how the shortened CAT will be developed to ensure comparability with the existing system, and evaluated for such. The State is partnering with organizations, has consultants, and a TAC who can contribute to these efforts. In addition, the application outlines the professional development that will	Although, the professional development appears appropriately detailed and a vendor will work with the state and relevant educators to ensure accurate and consistent scoring. It is not made clear <i>how</i> the accuracy and consistency of the scoring will be ensured across different teachers and classrooms.

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>strategies for scoring innovative assessments throughout the demonstration authority period, consistent with relevant nationally recognized professional and technical standards, to ensure inter-rater reliability and comparability of innovative assessment results consistent with 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4)(ii), which may include evidence of inter-rater reliability; and (ii) Train evaluators to use such strategies, if applicable; (25 points if factor (3) is applicable; 30 points if factor (3) is inapplicable) and</p>			<p>be provided for classroom teachers on the development and grading of the classroom-based assessments, including alignment of grading practices to the standards, universal design principles, and assessment literacy, in general.</p>	
<p>(a)(3) (10 points, if applicable) If the system will initially be administered in a subset of schools or LEAs in a State-- (i) The strategies the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, will use to scale the innovative assessment to all</p>	(a)(3):	9	<p>The State selected initial schools so that the sample of students reflected the demographic make-up of the students and geographically represented the state. Teachers applied to participate in the project and were selected based on specific criteria, such as their interest in</p>	<p>No evidence was found that the state will monitor the quality of the implementation of the HICAP across the authority period.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>schools statewide, with a rationale for selecting those strategies;</p> <p>(ii) The strength of the SEA’s or consortium’s criteria that will be used to determine LEAs and schools that will initially participate and when to approve additional LEAs and schools, if applicable, to participate during the requested demonstration authority period; and</p> <p>(iii) The SEA’s plan, including each SEA in a consortium, for how it will ensure that, during the demonstration authority period, the inclusion of additional LEAs and schools continues to reflect high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse LEAs and schools, or contributes to progress toward achieving such implementation across demographically diverse LEAs and schools, including diversity based on enrollment of subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act and student achievement. The plan must also include annual benchmarks toward achieving high-quality and consistent implementation across</p>			<p>assessment and commitment to the project, as well as their geographic location and the ethnic diversity of their students. In this way, the State has taken steps to ensure that the participants are committed to the program.</p>	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
participating schools that are, as a group, demographically similar to the State as a whole during the demonstration authority period, using the demographics of initially participating schools as a baseline. (10 points, if applicable)				
Total (out of 40) Criteria (a) (auto-total):		34		
(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support. (Up to 20 points total) (b)(1) (5 points) The extent and depth of prior experience that the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, and its LEAs have in developing and implementing the components of the innovative assessment system. An SEA may also describe the prior experience of any external partners that will be participating in or supporting its demonstration authority in implementing those components. In evaluating the extent and depth of prior experience, the Secretary considers— (i) The success and track record of efforts to implement innovative assessments or innovative	(b)(1):	5	The groups that the State is working with, such as the The National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment (or, the Center for Assessment) and Cambium Assessment (formerly, Assessment Division of the American Institutes for Research), have experience developing such innovative assessments, and evaluating the comparability, reliability and validity. HIDOE staff, themselves, also have experience developing and implementing innovative assessments.	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>assessment items aligned to the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act in LEAs planning to participate; and</p> <p>(ii) The SEA’s or LEA’s development or use of--</p> <p>(A) Effective supports and appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR part 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act for administering innovative assessments to all students, including English learners and children with disabilities, which must include professional development for school staff on providing such accommodations;</p> <p>(B) Effective and high-quality supports for school staff to implement innovative assessments and innovative assessment items, including professional development; and</p>				

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
(C) Standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, methods, or other strategies for scoring innovative assessments, with documented evidence of the validity, reliability, and comparability of annual summative determinations of achievement, consistent with 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4) and (7). (5 points)				
(b)(2) (5 points) The extent and depth of SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, and LEA capacity to implement the innovative assessment system considering the availability of technological infrastructure; State and local laws; dedicated and sufficient staff, expertise, and resources; and other relevant factors. An SEA or consortium may also describe how it plans to enhance its capacity by collaborating with external partners that will be participating in or supporting its demonstration authority. In evaluating the extent and depth of capacity, the Secretary considers-- (i) The SEA’s analysis of how capacity influenced the success of prior efforts to develop and implement	(b)(2):	5	The State already has a strong technological infrastructure, including delivery of a CAT. The State has evaluated potential areas of risk and it, along with its relevant vendors, have back-up plans in place for a variety of potential issues, such as power or internet outages. HIDOE’s Office of Information Technology Services and the Assessment Section will work together so that results from the classroom-based assessment system and the Department’s student information system.	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>innovative assessments or innovative assessment items; and</p> <p>(ii) The strategies the SEA is using, or will use, to mitigate risks, including those identified in its analysis, and support successful implementation of the innovative assessment. (5 points)</p>				
<p>(b)(3) (10 points)The extent and depth of State and local support for the application for demonstration authority in each SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, as demonstrated by signatures from the following:</p> <p>(i) Superintendents (or equivalent) of LEAs, including participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority period.</p> <p>(ii) Presidents of local school boards (or equivalent, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority.</p>	(b)(3):	9	<p>Letters of support were provided by superintendents of complex areas that will participate in the pilot, the Hawaii State Public Charter School Commission, the Hawaii Board of Education Chairperson, the State’s Special Education Advisory Council, the Hawaii State Teacher Association, and the Hawaii State Parent Teacher Student Association.</p>	<p>No letters of support were provided by civil rights organizations or business organizations.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
(iii) Local teacher organizations (including labor organizations, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority. (iv) Other affected stakeholders, such as parent organizations, civil rights organizations, and business organizations. (10 points)				
Total (out of 20) Criteria (b) (auto-total):		19		
(c) Timeline and budget. (Up to 15 points) The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s timeline and budget for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the timeline and budget, the Secretary considers-- (c)(1) (5 points). The extent to which the timeline reasonably demonstrates that each SEA will implement the system statewide by the end of the requested demonstration authority period, including a description of--	(c)(1):	5	The State provided a reasonable timeline that included activities necessary to develop and administer this innovative assessment, including which parties are responsible for the different activities.	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
(i) The activities to occur in each year of the requested demonstration authority period; (ii) The parties responsible for each activity; and (iii) If applicable, how a consortium’s member SEAs will implement activities at different paces and how the consortium will implement interdependent activities, so long as each non-affiliate member SEA begins using the innovative assessment in the same school year consistent with 34 CFR part 200.104(b)(2); (5 points) and				
(c)(2) (10 points). The adequacy of the project budget for the duration of the requested demonstration authority period, including Federal, State, local, and non-public sources of funds to support and sustain, as applicable, the activities in the timeline under paragraph (c)(1) of this section, including--	(c)(2):	3	The budget addresses the broad aspects of developing, administering, and evaluating the innovative system. The cost of item development is relatively low, which is reasonable because items will come from Smarter Balanced.	Because the State will need to continue to deliver existing assessments during the authority period, the State, “Center for Assessment, Cambium Assessment, and the vendor for the classroom-based assessment system, will pursue additional funding to pilot and scale the HICAP. However, it is not clear how much additional funding will be

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>(i) How the budget will be sufficient to meet the expected costs at each phase of the SEA’s planned expansion of its innovative assessment system; and</p> <p>(ii) The degree to which funding in the project budget is contingent upon future appropriations at the State or local level or additional commitments from non-public sources of funds. (10 points)</p>				<p>required, above and beyond, what the State can expect from anticipated federal and state funds. The State has not provided a contingency plan for the development and implementation of HICAP if additional funds are not secured.</p> <p>Even though the key aspects of HICAP are listed in the budget, no detail is provided on how the estimated costs were developed and if they are reasonable to cover the various activities.</p>
Total (out of 15) Criteria (c):	8			
<p>(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents. (Up to 25 points)</p> <p>The quality of the SEA or consortium’s plan to provide supports that can be delivered consistently at scale to educators, students, and parents to enable successful implementation of the innovative assessment system and improve instruction and student outcomes. In determining the quality of supports, the Secretary considers--</p> <p>(d)(1) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 9 points if factor (4)</p>	(d)(1):	4	<p>The State provided extensive plans for the professional development and training for teachers and principals – both to familiarize them with the new assessments, as well as the training necessary to administer the innovative system.</p>	<p>While one goal of the classroom-based assessments is to inform instruction throughout the school year, this reviewer did not find specific plans to assist educators with delivering instruction that is informed by the results of the HICAP classroom-based assessments.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
is inapplicable). The extent to which the SEA or consortium has developed, provided, and will continue to provide training to LEA and school staff, including teachers, principals, and other school leaders, that will familiarize them with the innovative assessment system and develop teacher capacity to implement instruction that is informed by the innovative assessment system and its results;				
(d)(2) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 8 points if factor (4) is inapplicable) The strategies the SEA or consortium has developed and will use to familiarize students and parents with the innovative assessment system;	(d)(2):	4	<p>The State has detailed plans on the materials it will develop for students and teachers. The materials will be available online, or through weekly email updates, and the HICAP portal that will be created.</p> <p>Easy-to-understand standards-based reports will be available for parents and students.</p>	The majority of these strategies are web-based and may not be accessible to all parents.
(d)(3) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 8 points if factor (4) is inapplicable) The strategies the SEA will use to ensure that all students and each subgroup of students under section 1111(c)(2) of the Act in participating schools receive the support, including appropriate accommodations	(d)(3):	5	Appropriate accommodations as specified in students' IEPs or EL plan will be provided for students taking the revised assessments. The procedures to ensure that all students are tested, and with appropriate accommodations, are already in place and will continue for the revised assessments. In addition, the	

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
consistent with 34 CFR part 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act, needed to meet the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act; and			web-based platform for the classroom-based assessments will include supports for accommodations.	
(d)(4) (10 points if applicable). If the system includes assessment items that are locally developed or locally scored, the strategies and safeguards (e.g., test blueprints, item and task specifications, rubrics, scoring tools, documentation of quality control procedures, inter-rater reliability checks, audit plans) the SEA or consortium has developed, or plans to develop, to validly and reliably score such items, including how the strategies engage and support teachers and other staff in designing, developing, implementing, and validly and reliably scoring high-quality assessments; how the safeguards are sufficient to ensure unbiased, objective scoring of assessment items; and how the SEA will use effective professional development to aid in these efforts (10 points if applicable)	(d)(4):	6	<p>The application outlines the professional development that will be provided for classroom teachers on the development and grading of the classroom-based assessments, including alignment of grading practices to the standards, universal design principles, and assessment literacy, in general.</p> <p>Along with HIDOE staff and the State TAC, the State is partnering with the Center for Assessment and Cambium, who can all provide assistance with local development and scoring of the classroom-based assessments.</p>	Although, the professional development appears appropriately detailed and a vendor will work with the state and relevant educators to ensure accurate and consistent scoring. It is not made clear <i>how</i> the accuracy and consistency of the scoring will be ensured across different teachers and classrooms, now how the validity and reliability will be assessed.
Total (out of 25) Criteria (d):	19			

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement. (Up to 20 points) The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s plan to annually evaluate its implementation of innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers—</p> <p>(e)(1) (12 points) The strength of the proposed evaluation of the innovative assessment system included in the application, including whether the evaluation will be conducted by an independent, experienced third party, and the likelihood that the evaluation will sufficiently determine the system’s validity, reliability, and comparability to the statewide assessment system consistent with the requirements of 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4) and (9); and</p>	(e)(1):	6	<p>The shortened summative CAT will be evaluated for technical quality by the State TAC, HIDOE curriculum and measurement specialists, and Cambium Assessment.</p> <p>The State will hire an independent evaluator to conduct annual evaluations of the effectiveness of the classroom-based assessments to inform instruction.</p>	<p>There was no independent evaluator for the shortened summative CAT.</p> <p>Because the independent evaluator has not been determined, this reviewer cannot verify the experience of that external reviewer to conduct a thorough evaluation of the classroom-based assessments component of HICAP. The list of aspects of the classroom-based assessments to be evaluated was limited.</p>
<p>(e)(2) (8 points) The SEA’s or consortium’s plan for continuous improvement of the innovative assessment system, including its process for--</p>	(e)(2):	7	<p>The State has indicated that they will seek stakeholder feedback, review results and data, and monitor administrations, throughout the authority period. The results of the reviews will be shared with the State</p>	<p>The State should provide more details on how the classroom-based assessments will be monitored.</p>

2020 IADA Application Technical Review Form Application “C”-Hawaii

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
(i) Using data, feedback, evaluation results, and other information from participating LEAs and schools to make changes to improve the quality of the innovative assessment; and (ii) Evaluating and monitoring implementation of the innovative assessment system in participating LEAs and schools annually.			TAC to get feedback on the psychometric and other technical issues related to the assessments. The State will meet with Cambium Assessment and the Center for Assessment to review the development and implementation of HICAP. All of this information will be used to inform changes and improvements to the system.	
Total (out of 20) Criteria (e): (auto-total)	<u>13</u>			
Total (a+b+c+d+e) (auto-total)	<u>93</u>			