



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

September 11, 2020

The Honorable Ann Lebo  
Director  
Iowa Department of Education  
400 East 14<sup>th</sup> Street  
Des Moines, IA 50319

Dear Director Lebo:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (the Department) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). I appreciate the efforts of the Iowa Department of Education (IDE) to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in March 2020. Specifically, IDE submitted evidence regarding the general assessments in reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics in grades 3-8 and high school; the general assessment in science in grades 5, 8, and high school; the alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) in science in grades 5, 8, and high school; and the AA-AAAS in R/LA and mathematics in grades 3-8 and high school.

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

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated IDE's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the components of your assessment system meet some, but not all, of the statutory and regulatory requirements of sections 1111(b)(1) and (2) of the ESEA. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- General assessments in R/LA and mathematics in grades 3-8 and high school (Iowa Statewide Assessment of Student Progress (ISASP)): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- General assessment in science for grades 5, 8, and high school (ISASP): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- Alternate assessment of alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) in science for grades 5, 8, and high school (Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM)): **Partially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- AA-AAAS in R/LA and mathematics in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**

The component that **partially meets requirements** does not meet a number of the requirements of the statute and regulations and IDE will need to provide substantial additional information to demonstrate it meets the requirements. The Department expects that IDE may not be able to submit all of the required information within one year.

400 MARYLAND AVE., SW, WASHINGTON, DC 20202  
[www.ed.gov](http://www.ed.gov)

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

**Substantially meets requirements** means that these components meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional evidence is required.

Because the DLM science assessment does not meet a number of the requirements of the statute and regulations and the IDE will need to provide substantial additional information to demonstrate it meets the requirements, the Department expects that the IDE may not be able to submit all of the required information within one year. The Department is placing a condition on the State's 2020 Title I, Part A grant award. This condition will remain until the assessments in this review have been determined to meet all requirements. If the outcome of the re-review by peers indicates full approval, then the condition will be removed. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action. Additionally, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) will monitor progress on matters pertaining to requirements in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) related to the participation of students with disabilities in Title I assessments. In particular, OSERS will monitor progress against critical elements 5.4, 6.1, and 6.3.

The specific list of items required for IDE to submit is enclosed with this letter. I request that IDE submit a plan within 30 days outlining when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. I recognize the unprecedented situation affecting you and your schools due to widespread and extended school closures caused by the novel coronavirus, COVID-19. As a result, if you need more than 30 days to submit your plan, please let my staff know at [ESEA.Assessment@ed.gov](mailto:ESEA.Assessment@ed.gov). Upon submission of the plan, the Department will reach out to IDE to determine a mutually agreeable schedule. Resubmission should occur once all necessary evidence is complete (rather than in multiple submissions).

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

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

If you have any questions, please contact my staff at: [ESEA.Assessment@ed.gov](mailto:ESEA.Assessment@ed.gov).

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan  
Assistant Secretary  
for Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Erika Cook, Bureau Chief

## Critical Elements that Require Additional Evidence for Iowa’s Assessment System

| Critical element                                | Additional Evidence Needed   |
|---|--|
| <p><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> | <p>For the Iowa Statewide Assessment of Student Progress (ISASP) in reading/language Arts (R/LA) and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, and aligns the assessments to the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards for the grade that is being assessed, specifically:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of a plan to match R/LA items in the content domain to their respective content standards in the test blueprints for the grades 6, 10 and 11 Key Ideas and Details domain, the grade 7 Research to Build and Present Knowledge domain, and in the grade 3 mathematics Geometry domain.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>For the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, and aligns the assessments to the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards for the grade that is being assessed (e.g., documentation that the test design adequately samples the Essential Elements in science).</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p>            | <p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive processes, including higher-order thinking skills (e.g., documentation that clarifies how the development and review process for Essential Element Concept Maps contributes to a technically sound test item development process).</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p>         | <p>For the ISASP in R/LA, mathematics, and science and for the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations (e.g., evidence of providing key documents on test administration and communicating this to district and school test coordinators and administrators through emails, websites, or listserv messages for downloading; or through cover memos with hard copies of the materials delivered to districts and schools).</li> <li>• Evidence that the State has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of English learners (ELs), specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with</li> </ul>   |

| Critical element  | Additional Evidence Needed  |
|---|---|
|   | <p>disabilities (e.g., documentation of who participates in test administration training and how the State ensures this occurred).</p>  |
| <p><b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b></p>                        | <p>For the ISASP and DLM in R/LA, Mathematics, and Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State adequately monitors the administration of its assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools (e.g., summary and follow-up of monitoring results from the most recent administration of the assessments).</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></p>   | <p>For the ISASP and DLM in R/LA, mathematics, and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has implemented and documented policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Detection of test irregularities.</li> <li>○ Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments.</li> <li>○ Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities (e.g., summary of test security incidents from the most recent year of test administration such as types of incidents and frequency, and examples of how they were addressed; or other documentation that shows the State identifies, tracks, and resolves test irregularities).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| <p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p> | <p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional evidence requested for critical element 2.1 will address this critical element.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p>  | <p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables (e.g., other measures of science achievement).</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p>   | <p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including documentation of reliability for its assessments for the student population overall and each student group once other changes to the assessment have been implemented, such as expansion of the item pool, increase in number of items per testlet, and increase in number of linkage levels.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b></p>                            | <p>For the DLM in Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in their design, development and analysis, including analysis by student subgroup to analyze test fairness (e.g.,</li> </ul>  |

| Critical element   | Additional Evidence Needed   |
|--|--|
|  | <p>differential item functioning analyses subgroup comparisons other than gender).</p>   |
| <p><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></p>                 | <p>For the ISASP in R/LA and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for academic assessments, including performance for high- and low-achieving students (e.g., provide a plan for addressing the large conditional standard errors of measurement at the upper end of the distributions for grades 7-11 in R/LA and for grade 8 in science).</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p>                                    | <p>For the ISASP in R/LA, mathematics, and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards (e.g., documentation of scorer training and monitoring the scoring process, and provide a plan to address the low percent perfect agreement for human-human scoring and human-machine scoring at grades 3-11, and evidence that rates of agreement have improved).</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></p>         | <p>For the ISASP in mathematics and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments (e.g., documentation of procedures for translations or trans-adaptation for Spanish and English language versions of the assessments, or a report of analyses from back-translation of a translated test).</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></p> | <p>For the ISASP in R/LA, mathematics, and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has a system of monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system of general and alternate assessments (e.g., documentation of a plan for continuous improvement that include some of the following: master plan for continued development of items in all subjects, expectations for ongoing analyses to provide evidence of the use of clear and technically sound criteria, and documentation of ongoing maintenance of the ISASP program).</li> </ul> <p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and</li> </ul> |

| Critical element  | Additional Evidence Needed   |
|---|--|
|   | <p>alternate assessments); for example documentation of a plan to monitor the science test before, during, and after the inclusion of Phase II development items to the item bank; including clear and technically sound criteria.</p>   |
| <p><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p>            | <p>For the ISASP and DLM in R/LA, mathematics, and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and English learners ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations (e.g., summary report of findings from the most recent test administrations, with action steps to address and remediate findings).</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b></p> | <p>For the alternate academic achievement standards in science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State formally adopted the alternate academic achievement standards in the required tested grades for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b></p>                                     | <p>For the alternate academic achievement standards in science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State used a technically sound method and process that involves panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its alternate academic achievement standards in science to ensure they are valid and reliable.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b></p>            | <p>For the academic achievement standards in R/LA, mathematics, and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards and with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education (CTE) standards such that a student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate Academic Achievement Standards in R/LA, mathematics and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s alternate academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards are aligned to ensure that a student who meets the alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment.</li> </ul> |

# U. S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## March 2020 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]

Contents

**SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS .....4**

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

**Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards ..... 5**

**Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments..... 6**

**Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments.. 8**

**Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments..... 10**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS.....11**

**Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development ..... 11**

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development ..... 13**

**Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration..... 14**

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration ..... 17**

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

**Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 23**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY .....25**

**Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content25**

**Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes ..... 27**

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

**Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables..... 30**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER.....31**

**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability ..... 31**

**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility ..... 34**

**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum ..... 36**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 37**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 38**

**Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment..... 39**

**Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance ..... 41**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS.....42**

**Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 42**

**Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments..... 45**

**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations ..... 47**

**Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations**

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



..... 50

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING.....53**

**Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students..... 53**  
**Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting ..... 55**  
**Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards..... 56**  
**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting ..... 58**

**SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS..61**

**Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments ..... 61**  
**Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments ..... 63**  
**Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments ..... 65**

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS**

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

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>   | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>   |
|--|---|---|
| <p><b><u>For academic content standards:</u></b><br/>                     The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public schools and public school students in the State.</p> | <p><b>General Assessments - ISASP</b><br/> <b>IA.1.1.1</b> <i>July 2010, State Board of Education Minutes, pp. 8-9</i><br/><br/> <b>IA.1.1.2</b> <i>August 2015, State Board of Education Minutes, pp. 3-4</i><br/><br/> <b>IA.1.1.3</b> <i>November 2016, State Board of Education Minutes, pp. 7-8</i><br/><br/> <b>Alternate Assessment -- AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b><br/> <b>AA-SC.1.1.1</b> <i>August 2015 Iowa State Board of Education Minutes, pages 3-4</i><br/> <b>AA-SC.1.1.2</b> <i>Iowa Science Standards</i><br/><br/> <b>AA-SC.1.1.3</b> <i>Iowa Science Essential Elements</i></p> | <p><b>ISASP</b><br/>                     Iowa submitted evidence from State BOE meetings that the content standards for math, reading, and science were reviewed and approved formally. The evidence provided is adequate on the State adoption of the standards.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b><br/>                     Iowa submitted evidence from State BOE meetings and other documents that the revised content standards for science were reviewed and approved formally. Info from the work done with DLM was also shared to support the process that was used.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b></p>  |   |   |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>                                |   |   |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards**

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>   | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>   |
|---|---|---|
| <p><b><u>For academic content standards:</u></b><br/>                     The State’s challenging academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science are aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards.</p> | <p><b>General Assessments -- ISASP</b></p> <p><b>IA.1.2.1</b> <i>Iowa Core English Language Arts &amp; Literacy</i>, pp. 10, 22, 29, 46, 55, 63, 69, 78, and 83.</p> <p><b>IA.1.2.2</b> <i>Appendix A of the Common Core ELA Standards</i></p> <p><b>IA.1.2.3</b> <i>Iowa Core Mathematics</i>, pp. 58 and 87</p> <p><b>IA.1.2.4</b> <i>Appendix A, Common Core State Standards for Mathematics</i>, p. 2</p> <p><b>IA.1.2.5</b> <i>Appendix C of the Next Generation Science Standards</i></p> <p><b>Alternate Assessment -- AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b></p> <p><b>AA-SC.1.2.1</b> <i>Appendix C of the Next Generation Science Standards</i></p> <p><b>AA-SC.1.1.3</b> <i>Iowa Science Essential Elements</i></p> | <p><b>ISASP</b><br/>                     The evidence provided by IDE adequately addresses their CCR standards and their adoption of the CCSS in ELA, Math, and Science. In the future, evidence of the alignment to specific CTE standards and programs would be useful to provide.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b><br/>                     The evidence for Alt Science is adequate.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b></p>   |   |   |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>   |   |   |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments**

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>                                     | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b> |
|--|---|---|
| <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments aligned with <b><u>grade-level academic achievement standards</u></b> or alternate academic achievement standards in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 9-12);</li> <li>• Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <p>The State’s <b><u>academic content assessments</u></b> must be the same assessments administered to all students in the tested grades, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may take an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards.</li> <li>• A State may permit an LEA to administer a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in lieu of the State high school assessment if certain conditions are met.</li> <li>• A State that administers an end-of-course high school mathematics assessment may exempt an 8<sup>th</sup> grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in</li> </ul> | <p>Department staff determined that the State’s evidence is sufficient for this critical element.</p> | <p>No evidence required.</p>  |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>eighth grade and allow the student to take the State end-of-course mathematics test instead.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Department may have approved the State, under the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority, to permit students in some LEAs to participate in a demonstration assessment system in lieu of participating in the State assessment.</li></ul> |  |  |
| <b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement</b>   |  |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required   |  |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments**

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>                                     | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b> |
|--|---|---|
| <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For students with disabilities, policies State that all students with disabilities in the State, including those children with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;</li> <li>• For ELs:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policies State that all ELs must be included in all aspects of the content assessment system, unless the State has chosen the statutory option for recently arrived ELs under which such ELs are exempt from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment.</li> <li>○ If a State has developed native language assessments for ELs in R/LA, ELs must be assessed in R/LA in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except, if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <p>Department staff determined that the State’s evidence is sufficient for this critical element.</p> | <p>No evidence required.</p>  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If the State uses the flexibility for Native American language schools and programs: (1) the State provides the content assessment in the Native American language to all students in the school or program; (2) the State submits such content assessment for peer review as part of its State assessment system; and (3) the State continues to provide ELP assessments and services for ELs as required by law. The State must assess in English the students' achievement in R/LA in high school.</li> </ul> |  |  |
| <p><b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement</b></p>  |  |  |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p>   |  |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

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

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

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>                                     | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b> |
|--|---|---|
| <p>If the State has developed or amended challenging <b>academic</b> standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education).</li> <li>• Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas).</li> <li>• Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State.</li> <li>• Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents.</li> </ul> | <p>Department staff determined that the State’s evidence is sufficient for this critical element.</p> | <p>No evidence required.</p>  |
| <p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</b></p>  |   |   |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p>   |   |   |

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

**Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development**

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>   | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>   |
|---|---|---|
| <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <b><u>the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards</u></b> for the grade that is being assessed and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <b><u>the State’s grade-level academic content standards</u></b> and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <b><u>the State’s academic content standards</u></b>, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills).</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and intended uses and interpretations of results.</li> </ul> | <p><b>General Assessments -- ISASP</b><br/> <b>IA.2.1.1.1</b> <i>State Code: Iowa Code 281 - 12.8(1)h</i><br/> <b>IA.2.1.1.2</b> <i>Iowa Code Chapter 256.7(21) Duties of State Board</i><br/> <b>IA.2.1.1.3</b> <i>ISASP ELA PLD</i><br/> <b>IA.2.1.1.4</b> <i>ISASP Math PLD</i><br/> <b>IA.2.1.1.5</b> <i>ISASP Science PLD</i><br/> <b>IA.2.1.1.6</b> <i>ISASP Cut Score Ranges</i><br/> <b>IA.2.1.1.7</b> <i>ISASP Interpretative Manual for Educators</i>, pp. 11-25<br/> <b>IA.2.1.1.8</b> <i>ISASP Student Sample ISR</i><br/> <b>IA.2.1.1.9</b> <i>ISASP Class Sample Roster</i><br/> <b>IA.2.1.1.10</b> <i>ISASP School Sample Summary</i><br/> <b>IA.2.1.1.11</b> <i>ISASP Interpretive Information for Families</i><br/> <b>IA.2.1.1.12</b> <i>ISASP Performance Level Descriptors English and Spanish</i><br/> <b>IA.2.1.2.1</b> <i>ISASP Test Specifications ELA</i><br/> <b>IA.2.1.2.2</b> <i>ISASP Test Specifications Mathematics</i><br/> <b>IA.2.1.2.3</b> <i>ISASP Test Specifications Science</i><br/> <b>IA.1.3.1.2</b> <i>HumRRO ISASP Alignment Study</i></p> | <p><b>ISASP</b><br/> Iowa submitted many pieces of evidence for this C.E. that show State Code, PLDs, Interpretive Manual, ISR, PLDs, and other materials for interpreting scores. The info on test design and use is very comprehensive.</p> <p>State Code provides clear statement of purpose of assessments and manuals and reports provide additional information on interpreting scores.</p> <p>Test specification documents show how each assessment was designed to map to the depth and breadth of the standards, including use of different types of items aimed at eliciting evidence of higher-order thinking and application.</p> <p>The HumRRO alignment report provides good evidence of the alignment of the assessment items to the standards and to the test blueprint overall. The reviewers noted that 3<sup>rd</sup> grade Math did not fully meet the blueprint for Geometry. It is unclear what response, if any, the State took to address the report findings. It is assumed that the State will take necessary steps toward remedying this.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b><br/> No further evidence was needed from IDE as DLM responded to this C.E.</p> |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting.</li> <li>• If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be <i>entirely</i> administered through a portfolio.</li> </ul> |  |  |
| <b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>   |  |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X_ No additional evidence is required or   |  |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  |  |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development**

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>  | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess student achievement based on the <b>State’s academic content standards</b> in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</li> </ul> | <p><b>IA.2.2.1</b> <i>ISASP Technical Manual</i>, Chapter 2</p> <p><b>IA.1.3.1.2</b> <i>HumRRO ISASP Alignment Study</i></p> | <p><b>ISASP</b><br/>The process used to develop items is documented in the Technical Manual (TM) and appears to be sound and meet industry best-practice standards. The process used in the alignment study also appears to be sound in its evaluation of the items in terms of content and cognitive processes that are being measured in the content standards.</p> <p>The State could consider gathering additional information on field test implementation that might be useful to better understand how the field test helps ensure item quality (e.g. how many students included, item coverage, etc.).</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b><br/>No further evidence was needed from IDE as DLM responded to this C.E.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b></p>  |  |  |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>                              |  |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration**

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>  | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities;</li> <li>• If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul> | <p><b>General Assessments -- ISASP</b></p> <p><b>IA.2.3.1.1</b> <i>ISASP 2018-2019 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual</i></p> <p><b>IA.1.4.2.2</b> <i>ISASP Test Administration Manual 2018-19</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.3.1.3</b> <i>ISASP Directions for Administration of Online Tests</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.3.1.4</b> <i>ISASP Directions for Administering Paper Tests</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.3.1.5</b> <i>2018-2019 Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual</i></p> <p><b>IA.1.4.2.2</b> <i>ISASP Test Administration Manual 2018-19</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.3.2.1</b> <i>ISASP Preparing Teachers Checklist</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.3.1.5</b> <i>2018-2019 Iowa Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual, pp. 7-20</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.3.2.2</b> <i>Iowa Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual Webinar PPT, slides7-8</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.3.1.1</b> <i>ISASP 2018-19 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual, Section 2.</i></p> <p><b>IA.1.4.2.2</b> <i>ISASP Test Administration Manual 2018-19 pp. 18-20, 22-25</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.3.3.1</b> <i>PearsonAccess<sup>Next</sup> Technology Support site</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.3.3.2</b> <i>ISASP Technology Readiness Checklist</i></p> | <p><b>ISASP</b></p> <p>The documents provide adequate evidence of thorough procedures for test administration, including related to administration and accommodations. It is not clear how these are communicated to educators and other appropriate staff, with the exception of a document that shows a webinar was held on accessibility/accommodation procedures.</p> <p>Peer reviewers would like to see more evidence on the process used to communicate and train educators and other appropriate staff for test administration. For example, no information on who attended that webinar is provided. The State’s index document refers to annual training but no evidence of who must participate in training, who does/did participate in training, or how training is done is clear in the documents provided.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b></p> <p>The documents provide adequate evidence related to accommodations in general. Reviewers found the DLM test administration manual in C.E. 2.5. It is unclear from the information provided how the State ensures that staff participate in required training. Technology requirements seemed clearly articulated in the technology manual along with some troubleshooting information for schools.</p> |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   | <p><b>IA.2.3.3.3</b> <i>ISASP New Technology Coordinator Training</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.3.3.4</b> <i>Troubleshooting for Online Tests</i></p> <p><b>IA 2.3.3.5</b> <i>Pearson Information Security Program</i></p> <p><b>IA 2.3.3.6</b> <i>Pearson Business Continuity Management Program</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.3.3.7</b> <i>Pearson SOC 2 Type 1 Audit Report</i></p> <p><b>Alternate Assessment -- AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b></p> <p><b>AA-SC.1.3.2</b> <i>Alternate Assessment Commencement Email 2018-2019</i></p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.3.1</b> <i>DLM Required Training Module 1 Transcript pgs. 5-9</i></p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.3.2</b> <i>2018-2019 Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual</i></p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.3.3</b> <i>Iowa Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual Webinar PPT</i></p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.3.2</b> <i>2018-2019 Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual, pages 7-20</i></p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.3.3</b> <i>Iowa Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual Webinar PPT, slides7-8</i></p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.3.4</b> <i>DLM Technology Specifications Manual, pages 7-9</i></p> |  |
| <p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p>                           |   |  |
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> |   |  |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]

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

**General Assessment-ELA, Math, Science and Alt Assessment-Science**

- Evidence that the State provides key documents regarding test administration and communicates this to district and school test coordinators and administrators, such as e-mails, websites, or listserv messages to inform relevant staff of the availability of documents for downloading or cover memos that accompany hard copies of the materials delivered to districts and schools.
- Evidence of who must participate in training and how the state ensures this.

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration**

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>   | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>   |
|---|---|---|
| <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.</p>   | <p>Department staff determined that additional evidence is needed for this critical element. During the 2018-2019 school year, IDE piloted a State monitoring process and tool for federally mandated assessments with a sample of school districts. The State monitoring plan was to be implemented Statewide during the 2019-2020 school year. The State must provide documentation that the administration of the ISASP in R/LA, mathematics, and science, as well as, the DLM in science is monitored to some degree (e.g. summary and follow-up of monitoring results from the most recent administration of the assessments).</p> | <p><b>ISASP</b><br/>Evidence that the State adequately monitors the administration of its assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools (e.g., summary and follow-up of monitoring results from the most recent administration of the assessments).</p> |
| <p><b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</b></p>   |   |   |
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:<br/> <b>General Assessment-ELA, Math, and Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State adequately monitors the administration of its assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools (e.g., summary and follow-up of monitoring results from the most recent administration of the assessments).</li> </ul> |   |   |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security**

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>   | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>   |
|---|---|---|
| <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> <li>Application of test security procedures to all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.</li> </ul> | <p><b>General Assessments -- ISASP</b></p> <p><b>IA.2.5.1.1</b> <i>Test Security Podcast Slide Deck</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.4.2</b> <i>2018-2019 State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.5.1.3</b> <i>ISASP Test Security Training PPT</i>, slides 4-19</p> <p><b>IA.2.5.1.2</b> <i>2019-2020 Iowa Test Security Training Part I</i>, slides 10-14</p> <p><b>IA.1.4.2.2</b> <i>ISASP Test Administration Manual 2018-19</i>, pp. 11-14</p> <p><b>IA.2.4.2</b> <i>2018-2019 State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i>, pp. 9-10</p> <p><b>IA.2.5.1.2</b> <i>2019-2020 Iowa Test Security Training Part I</i>, slide 14</p> <p><b>IA.2.4.2</b> <i>2018-2019 State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i>, p. 10</p> <p><b>IA.2.5.1.3</b> <i>ISASP Test Security Training PPT</i>, slides 20-25</p> <p><b>IA.1.4.2.2</b> <i>ISASP Test Administration Manual 2018-19</i>, pp.14-15</p> <p><b>IA.2.4.2</b> <i>2018-2019 State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i>, Appendix J, p. 10</p> <p><b>IA.2.4.1</b> <i>2019-2020 State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i>, p. 11, Appendices M, N, and O</p> | <p><b>ISASP</b></p> <p>The State provided evidence of a set of policies and documentation aimed at ensuring test security including training, manuals, mandatory forms to be completed, reporting of test irregularities, and descriptions of consequences of testing violations. These policies and procedures apply primarily to prevention activities during test administration. However, reviewers found no evidence of the test security procedures used during test development.</p> <p>For detection, no evidence is shown for policies and procedures to check on any irregularities on the Internet, such as students sharing items with each other on social media, or in conducting analyses like data forensics to check on things like large numbers of response changes or similarities in student responses.</p> <p>State must provide additional documentation of evidence of remediation and investigation procedures.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b></p> <p>The same comments for ISASP also apply here. Evidence on prevention is sufficient, however more evidence is required on the detection, remediation, and investigation process.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS READING AND MATH</b></p> <p>The same comments for ISASP also apply here. Evidence on prevention is sufficient, however more evidence is required on the detection, remediation, and investigation process.</p> |

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p><b>IA.1.4.2.2</b> <i>ISASP Test Administration Manual 2018-19, pp.15-16</i></p> <p><b>IA.1.4.2.2</b> <i>ISASP Test Administration Manual 2018-19, pp.19</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.4.1</b> <i>2019-2020 State of Iowa Test Security Manual, p. 11</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.5.1.3</b> <i>ISASP Test Security Training PPT, slides 28-29</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.4.2</b> <i>2018-2019 Statewide Test Security Manual, p. 10</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.5.1.2</b> <i>2019-2020 Iowa Test Security Training Part 1, slide 14</i></p> <p><b>IA.1.4.2.2</b> <i>ISASP Test Administration Manual 2018-19, p.16</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.5.4.1</b> <i>IDE Assurances for Proper and Ethical Test Administration 2019</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.4.2</b> <i>2018-2019 State of Iowa Test Security Manual, p. 3</i></p> <p><b>Alternate Assessment -- AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b></p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.5.1</b> <i>Test Security Podcast Slide Deck</i></p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.4.2</b> <i>2018-2019 State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i></p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.5.3</b> <i>DLM Test Security Agreement</i></p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.5.4</b> <i>2019-2020 DLM Test Administration Manual pages 43-45</i></p> |  |
|--|--|--|

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p><b>AA-SC.2.5.5</b> 2019-2020 DLM Returning Educator Required Training Slides 23-25</p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.5.6</b> 2019-2020 DLM Required Training Module 1 Training, slides 32-34</p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.5.2</b> 2019-2020 Iowa Test Security Training Part 1, slides 10-14</p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.4.2</b> 2018-2019 State of Iowa Test Security Manual, pages 9-11</p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.5.2</b> 2019-2020 Iowa Test Security Training Part 1, Slide 14</p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.4.2</b> 2018-2019 State of Iowa Test Security Manual, Appendix J, page 10</p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.4.1</b> 2019-2020 State of Iowa Test Security Manual, pages 10-11, Appendices M, N, and O</p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.4.2</b> 2018-2019 Statewide Test Security Manual, page 10</p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.5.2</b> 2019-2020 Iowa Test Security Training Part 1, slide 14</p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.5.7</b> IDE Assurances for Proper and Ethical Test Administration 2019</p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.4.2</b> 2018-2019 State of Iowa Test Security Manual, page 3</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessments -- AA-AAAS READING AND MATH</b></p> <p><b>AA-R.2.5.1</b> Test Security Podcast Slide Deck</p> |  |
|--|---|--|

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p><b>AA-R.2.5.2</b> 2018-2019 <i>State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i></p> <p><b>AA-R.2.5.3</b> DLM Test Security Agreement</p> <p><b>AA-R.2.5.4</b> 2019-2020 DLM Test Administration Manual, pages 43-45</p> <p><b>AA-R.2.5.5</b> 2019-2020 DLM Returning Educator Required Training, slides 23-25</p> <p><b>AA-R.2.5.6</b> 2019-2020 DLM Required Training Module 1 Training, slides 32-34</p> <p><b>AA-R.2.5.7</b> 2019-2020 <i>Iowa Test Security Training Part I</i>, slides 10-14</p> <p><b>AA-R.2.5.8</b> 2018-2019 <i>State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i>, pages 10-11</p> <p><b>AA-R.2.5.7</b> 2019-2020 <i>Iowa Test Security Training Part I</i>, slide 14</p> <p><b>AA-R.2.5.2</b> 2018-2019 <i>State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i>, Appendix J, page 10</p> <p><b>AA-R.2.5.8</b> 2019-2020 <i>State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i>, pages 10-11, 57-59, Appendices M, N, and O</p> <p><b>AA-R.2.5.2</b> 2018-2019 <i>Statewide Test Security Manual</i>, page 10</p> <p><b>AA-R.2.5.7</b> 2019-2020 <i>Iowa Test Security Training Part I</i>, slide 14</p> <p><b>AA-R.2.5.9</b> <i>IDE Assurances for Proper and Ethical Test Administration 2019</i></p> |  |
|--|--|--|

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   | AA-R.2.5.2 2018-2019 State of Iowa Test Security Manual, page 3 |  |
| <b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b>  |   |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or  |   |  |
| Summary applies to <b>ISASP and both Alternate Assessment Components</b>  |   |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  |   |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Data forensics analyses that are done</li><li>• Monitoring of the Web for secure test materials</li><li>• Evidence of outcomes from any investigations and/or remediation that were done. For example, summary of test security incidents from most recent year of test administration (e.g., types of incidents and frequency) and examples of how they were addressed, or other documentation that demonstrates that the State identifies, tracks, and resolves test irregularities.</li><li>• State security plan, or excerpts from the State’s assessment contracts or other materials that show expectations, rules and procedures for reducing security threats and risks and protecting test materials <b>during item development, test construction, materials production, distribution, and test administration.</b></li></ul> |   |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy**

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>  | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>  |
|---|--|--|
| <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results;</li> <li>• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>• To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul> | <p><b>General Assessments -- ISASP</b></p> <p><b>IA.2.6.1.1</b> <i>Dept. Of Educ. Supplemental Policies and Procedures Handbook</i>, pp. 24-27</p> <p><b>IA.2.6.1.2</b> <i>ISASP Entry Point</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.6.2.1</b> <i>Iowa Administrative Code 282-25.3(6) Standard VI</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.4.2</b> <i>2018-2019 State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i>, p. 4</p> <p><b>IA.1.4.2.2</b> <i>ISASP Test Administration Manual 2018-19</i>, pp. 11-14 and p. 26</p> <p><b>IA.2.6.2.2</b> <i>Regulatory Compliance</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.6.2.1</b> <i>Iowa Administrative Code 282-25.3(6) Standard VI</i></p> <p><b>IA.1.3.4</b> <i>Iowa’s ESSA Plan</i>, pp. 32-38</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessment -- AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b></p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.6.1</b> <i>Dept. Of Educ. Supplemental Policies and Procedures Handbook</i>, pages 24-27</p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.6.2</b> <i>Iowa Administrative Code 282-25.3(6) Standard VI</i></p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.4.2</b> <i>2018-2019 State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i>, page 4</p> | <p><b>ISASP</b></p> <p>Based on the evidence submitted by IDE for C.E. 2.6, they have strong policies and procedures in place for protecting the integrity of the data and student privacy. Iowa has strong Admin Code, State policies such as their Data Confidentiality Policy, and relies on their vendors to help maintain data integrity. The info in the Test Administration Manual (TAM) and the Test Security (TS) Manual also support the approach they are using in this area.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b></p> <p>Iowa shared materials on the process used for the test, which supplements the info that came from DLM previously. The process adequately meets professional testing standards to protect data and personal info. Many of the documents are similar to those for the ISASP (noted above).</p> |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   | <p>AA-SC.2.6.3 <i>DLM MOU 2019-2020</i></p> <p>AA-SC.2.6.2 <i>Iowa Administrative Code 282-25.3(6) Standard VI</i></p> <p>AA-SC.1.3.5 <i>Iowa's ESSA Plan, page 32-38</i></p> |  |
| <b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b>  |   |  |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> |   |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

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

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>  | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>  |
|---|--|--|
| <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><b><u>The State’s academic assessments</u></b> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards;</li> <li>• If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards and administers alternate assessments aligned with those standards, the assessments show adequate alignment to the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content</li> </ul> | <p><b>General Assessments – ISASP</b></p> <p><b>IA.3.1.1</b> <i>K-12 Literacy Iowa Core Standards</i><br/> <b>IA.3.1.2</b> <i>K-12 Mathematics Iowa Core Standards</i><br/> <b>IA.3.1.3</b> <i>K-12 Iowa Science Standards</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.1.2.1</b> <i>ISASP Test Specifications ELA</i>, pp. 10-74<br/> <b>IA.2.1.2.2</b> <i>ISASP Test Specifications Mathematics</i>, pp. 11-93<br/> <b>IA.2.1.2.3</b> <i>ISASP Test Specifications Science</i>, pp. 7-18</p> <p><b>IA.1.3.1.2</b> <i>HumRRO ISASP Alignment Study</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.2.1</b> <i>ISASP Technical Manual Chapter 2</i> Test Development, pp. 2-1 to 2-20, (See Tables 2.2 and 2.3 on pp. 2-3 and 2-4 for complexity ranges for Reading and Writing texts; see Tables 2.7-2.1 on p. 2-9 for DOK descriptions and percentage of items by DOK level)<br/> <b>Chapter 7</b> Validity, pp. 7-1 to 7-10</p> <p><b>IA.2.1.2.1</b> <i>ISASP Test Specifications ELA</i>, pp. 10-74<br/> <b>IA.2.1.2.2</b> <i>ISASP Test Specifications Mathematics</i>, pp. 11-93<br/> <b>IA.2.1.2.3</b> <i>ISASP Test Specifications Science</i>, pp. 7-18</p> <p><b>IA.1.3.1.2</b> <i>HumRRO ISASP Alignment Study</i></p> | <p><b>ISASP</b></p> <p>In the materials provided, IDE has provided adequate evidence of the overall validity of the new assessment. Relevant info was provided on the core standards, test specs, alignment, and process used for item development, which shows that the ELA and Math and Science assessments have content validity. In addition, the DLM info for the Alternate Science also shows evidence of alignment to the alt standards.</p> <p>Though not cited for this critical element (it is cited for C.E. 3.3), the TM also refers to another document (ISASP Annual Statistical Report (ISASP ASR-2019)) which could provide additional information on the results of various analyses relating to validity.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b></p> <p>No further evidence was needed from IDE as DLM responded to this C.E.</p> |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.  |  |  |
| <b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b>   |  |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or<br><br><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li></ul> |  |  |

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes**

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>  | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap: <b><u>the intended cognitive processes</u></b> appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p> | <p><b>General Assessments -- ISASP</b></p> <p><b>IA.3.1.1</b> <i>K-12 Literacy Iowa Core Standards</i><br/> <b>IA.3.1.2</b> <i>K-12 Mathematics Iowa Core Standards</i><br/> <b>IA.3.1.3</b> <i>K-12 Iowa Science Standards</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.1.2.1</b> <i>ISASP Test Specifications ELA</i>, pp. 10-74<br/> <b>IA.2.1.2.2</b> <i>ISASP Test Specifications Mathematics</i>, pp. 11-93<br/> <b>IA.2.1.2.3</b> <i>ISASP Test Specifications Science</i>, pp. 7-18</p> <p><b>IA.1.3.1.2</b> <i>HumRRO ISASP Alignment Study</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.2.1</b> <i>ISASP Technical Manual</i><br/> <u>Chapter 2</u> Test Development, pp. 2-1 to 2-20, (See Tables 2.2 and 2.3 on pp. 2-3 and 2-4 for complexity ranges for Reading and Writing texts; see Tables 2.7-2.1 on p. 2-9 for DOK descriptions and percentage of items by DOK level)<br/> <u>Chapter 7</u> Validity, pp. 7-1 to 7-10</p> | <p><b>ISASP</b><br/> The Iowa Core Standards articulate the cognitive processes that are assessed. Adequate evidence of cognitive complexity was shown in the Test Specs and Alignment Study materials. The TM provides additional info on this.</p> <p>In the future, the State could strengthen its evidence on validity based on <b>intended cognitive processes</b> by use of cognitive interviewing of students.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b><br/> No further evidence was needed from IDE as DLM responded to this C.E.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>  |  |  |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>  |  |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure**

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>   | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>  |
|--|---|--|
| <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s <b><u>academic content standards</u></b>.</p> | <p><b>General Assessments -- ISASP</b></p> <p><b>IA.2.2.1 ISASP Technical Manual</b><br/> <u>Chapter 1</u> Overview<br/> <u>Chapter 2</u> Test Development, pp. 2-1 to 2-20<br/> <u>Chapter 4</u> Reports, pp. 4-1 to 4-6<br/> <u>Chapter 7</u> Validity, pp. 7-1 to 7-10, Evidence based on internal structure, pp. 7-3 to 7-4</p> <p><b>IA.3.3.1 2019 ISASP Annual Statistical Report</b><br/> <u>ELA:</u><br/>                     Internal Consistency Reports, pp. 12-13;<br/>                     Dimensionality Reports, pp. 19-20<br/> <u>Reading:</u><br/>                     Item Total Correlation, pp. 32-41;<br/>                     Internal Consistency Reports, pp. 189-192;<br/>                     Dimensionality Reports, pp. 193-194<br/> <u>Language/Writing</u><br/>                     Item Total Correlation, pp. 208-217;<br/>                     Internal Consistency Reports, pp. 374-379;<br/>                     Dimensionality Reports, pp. 380-381<br/> <u>Mathematics:</u><br/>                     Item Total Correlation, pp. 395-404;<br/>                     Internal Consistency Reports, pp. 561-566;<br/>                     Dimensionality Reports, pp. 572-573<br/> <u>Science:</u><br/>                     Item Total Correlation, pp. 581-585;<br/>                     Internal Consistency Reports, pp. 628-630;<br/>                     Dimensionality Reports, pp. 634-635</p> | <p><b>ISASP</b><br/>                     The ISASP Annual Stat Report and the TM provide adequate evidence of the internal structure of the new assessments. Summary information in TM combined with statistical report details on dimensionality, item-total correlations, etc. provides adequate validity evidence about scoring and reporting structure.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b><br/>                     No further evidence was needed from IDE as DLM responded to this C.E.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>  |   |  |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>  |   |  |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables**

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>   | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>  |
|---|---|--|
| <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>   | <p><b>General Assessments -- ISASP</b></p> <p><b>IA.2.2.1 ISASP Technical Manual</b><br/> <u>Chapter 7</u> Validity, pp. 7-6 to 7-7 and Tables 7.2 to 7.4</p> | <p><b>ISASP</b></p> <p>When a new assessment program begins, it usually takes some time to gather the validity evidence. IDE has done some initial studies in this area and provides evidence of relations to the previous Iowa Assessments test scores and matching done across years.</p> <p>The State acknowledges that because the ISASP is new, limited information is available (“Given that the ISASP has just completed one administrative year, opportunities to examine the relationship with other assessments are limited. However, as a more complete research agenda is being planned to expand evidence based on relations to other variables, two assessments are presented below as preliminary evidence.”, p.7-5).</p> <p>Peers recommend that the State TAC continues to monitor the evidence gathered on validity, in particular, that based on relations to other variables. In addition, peers also recommend that the State develop a multi-year plan to conduct validity studies on an ongoing basis. This plan should be reviewed and approved by the TAC.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b></p> <p>No further evidence was needed from IDE as DLM responded to this C.E.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>   |   |  |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul> |   |  |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence  |
|---|---|---|
| <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a <b><u>student’s academic achievement</u></b>.</li> </ul> | <p><b>General Assessments -- ISASP</b></p> <p><b>IA.2.2.1 ISASP Technical Manual <u>Chapter 8 Reliability</u></b>, pp. 8–1 to 8–10</p> <p><b>IA.3.3.1 2019 ISASP Annual Statistical Report <u>ELA</u>: Summary Statistics Reports, and Internal Consistency Reports</b>, pp. 12-13</p> <p><b><u>Reading</u>:</b><br/>Item Total Correlations, pp. 32-41<br/>Coefficient alpha reliability by student group, pp. 53-188<br/>Internal Consistency Reports, pp. 189-192</p> <p><b><u>Language/Writing</u>:</b><br/>Item Total Correlations, pp. 208-217<br/>Coefficient alpha reliability by student group, pp. 238-373<br/>Internal Consistency Reports, pp. 374-379</p> <p><b><u>Mathematics</u>:</b><br/>Item Total Correlation, pp. 395-404<br/>Coefficient alpha reliability by student group, pp. 425-560<br/>Internal Consistency Reports, pp. 561-566<br/>Classification Accuracy Reports, pp. 567-571</p> <p><b><u>Science</u>:</b> Item Total Correlation, pp. 581-585<br/>Coefficient alpha reliability by student group, pp. 591- 627<br/>Internal Consistency Reports, pp. 628-630</p> <p><b>IA.2.2.1 ISASP Technical Manual, <u>Chapter 8 Reliability</u></b>, Overall and conditional standard error of measurement, pp. 8–3 to 8–5, Measurement error for groups of students, page 8–2</p> | <p><b>ISASP</b><br/>Iowa has documented adequate reliability of its new assessments. The TM and Annual Stat Report provide much info on reliability coefficients for overall population and subgroups, internal consistency, correlations, alpha, classification accuracy, SEMs and CSEMs. Reliability for the ELA, Math, and Science assessments adequately meets professional and technical testing standards.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b><br/>No further evidence was needed from IDE as DLM responded to this C.E.</p> <p><b>[COMMENT TO USED]</b><br/>Peers commend the State on organizing the materials well in its submission and including specific page numbers on the evidence that was cited.</p> |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>  | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b> |
|--|--|---|
|  | <p><b>IA.3.3.1 2019 ISASP Annual Statistical Report</b><br/> <u>ELA</u>: Summary Statistics Reports, pp. 12-13<br/> <u>Reading</u>:<br/>                     Frequency Distributions Reports with CSEMs, pp. 43-52, Summary Statistics Reports, pp. 53-188<br/> <u>Language/Writing</u>:<br/>                     Frequency Distributions Reports with CSEMs, pp. 219-237, Summary Statistics Reports, pp. 238-373<br/> <u>Mathematics</u>:<br/>                     Frequency Distributions Reports with CSEMs, pp. 406-424, Summary Statistics Reports, pp. 425-560<br/> <u>Science</u>:<br/>                     Frequency Distributions Reports with CSEMs, pp. 586-590, Summary Statistics Report, pp. 591-627</p> <p><b>IA.2.2.1 ISASP Technical Manual</b><br/> <u>Chapter 5</u> Performance Standards, pp. 5–1 to 5–7</p> <p><b>IA.4.1.3.1 2019 ISASP Standard Setting Technical Report</b></p> <p><b>IA.2.2.1 ISASP Technical Manual, Chapter 8</b><br/> <u>Reliability</u>, Classification consistency and accuracy, page 8–10</p> <p><b>IA.3.3.1 2019 ISASP Annual Statistical Report</b><br/> <u>ELA</u>: Classification Accuracy Reports, pp. 14-18<br/> <u>Mathematics</u>: Classification Accuracy Reports, pp. 567-571<br/> <u>Science</u>: Classification Accuracy Reports, pp. 631-633</p> |   |
| <b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b>   |  |   |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>X</u> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul> |  |   |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|------------------|--|--|
|                  |  |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility**

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>   | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>  |
|--|---|--|
| <p><i>For all State academic assessments,</i> assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition<sup>1</sup>).</p> <p><b>For academic content assessments,</b> the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in their design, development and analysis.</p> | <p><b>General Assessments -- ISASP</b></p> <p><b>IA.2.2.1 ISASP Technical Manual,</b><br/> <u>Chapter 2</u> Test Development, pp. 2–1 to 2–20; Fairness Review, pp. 2–11 to 2–13, Table 2.11; Universal Design, p. 2–13; Fairness Review Summaries and DIF, pp. 2–15 to 2–20, Tables 2.12 to 2.18<br/> <u>Chapter 3</u> Test Administration, Features and Accommodations, pp. 3–1 to 3–9<br/> <u>Chapter 7</u> Validity, pp. 7–1 to 7–10<br/> <u>Chapter 8</u> Reliability, pp. 8–1 to 8–10 (esp. pp. 8–2 to 8–3)</p> <p><b>IA.2.3.1.1 ISASP 2018-19 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual</b></p> <p><b>IA.4.2.1 ISASP Fairness Review 2018 Documentation</b></p> <p><b>IA.1.4.2.2 ISASP Test Administration Manual 2018-19</b></p> <p><b>IA.4.2.2 ISASP Technology PPT TestNav8</b></p> <p><b>IA.3.3.1 2019 ISASP Annual Statistical Report</b><br/> <u>ELA:</u> Summary Statistics Reports, pp. 12-13<br/> <u>Reading:</u> Summary Statistics Reports, pp. 53-188<br/> DIF Reports, pp. 42, 195-196<br/> <u>Language/Writing:</u> Summary Statistics Reports, pp. 238-373<br/> DIF Reports, pp. 218, 382-383</p> | <p><b>ISASP</b><br/> The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps in developing and implementing fair and accessible assessments. Adequate evidence for C.E. 4.2 was provided on fairness and accessibility, which includes approaches based on ECD, UD, DIF analyses, use of accommodations for students with special needs, and various analyses of fairness and accessibility for ELs.</p> <p>The Fairness Review 2018 Documentation is a strong example of the reasonable and appropriate steps that were taken. The peers found that the State had documented its development of assessments using the principals of universal design for learning in order to make the assessments accessible for students.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b><br/> No further evidence was needed from IDE as DLM responded to this C.E.</p> |

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

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



## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|   | <u>Mathematics</u> : Summary Statistics Reports, pp. 425-560<br>DIF Reports, pp. 405, 574-575<br><u>Science</u> : Summary Statistics Reports, pp. 591-627<br>DIF Reports, pp. 585, 636-637 |  |
| <b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b>  |  |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or                     |  |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: |  |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum**

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>  | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>   |
|--|--|---|
| <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for <b>academic assessments</b>, including performance for high- and low-achieving students.</p>  | <p><b>General Assessments – ISASP</b></p> <p><b>IA.2.2.1 ISASP Technical Manual</b>,<br/> <u>Chapter 8</u> Reliability, Overall and conditional standard error of measurement, pp. 8–2 to 8–5, Measurement error for groups of students, p. 8–5, Classification consistency and accuracy, p. 8–10<br/> <u>Chapter 5</u> Performance Standards, pp. 5–1 to 5–7</p> <p><b>IA.3.3.1 2019 ISASP Annual Statistical Report</b><br/> <u>Reading</u>: Frequency Distributions Reports with CSEMs, pp. 43-52<br/> <u>Language/Writing</u>: Frequency Distributions Reports with CSEMs, pp. 219-237<br/> <u>Mathematics</u>: Frequency Distributions Reports with CSEMs, pp. 406-424<br/> <u>Science</u>: Frequency Distributions Reports with CSEMs, pp. 586-590</p> | <p><b>ISASP</b><br/>           Evidence in the TM and Annual Stat Report show that the tests cover an adequate range of the performance continuum. Measures of precision, CSEMs, IRT ability estimates, and other data are provided on the score scale and student performance.</p> <p>In some cases (e.g. grades 7- 11, reading, p.8-5 of the TM), CSEMs are higher at the upper end of the distribution, suggesting potentially less precision for the highest-achieving students. The State must check the data carefully to determine what, if anything, is causing this effect in reading scores and it needs to be documented in the TM.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b><br/>           No further evidence was needed from IDE as DLM responded to this C.E.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>  |  |   |
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of CSEMs at higher end of distribution for reading, especially for grades 7-11, with an interpretation of the causes of this effect.</li> </ul> |  |   |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring**

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>   | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>   |
|---|---|---|
| <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s <b><u>academic achievement standards</u></b>.</p>   | <p><b>General Assessments – ISASP</b></p> <p><b>IA.2.2.1 ISASP Technical Manual</b></p> <p><u>Chapter 2</u> Test Development, pp. 2–1 to 2–20<br/> <u>Chapter 4</u> Reports, pp. 4–1 to 4–6<br/> <u>Chapter 5</u> Performance Standards, pp. 5–1 to 5–7<br/> <u>Chapter 6</u> Scaling and Equating, pp. 6–1 to 6–15<br/> <u>Chapter 7</u> Validity, pp. 7–1 to 7–10<br/> <u>Chapter 8</u> Reliability, pp. 8–1 to 8–10<br/> <u>Chapter 9</u> Quality Control Procedures, pp. 9–1 to 9–3</p> | <p><b>ISASP</b></p> <p>The TM describes the technical work on scaling used to create scores and develop valid interpretations, as well as information on the process used to develop achievement standards. However, no detail on how human scorers are trained, qualified, or examples of scoring rubrics are provided. Also, little info is provided on the use of AI scoring, such as training of the engine.</p> <p>Although this documentation is missing, the generally good levels of interrater reliability suggest that some such procedures must be in place. The quality control chapter provides a general overview of the steps and procedures in place to ensure accurate scoring (e.g. key checks on multiple choice items, checks on consistent scoring of other types of items), but it does not provide the details of the process used to meet C.E.4.4.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b></p> <p>No further evidence was needed from IDE as DLM responded to this C.E.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>   |   |   |
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that IDE has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments, including training of scorers, monitoring the scoring process, etc.</li> </ul> |   |   |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms**

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>  | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>  |
|---|--|--|
| <p>If the State administers multiple forms of <b>academic assessments</b> within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s <b>academic content standards</b> and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p> | <p><b>General Assessments – ISASP</b></p> <p><b>IA.2.2.1 ISASP Technical Manual</b></p> <p><u>Chapter 2</u> Test Development, pp. 2–1 to 2–20</p> <p><u>Chapter 6</u> Scaling and Equating, pp. 6–1 to 6–15</p> <p><u>Chapter 9</u> Quality Control Procedures, pp. 9–1 to 9–3</p> | <p><b>ISASP</b></p> <p>The TM provides adequate evidence of the process used in Iowa to assemble parallel test forms, conduct equating and validation checks, do item calibrations, examine psychometric characteristics of the forms, document measurement precision, and ensure comparable test scores.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b></p> <p>No further evidence was needed from IDE as DLM responded to this C.E.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></p>   |  |  |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>   |  |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment**

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>   | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>  |
|---|---|--|
| <p>If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery; <b>or a native language version of the academic content assessment</b>), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>• Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul> | <p><b>General Assessments – ISASP</b></p> <p><b>IA.2.2.1 ISASP Technical Manual</b><br/> <u>Chapter 2</u> Test Development, pp. 2–1 to 2–20<br/> <u>Chapter 6</u> Scaling and Equating, pp. 6–1 to 6–15<br/> <u>Chapter 7</u> Validity, pp. 7–1 to 7–10<br/> <u>Chapter 8</u> Reliability, pp. 8–1- to 8–10</p> <p><b>IA.3.3.1 2019 ISASP Annual Statistical Report</b>, pp. 14ff, 43ff, 238ff, 425ff, 591ff</p> <p><b>IA.3.3.1 2019 ISASP Annual Statistical Report</b><br/> <u>Reading</u>: DIF Reports, p. 42<br/> <u>Language/Writing</u>: DIF Reports, p. 218<br/> <u>Mathematics</u>: DIF Reports, p. 405<br/> <u>Science</u>: DIF Reports, pp. 585</p> <p><b>IA.2.2.1 ISASP Technical Manual</b><br/> <u>Chapter 2</u> Test Development, pp. 2–1 to 2–20<br/> <u>Chapter 6</u> Scaling and Equating, pp. 6–1 to 6–15<br/> <u>Chapter 7</u> Validity, pp. 7–1 to 7–10<br/> <u>Chapter 8</u> Reliability, pp. 8–1 to 8–10<br/> <u>Chapter 9</u> Quality Control Procedures, pp. 9–1 to 9–3</p> <p><b>IA.3.3.1 2019 ISASP Annual Statistical Report</b><br/> <u>Reading</u>: DIF Reports, p. 42<br/> <u>Language/Writing</u>: DIF Reports, p. 218<br/> <u>Mathematics</u>: DIF Reports, p. 405<br/> <u>Science</u>: DIF Reports, p. 585</p> | <p><b>ISASP</b><br/>                     State provides online and paper-based tests. Iowa submitted adequate evidence on the comparability of their PBTs and CBTs. Based on the info presented in the TM and ASR, the design and development of the tests yield equivalent scores across these two modes of administration.</p> <p>Spanish language translations of math and science assessments are available. Reviewers did not find information on translation procedures or comparability of Spanish and English-language versions of items.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b><br/>                     No further evidence was needed from IDE as DLM responded to this C.E.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>   |   |  |
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>   |   |  |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]

- Documentation that the State followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results across Spanish and English language versions, such as procedures for translation or trans-adaptation of the assessment, or a report of analysis of results of back-translation of a translated test.

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance**

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>  | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>   |
|--|--|---|
| <p>The State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and</li> <li>Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.</li> </ul>  | <p><b>General Assessments -- ISASP</b></p> <p><b>IA.2.2.1 ISASP Technical Manual</b><br/> <u>Chapter 2</u> Test Development, pp. 2–1 to 2–20<br/> <u>Chapter 6</u> Scaling and Equating, pp. 6–1 to 6–15<br/> <u>Chapter 9</u> Quality Control Procedures, pp. 9–1 to 9–3</p> <p><b>IA.4.7.2.1 ISASP Website General Information</b></p> <p><b>IA.4.7.2.2 ISASP Website Technology Setup</b></p> | <p><b>ISASP</b><br/>                     The TM suggests that IDE has conducted analyses to ensure quality of the assessment system but no evidence of the requirement for ongoing monitoring, maintaining, and improving it is provided. QC steps are performed by the State and its vendors, which appear to be technically sound, but plans for the future are not detailed. IDE needs to submit evidence on a State system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system.</p> <p>Although the screen shots provided as evidence were blurred, the peers went to the actual website and it demonstrates adequate evidence of technical quality.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b><br/>                     No further evidence was needed from IDE as DLM responded to this C.E.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>  |  |   |
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IDE needs to submit evidence on a State system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, State needs to provide plans for continuous improvement that include some of the following:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Master plan for continued development of items and forms for the new assessment</li> <li>State’s expectations for ongoing analyses to provide evidence of the use of clear, technically sound criteria</li> <li>Documentation of ongoing maintenance of the assessment program.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |  |   |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS**

**Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities**

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>   | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>  |
|---|---|--|
| <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</p> <p>If a State adopts alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and administers an alternate assessment aligned with those standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D), respectively, the State must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with an AA-AAAS, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A State definition of “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” that addresses factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</li> </ul> | <p><b>General Assessments -- ISASP</b></p> <p><b>IA.1.4.2.1</b> <i>Iowa Code Chapter 12</i>, p. 26, section h (2)</p> <p><b>IA.1.3.3</b> <i>Iowa’s Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines</i>, p. 1</p> <p><b>IA.5.1.2.1</b> <i>Exemption Policy</i></p> <p><b>IA.1.3.3</b> <i>Iowa’s Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines</i></p> <p><b>IA.5.1.4.1</b> <i>Graduation Guidance for IEP Teams</i></p> <p><b>IA 5.1.5.1</b> <i>Determining Supports for Learning and Performance for All Students</i>, Appendix A, pp. 61-65 and Appendix B, pp. 66-70</p> <p><b>IA.5.1.5.1</b> <i>Determining Supports for Learning and Performance for All Students</i>, Appendix A, pp. 61-65 and Appendix B, pp. 66-70</p> <p><b>IA.2.3.1.5</b> <i>2018-2019 Iowa Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual</i>, Tools 3, 4, and 5 on pp. 29-39</p> <p><b>IA.5.1.7.1</b> <i>Justification for Exceeding the 1% Cap</i></p> <p><b>Alternate Assessment -- AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b></p> <p><b>AA-SC.1.4.3</b> <i>Iowa Code Chapter 12</i></p> | <p><b>ISASP</b></p> <p>State documentation makes clear that all students must participate in either the general or alternate assessment and provides guidelines for teams to use in determining which assessment is appropriate. Accommodation procedures and the Determining Support Manuals provide additional information on how to select accommodations to allow students to participate (including a wide variety of accommodations and accessibility features).</p> <p>Iowa has State Code that supports the inclusion of all students, and procedural guidelines are in place for students taking the ELA, Math, and Science assessments. IEP teams are involved in the determinations. Iowa also has alternate assessments and guidelines on their use. Adequate evidence was provided on their AA-AAAS, the process the State uses for them, and official communications to districts and schools, as well as to parents. The State also monitors each LEA to ensure the 1% cap for participation is followed.</p> <p>For C.E. 5.1 reviewers did not find evidence that parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child’s achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards; however, they found evidence in C.E. 6.4 that meets this requirement.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b></p> <p>The State has inclusion procedures in place for the Alt Science. The evidence on Iowa’s AA participation guidelines and guidance for IEP teams support this. Many of the documents submitted are similar to those for the ISASP.</p> |

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>   | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>   |
|--|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provides a clear explanation of the differences between assessments aligned with grade-level academic achievement standards and those aligned with alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an AA-AAAS, such as how participation in such assessments may delay or otherwise affect the student from completing the requirements for a regular high school diploma;</li> <li>• Ensure that parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child's achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• Not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma; and</li> <li>• Promote, consistent with requirements under the IDEA, the involvement and progress of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the general education curriculum that is based on the State's academic content standards</li> </ul> | <p><b>AA-SC.1.3.4</b> <i>Iowa's Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines</i>, page 1</p> <p><b>AA-SC.1.3.4</b> <i>Iowa's Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines</i></p> <p><b>AA-SC.1.3.4</b> <i>Iowa's Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines</i></p> <p><b>AA-SC.5.1.1</b> <i>Graduation Guidance for IEP Teams</i></p> <p><b>AA-SC.5.1.2</b> <i>Determining Supports for Learning and Performance for all Students: Appendix A</i>, pages 61-65</p> <p><b>AA-SC.5.1.2</b> <i>Determining Supports for Learning and Performance for all Students Appendix B</i>, pgs. 66-70</p> <p><b>AA-SC.5.1.3</b> <i>Justification for Exceeding the 1% Cap</i></p> <p><b>Alternate Assessments -- AA-AAAS READING AND MATH</b></p> <p><b>AA-R.5.1.1</b> <i>Iowa's Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines</i>, page 1</p> <p><b>AA-R.5.1.2</b> <i>Iowa Statewide Assessment Accessibility Manual</i>, pages 9-24</p> <p><b>AA-R.5.1.1</b> <i>Iowa's Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines</i>, page 1</p> | <p><b>AA-AAAS READING AND MATH</b></p> <p>As requested in the previous peer review, the State provided participation guidelines for the alternate assessment, including a description of students with significant cognitive disabilities. Similar to the comments made above for ISASP and AA-Science, IDE submitted evidence of its process for including SWDs in the other Alt Assessments. Peers judged the process to be adequate for these tests.</p> |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

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

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

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

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>   | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>  |
|--|---|--|
| <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s academic content assessments and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for ELs;</li> <li>• Assistance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for ELs, including to the extent practicable, assessments in the language most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do to determine the students’ mastery of skills in academic content areas until the students have achieved English language proficiency.</li> </ul> | <p><b>General Assessments -- ISASP</b></p> <p><b>IA.1.4.2.1</b> <i>Iowa Code Chapter 12</i>, p. 26, section h (2)</p> <p><b>IA.5.2.1.1</b> <i>School Leader Update Sample</i>, September 2018</p> <p><b>IA.5.2.1.2</b> <i>ISASP Overview of Assessment Bulletin</i>, August 2018</p> <p><b>IA.5.2.1.3</b> <i>DMPS 2019 Statewide Assessment Information letter to parents (English)</i></p> <p><b>IA.5.2.1.4</b> <i>Chapter 6 Tools and Resources for Addressing English Learners with Disabilities</i>, Tool 5, p. 15</p> <p><b>IA 5.1.5.1</b> <i>Determining Supports for Learning and Performance for all Students</i>, p. 12</p> <p><b>IA.2.3.1.1</b> <i>ISASP 2018-19 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual</i>, pp. 9, 17, and 21</p> <p><b>IA.2.3.1.1</b> <i>ISASP 2018-19 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual</i>, pp. 9,11,13, and 16</p> <p><b>IA.2.3.1.5</b> <i>2018-2019 Iowa Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual</i>, Tools 3, 4, and 5 on pp. 29-39</p> <p><b>IA.2.3.1.5</b> <i>2018-2019 Iowa Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual</i>, pp. 7-8</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessment -- AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b></p> | <p><b>ISASP</b></p> <p>Iowa has State Code that supports the inclusion of all EL students, and procedural guidelines are in place for students taking the ELA, Math, and Science assessments. The State provides communications to the field on assessing ELs. Guidance is provided on use of appropriate accommodations for ELs. The process that was described is adequate.</p> <p>See Notes for C.E. 4.7 on the reviewer’s finding of evidence on communications with parents in a language they can understand.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b></p> <p>IDE provided further evidence in addition to that from DLM. Many of the documents are similar to those used with the ISASP.</p> |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>   | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b> |
|---|---|---|
|   | <p><i>AA-SC.1.4.3 Iowa Code Chapter 12</i></p> <p><i>AA-SC.5.2.1 School Leader Update Sample - September 2018</i></p> <p><i>AA-SC.5.2.2 DMPS 2019 Statewide Assessment Information letter to parents (English)</i></p> <p><i>AA-SC.5.1.2 Determining Supports for Learning and Performance for all Students, Appendix A, pages 61-65 and Appendix B, pages 66-70</i></p> <p><i>AA-SC.2.4.4 DLM Accessibility Manual, pages 18-28</i></p> <p><i>AA-SC.2.3.2 Iowa Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual, Tools 3, 4, and 5 on pages 29-39.</i></p> <p><i>AA-SC.2.3.2 Iowa Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual, pages 7-8.</i></p> |   |
| <b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b>  |   |   |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> |   |   |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations**

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>   | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>   |
|---|---|---|
| <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations, such as, interoperability with, and ability to use, assistive technology, are available to measure the <b>academic achievement</b> of students with disabilities.</li> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs;</li> <li>• Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> <li>• Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny</li> </ul> | <p><b>General Assessments -- ISASP</b></p> <p><b>IA.2.3.1.5</b> <i>2018-2019 Iowa Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual</i>, pp. 7-8; 9-24; and 29-39.</p> <p><b>IA.2.3.1.1</b> <i>ISASP 2018-19 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual</i>, pp. 2-16</p> <p><b>IA.2.3.1.5</b> <i>2018-2019 Iowa Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual</i>, pp. 40-41</p> <p><b>IA.2.3.1.5</b> <i>2018-2019 Iowa Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual</i>, pp. 8-24</p> <p><b>IA.2.4.1</b> <i>2019-2020 State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i>, Appendix B, pp. 16-17</p> <p><b>IA.2.3.1.1</b> <i>ISASP 2018-19 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual</i>, p. i.</p> <p><b>IA.2.3.1.1</b> <i>ISASP 2018-19 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual</i>, p. 11 and 13</p> <p><b>IA.2.2.1</b> <i>ISASP Technical Manual</i>, pp. 2-10 to 2-20 and pp. 3-1 to 3-9</p> <p><b>IA.2.3.1.1</b> <i>ISASP 2018-19 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual</i>, p. 1</p> <p><b>IA.5.3.3.1</b> <i>ISASP AEA Curriculum Network 4 Jan 2019</i>, slides 7-9</p> <p><b>IA.2.2.1</b> <i>ISASP Technical Manual</i>, pp. 3-1 to 3-9, Table 3.1</p> | <p><b>ISASP</b><br/>State documentation describes a wide variety of accommodations available for students with disabilities and ELs (including those with disabilities). The TM describes scores and reliability for students with and without IEPs and EL/non-EL students. Documents show a process to allow exceptional requests for accommodations. State also requires an assurance to be provided by districts that they will provide accommodations for students (as part of test security process). The approach used by IDE meets best practice standards.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b><br/>Accommodations that are provided for use with the Alt Assessment in science are adequate. IDE submitted evidence for their use with the DLM tests, many that are similar to those for the ISASP.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS READING AND MATH</b><br/>The Accessibility Manual provides evidence that the accommodations are appropriate and effective. This manual also describes the process used for exceptional requests.</p> <p>In addition, the reviewers found the after-test accessibility tool to be an effective way to determine if the student felt the accessibility supports provided were appropriate in the student’s option.</p> <p>Since these are new assessments, reviewers recommend the State consider producing a summary of the frequency of use of each accommodation on the State’s assessments by student characteristics (e.g., students with disabilities and disability type, ELs and proficiency levels). This would help strengthen the State’s monitoring on the use of</p> |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>  | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b> |
|--|--|---|
| <p>students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</p> | <p><b>IA.2.3.1.5</b> 2018-2019 Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual, p. 21, Tool 25: Unique Accommodation Request Application</p> <p><b>IA.5.3.5.1</b> ISASP Accessibility and Accommodation Training PowerPoint 2018-2019</p> <p><b>IA.2.4.1</b> 2019-2020 State of Iowa Test Security Manual, Appendix B, pp. 16-17</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessment -- AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b></p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.3.2</b> Iowa Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual, pages 29-39</p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.3.2</b> Iowa Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual, pages 29-39</p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.3.2</b> Iowa Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual, pages 5, 8-24 and Appendix B</p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.3.2</b> Iowa Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual, page 21, Tool 25: Unique Accommodation Request Application</p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.3.1</b> DLM Required Training Module 1 Transcript, pages 5-9</p> <p><b>AA-SC.2.4.1</b> 2019-2020 State of Iowa Test Security Manual, Appendix B, pages 15-16</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessments -- AA-AAAS READING AND MATH</b></p> | <p>accommodations by showing how student needs are being met.</p>                     |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>  | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b> |
|--|--|---|
|  | <p><i>AA-R.5.1.2 Iowa Statewide Assessment Accessibility Manual, page 59, Tool 15: After-Test Accessibility Questions,</i></p> <p><i>AA-R.5.1.2 Iowa Statewide Assessment Accessibility Manual, page 75, Tool 25: Unique Accommodation Request Application</i></p> |   |
| <b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b>   |  |   |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> |  |   |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations**

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>  | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>  |
|---|--|--|
| <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures;</li> <li>• Monitored for administrations of all required academic content assessments and AA-AAAS.</li> </ul> | <p><b>General Assessments -- ISASP</b></p> <p><b>IA.2.4.1</b> <i>2019-2020 State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i>, Monitoring Practices p. 9 and Appendix L: State of Iowa External Monitoring Plan, p. 55, Appendix I: ISASP Monitoring Checklist for Test Security and Ethics, items 22 to 31</p> <p><b>IA.2.4.5</b> <i>Spring Basic Educational Data Survey Reference Manual</i>, pp. 9-10</p> <p><b>IA.2.3.1.5</b> <i>2018-2019 Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual</i>, p. 8</p> <p><b>IA.1.4.2.2</b> <i>ISASP Test Administration Manual 2018-19</i>, Appendix B</p> <p><b>IA.2.4.1</b> <i>2019-2020 State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i>, Appendix I, p. 32</p> <p><b>IA.2.3.1.5</b> <i>2018-2019 Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual</i>, Tool 6, p. 40</p> <p><b>IA.2.4.1</b> <i>2019-2020 State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i>, Appendix B: Assurances for Proper and Ethical Test Administration, pp. 16 – 1; Monitoring Practices pp. 9-10; Appendix I: ISASP Monitoring Checklist for Test Security and Ethics, pp. 25-31; and Appendix L: State of Iowa External Monitoring Plan pp. 54-55</p> <p><b>IA.2.4.1</b> <i>2019-2020 State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i>, Appendix L, State of Iowa External Monitoring Plan, pp. 54-55</p> | <p><b>ISASP</b><br/>State requires LEAs to monitor testing in addition to its own monitoring of selected sites. Part of the monitoring checklist references accommodations (though the requirement for LEAs to monitor does not require them to report on their findings, just on whether or not they did any monitoring). State also requires assurances in writing from districts regarding providing accommodations as part of test security process. No information on actual outcomes of monitoring were provided.</p> <p>Reviewers require evidence on monitoring results, such as a summary report of the findings from the most recent test administrations in the State, including action steps to address and remediate findings.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b><br/>The same procedures for monitoring ISASP are in place for the Alt Science. Much of the evidence for this is the same, although some other documents were provided that are specific to DLM (see monitoring checklist in TS Manual). A DLM educator portal is also used to make sure all appropriate supports are included for SWDs and EL students. Evidence of monitoring that was provided was of limited value to the reviewers (see DLM extract).</p> <p>Reviewers require evidence on monitoring results, such as a summary report of the findings from the most recent test administrations in the State, including action steps to address and remediate findings.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS READING AND MATH</b><br/>State evidence includes a description of how to conduct an observation on behalf of the consortium and what info is collected (Kite Collector app and questions), plus an</p> |

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

| <b>Critical Element</b> | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>   | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>  |
|-------------------------|---|--|
|                         | <p><b>Alternate Assessments -- AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b></p> <p><i>AA-SC.2.4.3 Spring Basic Educational Survey Reference Manual, pages 9-10</i></p> <p><i>AA-SC.2.4.1 2019-2020 State of Iowa Test Security Manual, pages 9, 41-56</i></p> <p><i>AA-SC.2.3.2 Iowa Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual, page 8</i></p> <p><i>AA-SC.2.4.1 2019-2020 State of Iowa Test Security Manual, Appendix K</i></p> <p><i>AA-SC.5.4.1 DLM Educator Portal User Guide 2019-2020, pages 29-41</i></p> <p><i>AA-SC.2.3.2 Iowa Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual, Tool 6, page 40</i></p> <p><i>AA-SC.2.4.1 2019-2020 State of Iowa Test Security Manual, page 55</i></p> <p><i>AA-SC.5.4.2 Kite Collector App</i><br/> <i>AA-SC.5.4.2 DLM Administration Monitoring</i><br/> <i>AA-SC.5.4.2 DLM Monitoring Extract</i></p> <p><b>Alternate Assessments -- AA-AAAS READING AND MATH</b></p> <p><i>AA-R.2.5.8 2019-2020 State of Iowa Test Security Manual, pages 9, 41-56</i></p> <p><i>AA-R.5.4.1 DLM Kite Collector App</i><br/> <i>AA-R.5.4.2 Kite Collector Questions for Test Administration Observations</i></p> | <p>excerpt from monitoring observations conducted during 2018-19. The only piece not included but requested in the previous peer review is a summary of findings from the observations and action steps to remediate them, including information on accommodations for students with IEPs and EL students.</p> <p>Therefore, since the State did not submit required evidence as requested from the previous peer review, the reviewers require evidence on monitoring results, such as a summary report of the findings from the most recent test administrations in the State, including action steps to address and remediate findings.</p> |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

| Critical Element   | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|--|
|  | AA-R.5.4.3 <i>DLM Monitoring Extract</i>                   |  |
| <b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b>   |  |  |
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>General assessment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reviewers require evidence on monitoring results, such as a summary report of the findings from the most recent test administrations in the State, including action steps to address and remediate findings.</li> </ul> <p><b>Alt-assessment – ELA, math</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since the State did not submit required evidence as requested from the previous peer review, the reviewers require evidence on monitoring results, such as a summary report of the findings from the most recent test administrations in the State, including action steps to address and remediate findings.</li> </ul> |  |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING**

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

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>  | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>   |
|---|--|---|
| <p><b><u>For academic content standards:</u></b></p> <p>The State formally adopted <b><u>challenging academic achievement standards</u></b> in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;</li> <li>The State applies its academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply;</li> </ul> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (1) at least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third for lower achievement; (2) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (3) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</p> | <p><b>General Assessments -- ISASP</b></p> <p><b>IA.6.1.1</b> <i>Final Executed MOU 8.6.18</i>, p. 2</p> <p><b>IA.6.1.2</b> <i>2019-09-12 Statewide Assessment</i>, pp. 2-5</p> <p><b>IA.6.1.3</b> <i>Iowa State Board of Education Minutes 9.12.19</i>, pp. 7-8</p> <p><b>IA.1.4.2.1</b> <i>Iowa Code Chapter 12</i> p. 26</p> <p><b>IA.6.1.3</b> <i>Iowa State Board of Education Minutes 9.12.19</i>, pp. 7-8</p> <p><b>IA.2.1.1.3</b> <i>ISASP ELA PLD</i><br/> <b>IA.2.1.1.4</b> <i>ISASP Math PLD</i><br/> <b>IA.2.1.1.5</b> <i>ISASP Science PLD</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.1.1.6</b> <i>ISASP Cut Score Ranges</i></p> <p><b>Alternate Assessments -- AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b></p> <p><b>AA-SC.1.1.1</b> <i>August 2015 Iowa State Board of Education Minutes</i>, pages 3-4</p> <p><b>AA-SC.1.4.3</b> <i>Iowa Code Chapter 12</i>, page 26</p> <p><b>AA-SC.6.1.2</b> <i>DLM Science Standard Setting 2016</i>, pages 12-13</p> <p><b>AA-SC.6.1.1</b> <i>Final Executed MOU 2015-2016</i></p> | <p><b>ISASP</b></p> <p>IDE submitted evidence on the process for formally adopting State achievement standards in ELA, Math, and Science and final approval by the BOE. Info on the PLDs and cut scores for these standards was also provided. The evidence is adequate to meet the requirements.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b></p> <p>No evidence of the <u>formal adoption</u> of the achievement standards as required in this critical element was included in the State submission for peer review. State Board minutes show that a presentation was given on science cut scores but no record of formal Board action is shown. (State notes that that because “the ...Board...declined to act on any of the items contained in the presentation; therefore, the State Board of Education implicitly approved the ...academic achievement standards.” Reviewers require evidence of formal adoption of these achievement standards.</p> <p>It was noted that the standard-setting report shows that there are 4 performance levels and provides information about the competencies associated with each level.</p> |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]

| Critical Element   | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b>   |  |  |
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>Alt-Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State formally adopted alternate academic achievement standards for science for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul> |  |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting**

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>   | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>  |
|--|---|--|
| <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards.</u></b></li> </ul> | <p><b>General Assessments -- ISASP</b></p> <p><b>IA.2.2.1</b> <i>ISASP Technical Manual</i>, Chapter 5 Performance Standards, pp. 5-1 to 5-7</p> <p><b>IA.4.1.3.1</b> <i>2019 ISASP Standard Setting Technical Report</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.1.1.3</b> <i>ISAS ELA PLD</i><br/> <b>IA.2.1.1.4</b> <i>ISASP Math PLD</i><br/> <b>IA.2.1.1.5</b> <i>ISASP Science PLD</i></p> <p><b>IA.6.1.3</b> <i>Iowa State Board of Education Minutes 9.12.19</i>, pp. 7-8</p> <p><b>IA.2.1.1.6</b> <i>ISASP Cut Score Ranges</i></p> | <p><b>ISASP</b><br/> Adequate evidence was submitted on the methods and process used to set cut scores and achievement standards – see info in the TM and Standard Setting Report. They were approved by the State BOE.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b><br/> No further evidence was needed from IDE as DLM responded to this C.E.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></p>  |   |  |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>  |   |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards**

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>  | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>   |
|---|--|---|
| <p><b><u>For academic achievement standards:</u></b></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards and with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards such that a student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards (1) are aligned with the State’s challenging academic content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled; (2) promote access to the general curriculum consistent with the IDEA; (3) reflect professional judgment as to the highest possible standards achievable for such students; (4) are designated in the IEP for each student for whom alternate academic achievement standards apply; and (5) are aligned to ensure that a student who meets the alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue</p> | <p><b>General Assessments -- ISASP</b></p> <p><b>IA.3.1.1</b> <i>K-12 Literacy Iowa Core Standards</i><br/> <b>IA.3.1.2</b> <i>K-12 Mathematics Iowa Core Standards</i><br/> <b>IA.3.1.3</b> <i>K-12 Iowa Science Standards</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.1.1.3</b> <i>ISASP ELA PLD</i><br/> <b>IA.2.1.1.4</b> <i>ISASP Math PLD</i><br/> <b>IA.2.1.1.5</b> <i>ISASP Science PLD</i></p> <p><b>IA.4.1.3.1</b> <i>ISASP Standard Setting Technical Report</i><br/> <b>IA.2.2.1</b> <i>ISASP Technical Manual, Chapter 2 Test Development, pp. 2-1 to 2-14</i><br/> <b>IA.2.2.1</b> <i>ISASP Technical Manual, Chapter 5 Performance Standards, pp. 5-1 to 5-7</i></p> <p><b>IA.6.1.3</b> <i>Iowa State Board of Education Minutes 9.12.19, pp. 7-8</i><br/> <b>IA.2.1.1.6</b> <i>ISASP Cut Score Ranges</i></p> | <p><b>ISASP</b></p> <p>The State PLD descriptors show how the achievement levels are related to the State’s academic content standards. The standard-setting report shows how the PLDs were used to help set cut scores as well as the process used to vertically articulate the cut scores. Panelist feedback (p.50-55) shows that most panelists agreed with the PLDs and were confident about cut scores.</p> <p>No information about how the achievement standards align to college entrance requirements or career and technical education standards was provided.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b></p> <p>No further evidence was needed from IDE as DLM responded to this C.E. More evidence is forthcoming from DLM in Dec 2020.</p> |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b> | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b> |
|---|---|---|
| postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment.   |   |   |
| <b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b>  |   |   |
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation that the State’s academic achievement standards are aligned with the State’s academic content standards and with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards.</li> </ul> |   |   |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting**

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>  | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>   |
|---|--|---|
| <p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on <b><u>student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level<sup>3</sup></u></b></p> <p>For <b><u>academic content assessments</u></b>, the State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the <b><u>specific academic needs of students</u></b>, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its academic content assessments that:</li> </ul> | <p><b>General Assessments -- ISASP</b></p> <p><b>IA.6.4.1.1</b> <i>Sample of Iowa School Performance Profile- Proficiency (2018)</i></p> <p><b>IA.6.4.1.2</b> <i>Sample of Iowa School Performance Profile- Growth (2018)</i></p> <p><b>IA.6.4.1.3</b> <i>Sample of Iowa School Performance Profile- Achievement (2018)</i></p> <p><b>IA.6.4.1.4</b> <i>State Board Meeting_9-12-2019</i>, pp. 17, 21, 25</p> <p><b>IA.6.4.1.5</b> <i>ISASP Statewide Assessment System Advisory Committee 10-02-19</i>, pp. 22, 23, 24</p> <p><b>IA.6.4.1.6</b> <i>ISASP Curriculum Network 10-04-19</i>, pp. 19, 20, 21</p> <p><b>IA.2.1.1.7</b> <i>ISASP Interpretive Manual for Educators</i> pp. 14-22</p> <p><b>IA.3.3.1</b> <i>2019 ISASP Annual Statistical Report</i><br/> <u>Reading</u>, pp. 53-188<br/> <u>Language/Writing</u>, pp. 238-373<br/> <u>Mathematics</u>, pp. 425-560<br/> <u>Science</u>, pp. 591-627</p> <p><b>IA.2.1.1.7</b> <i>ISASP Interpretive Manual for Educators</i></p> | <p><b>ISASP</b><br/>                 IDE provided evidence describing how it will make results for all students available on its website via school profiles. This was posted in early 2020 and reviewers checked it during peer review (note that the samples provided in the submission were from 2018).</p> <p>State provided evidence of several presentations to groups which describe the results in terms of standard setting. The State provides interpretive guides for educators and parents regarding how to appropriately use scores and describing their meaning and relationship to standards, as well as assessment design. Sample reports are also provided. The reports were reviewed and approved by key stakeholders in Iowa. Interpretive guides, letters, and student reports and PLDs for families are available in Spanish, Vietnamese, and Chinese. State also directs users to contact them if additional support with language or accessibility of report information is needed.</p> <p>State notes that timeline for 2019 results was not the same as what will be used for future assessments. However, no evidence was provided of a future timeline to provide results to districts, schools, and teachers in time to allow for their use before the next school year.</p> <p>The State should consider translating the statement on the webpage regarding the need for additional support in understanding test scores and reports into other languages.</p> <p><b>AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b></p> |

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

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence   |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a <b><u>student’s academic achievement</u></b>;</li> <li>○ Report the <b><u>student’s academic achievement</u></b> in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards;</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific <b><u>academic needs of students</u></b>;</li> <li>○ Are provided in an understandable and uniform format;</li> <li>○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian;</li> <li>○ Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> <li>● The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul> | <p><b>IA.6.4.2.1</b> <i>ISASP Iowa Percentile Ranks for 2019</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.2.1</b> <i>ISASP Technical Manual</i>, Chapter 4 Reports, pp. 4-1 to 4-6</p> <p><b>IA.2.1.1.7</b> <i>ISASP Interpretive Manual for Educators</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.1.1.11</b> <i>ISASP Interpretive Information for Families</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.1.1.7</b> <i>ISASP Interpretive Manual for Educators</i></p> <p><b>IA.6.4.2.1</b> <i>ISASP Iowa Percentile Ranks for 2019</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.2.1</b> <i>ISASP Technical Manual</i>, Chapter 4 Reports, pp. 4-1 to 4-6</p> <p><b>IA.6.4.3.1</b> <i>ISASP Website Information for Families</i></p> <p><b>IA.6.4.3.2</b> <i>ISASP Interpretive Information for Families in Spanish</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.1.1.8</b> <i>ISASP Student Sample ISR</i></p> <p><b>IA.6.4.3.3</b> <i>ISASP Student Sample ISR in Spanish</i></p> <p><b>IA.2.1.1.12</b> <i>ISASP Performance Level Descriptors English and Spanish</i></p> <p><b>IA.1.4.2.2</b> <i>ISASP Test Administration Manual 2018-19</i>, State-designated testing window, p. iii</p> <p><b>IA.6.4.4.1</b> <i>ISASP Interpretation of Results</i></p> <p><b>Alternate Assessments -- AA-AAAS SCIENCE</b></p> <p><b>AA-SC.6.4.1</b> <i>Draft Alternate Assessment Iowa School Performance Profile</i></p> | <p>IDE provided evidence describing how it will make results for all students available on its website via school profiles. This was posted in early 2020 and reviewers checked it during peer review (note that the samples provided in the submission were from 2018).</p> <p>The State provides interpretive guides for educators and parents regarding how to appropriately use scores and describing their meaning and relationship to standards, as well as assessment design. Sample reports are also provided. The reports were reviewed and approved by key stakeholders in Iowa. Interpretive guides, letters, and student reports and PLDs for families are available in Spanish, Vietnamese, and Chinese. State also directs users to contact them if additional support with language or accessibility of report information is needed.</p> <p>State notes that timeline for 2019 results was not the same as what will be used for future assessments. However, no evidence was provided of a future timeline to provide results to districts, schools, and teachers in time to allow for their use before the next school year.</p> |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>  | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b> |
|--|--|---|
|  | <p><i>AA-SC.6.4.2 Parent Interpretive Guide IA</i></p> <p><i>AA-SC.6.4.3 Parent Interpretive Guide IA Spanish</i></p> <p><i>AA-SC.6.4.4 Talking to Parents about DLM Score Reports</i></p> <p><i>AA-SC.6.4.5 How Can Score Reports be Used? Transcript</i></p> <p><b>AA-SC.1.3.2</b> Alternate Assessment Commencement Email 2018-2019</p> |   |
| <b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b>   |  |   |
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>For both the General Assessment-ELA, Math, Science and the Alt Science:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State has a process and future timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration</li> </ul> |  |   |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS**  
 (if **applicable**; evidence for this section would be submitted in ADDITION to evidence for sections 1 through 6)

**Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments**

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b> | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b> |
|---|---|---|
| <p>The State has established technical criteria to use in its review of any submission of a locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment. The State has completed this review using its established technical criteria and has found the assessment meets its criteria <b>prior to</b> submitting for the Department’s assessment peer review.</p> <p>The State’s technical criteria include a determination that the assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is aligned with the challenging State academic standards; and</li> <li>• Addresses the depth and breadth of those standards.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <p>The State has procedures in place to ensure that a district that chooses to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment administers the same assessment to all high school students in the district except for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who may be assessed with an AA-AAAS.</p> |   |   |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b> | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b> |
|---|---|---|
| <p>AND</p> <p>The technical criteria established by the State in reviewing a locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment must ensure that the use of appropriate accommodations does not deny a student with a disability or an EL—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The opportunity to participate in the assessment; and</li> <li>• Any of the benefits from participation in the assessment that are afforded to students without disabilities or students who are not ELs.</li> </ul> |   |   |
| <b>Section 7.1 Summary Statement</b>  |   |   |
| <p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>  |   |   |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments**

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b> | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b> |
|---|---|---|
| <p>The State must have procedures in place to ensure that:</p> <p><b>Before</b> a district requests approval from the State to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment, the district notifies all parents of high school students it serves—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the district intends to request approval from the State to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in place of the statewide academic assessment;</li> <li>• Of how parents and, as appropriate, students may provide meaningful input regarding the district’s request (includes students in public charter schools who would be included in such assessments); and</li> <li>• Of any effect of such request on the instructional program in the district.</li> </ul> |   |   |
| <p><b>Section 7.2 Summary Statement</b></p>   |   |   |
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>  |   |   |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|------------------|--|--|
|                  |  |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

**Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments**

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b> | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b> |
|---|---|---|
| <p>The locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is equivalent to or more rigorous than the statewide assessment, with respect to—               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The coverage of academic content;</li> <li>○ The difficulty of the assessment;</li> <li>○ The overall quality of the assessment; and</li> <li>○ Any other aspects of the assessment that the State may establish in its technical criteria;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Produces valid and reliable data on student academic achievement with respect to all high school students and each subgroup of high school students in the district that—               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Are comparable to student academic achievement data for all high school students and each subgroup of high school students produced by the statewide assessment at each academic achievement level;</li> <li>○ Are expressed in terms consistent with the State’s academic achievement standards; and</li> <li>○ Provide unbiased, rational, and consistent differentiation among schools within the State for the purpose of the State determined accountability system including calculating the Academic Achievement indicator and annually meaningfully differentiating between schools.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |   |   |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [IOWA]**

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b> | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b> |
|--|---|---|
| <b>Section 7.3 Summary Statement</b>   |   |   |
| <p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul> |   |   |

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