



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

September 10, 2021

The Honorable Katie Jenner  
State Superintendent of Education  
Indiana Department of Education  
100 N Senate Ave, 9th Floor  
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Dear Superintendent Jenner:

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 Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in July 2020 and winter 2021. The information in this letter is based on a review of information provided by IDOE in summer 2020 and information provided by the WIDA consortium in winter 2021 for the English language proficiency (ELP) general and alternate assessments and the Indiana Alternate Measure (I AM) alternate assessments. The ELP assessment review was a follow up to a review that occurred in 2019 regarding IDOE's ELP general and alternate assessments. The I AM alternate assessment review was a first time submission to the peer review.

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 IDOE'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:

- Alternate reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics assessments, grades 3-8 (Indiana's Alternate Measure (I AM)): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- Alternate science grades 4, 6, and high school (I AM Science): **Substantially meets requirements**
- General ELP assessment (ACCESS): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- Alternate ELP assessment (Alternate ACCESS): **Partially meets requirements of the ESEA.**

The components that **partially meet requirements** do not meet a number of the requirements of the statute and regulations and/or the HIDOE will need to provide substantial additional information to

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.*

demonstrate it meets the requirements. The Department expects that HIDEOE may not be able to submit all of the required information within one year. **Substantially meets requirements** means that these components meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations, but some additional evidence is required. The Department expects that IDOE may be able to provide this additional information within one year.

The specific list of items required for IDOE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because the State has not fully satisfied the condition placed on the State's Title I, Part A grant award related to its State assessment system, the Department is continuing to place a condition on the State's Title I grant award related to those components (i.e., the ELP assessments) of the assessment system. To satisfy this condition, IDOE must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. IDOE must provide to the Department a plan and timeline by which it will submit the additional documentation within 30 days of the receipt of this letter. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action. Upon submission of the plan, the Department will reach out to IDOE 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/

Ian Rosenblum  
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Programs  
Delegated the Authority to Perform the  
Functions and Duties of the Assistant Secretary  
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Lynn Schemel, Director of Assessment

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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<b>1.2 – Coherent and Progressive ELP Standards that Correspond to the State’s Academic Content Standards (for ELP assessments)</b>	For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the ELP standards contained language proficiency expectations that reflect the language needed for English learners (ELs) to acquire and demonstrate their achievement of the knowledge and skills identified in the State’s academic content standards appropriate to each grade-level/grade-band, specifically:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of the completed alignment study, including interpretations of findings, and a plan and timeline to address any issues identified in the study.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>1.3 – Required Assessments</b>	For the Alternate ACCESS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the alternate ELP assessment is available in kindergarten.</li> </ul>
<b>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</b>	For the Alternate ACCESS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the alternate ELP assessment is available in kindergarten.</li> </ul>
<b>1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments</b>	For the I AM science: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that, in developing the science academic content standards, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:                             <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>○ Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b>	For the I AM R/LA, mathematics, and science: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards for the grade that is being assessed and includes:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 the State’s grade-level academic content standards and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results, e.g., evidence that demonstrates how the assessments will adequately assess the full range of the academic content in each grade over time.</li> <li>○ Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills), such as evidence that can demonstrate how cognitive complexity is incorporated into the design of test forms.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that measure the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards, and reflect appropriate inclusion of the range of complexity found in the standards, specifically:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence that the test blueprints include the number of items for each standard and subdomain.</li> <li>○ Evidence of a description of the item selection process for paper test forms that adheres to the test blueprints.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<p><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p>	<p>For the I AM R/LA, mathematics, and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that demonstrates reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess SWSCD achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills (e.g., evidence that subsequent item development has addressed item bank deficits identified in the Technical Report).</li> </ul> <p>For the ACCESS:</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 ELP based on the State’s ELP standards in terms of content and language processes (e.g., documentation on the qualifications of item reviewers such as their grade levels taught, years of experience, and demographic diversity).</li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</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 ELP based on the State’s ELP standards in terms of content and language processes (e.g., evidence that the item development process includes experts with knowledge of ELs with significant cognitive disabilities including their grade levels taught, years of experience, and demographic diversity).</li> </ul>
<p><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></p>	<p>For the I AM R/LA, mathematics, and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the documentation and implementation of an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through the remediation of any test security incidents involving the State’s assessments.</li> </ul> <p>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results, specifically:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of how WIDA works with member States on follow-up investigations and how information is communicated to these States including a plan to address the test security vendor’s findings.</li> <li>○ Evidence of consequences for confirmed violations of test security (e.g., evidence of test score invalidation).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence the State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results (e.g., evidence that the test security vendor’s services include the Alternate ACCESS).</li> </ul>
<p><b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b></p>	<p>For the I AM R/LA, mathematics, and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically: 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>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p>	<p>For the I AM R/LA, mathematics, and Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:               <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. Evidence requested in critical elements 2.1 and 2.2 above will also apply to this critical element.</li> <li>○ Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards (e.g., a plan and timeline to address issues identified in the alignment study for I AM, as well as related evidence requested in critical elements 2.1 and 2.2).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>For the ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s ELP assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s ELP standards, specifically:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence that the WIDA alignment and correspondence studies are based on the State’s content standards and ELP standards.</li> <li>○ A plan to address any issues identified in the alignment and correspondence studies.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s ELP standards (e.g., evidence of a plan to address any issues identified in the alignment and linking studies).</li> </ul>
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive/Linguistic Processes</b></p>	<p>For the I AM R/LA, mathematics, and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate validity evidence that the assessments tap: the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards. Evidence requested in critical element 2.1 and 3.1 will also help address this critical element.</li> </ul> <p>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended language processes appropriate for each grade-level or grade-band as represented in the State’s ELP standards, specifically evidence that:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Items are reviewed based on the linguistic complexity of the vocabulary, graphics, and other content features of the items.</li> <li>○ The panel reviewing the items include language development experts.</li> <li>○ The State documents the reviewers’ judgments of the language processes being demonstrated by the item.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></p>	<p>For the I AM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards in science (e.g., how the internal structure of the science assessments represent both dimensions of the science standards).</li> </ul>
<p><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p>	<p>For the I AM R/LA, mathematics, and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are related with other variables as expected (e.g., interpretations for sub-score correlations found at grades 3, 4 and 10).</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</li> </ul>
<b>4.1 – Reliability</b>	<p>For the I AM mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate reliability for the State’s assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, specifically:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence that the State has examined the adequacy of overall reliabilities at grades 7, 8 and 10.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate reliability for the State’s assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, specifically:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of a plan to improve the consistency and accuracy of the assessments since the values are low in some cases (e.g., ACCESS listening domain grade one levels 2-5).</li> <li>○ Evidence of a plan to address the precision of the test forms in speaking and writing across all proficiency levels which could eliminate the almost bimodal nature of the test information function (TIF) curves.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>For the ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate reliability for the State’s assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards (e.g., evidence that the new folders of items and tasks developed as a result of the refreshment plan, which is based on reliability findings, have been included in the item bank).</li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate reliability for the State’s assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards (e.g., evidence of TIF for the overall assessment).</li> </ul>
<b>4.2 – Fairness and accessibility</b>	<p>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</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 ELs and fair across student groups, including ELs with disabilities, in their design, development, and analysis (e.g., evidence of completed differential item functioning or DIF analyses based on disability status; and for the Alternate ACCESS evidence of the role that universal design plays in the design, development, and analysis stages).</li> </ul>
<b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b>	<p>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the ELP assessments assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum including performance for EL students with high and low levels of English language proficiency and with different proficiency profiles across the domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Evidence requested for critical element 4.1 will also satisfy this critical element.</li> </ul>



Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<p><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p>	<p>For the I AM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement science (e.g., how the reporting structure of the science assessments represent both dimensions of the science standards).</li> </ul> <p>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its ELP assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s ELP standards, specifically:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Documentation for how the State will score tests when a student is exempt from one domain, including a rationale for the State’s composite proficiency level in such cases.</li> <li>○ Evidence of the State’s scoring procedures and protocols.</li> <li>○ For ACCESS, evidence that the State’s consistently ensures the accuracy of scoring item given on the paper test forms.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b></p>	<p>For the ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State ensures that all forms of the ELP assessments adequately represent the State’s ELP standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across settings, specifically:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of an equating plan for the paper test forms of the listening and reading tests.</li> <li>○ Evidence of a rationale for using anchor item sets for the reading tests.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State ensures that all forms of the ELP assessments adequately represent the State’s ELP standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across settings.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></p>	<p>For the I AM R/LA, mathematics, and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the paper, large print, and Braille versions of the assessment:               <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>○ Have adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></p>	<p>For the I AM R/LA, mathematics, and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website (e.g., please provided updated URLs for this information).</li> </ul> <p>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website (e.g., please provided updated URLs for this information).</li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</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.</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<p><b>5.3 - Accommodations</b></p>	<p>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation that the State ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities (e.g., evidence of completed work products and research studies mentioned in the evidence to demonstrate that the provided accommodations are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, do not alter the construct being assessed, and 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> </ul>
<p><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p>	<p>For the I AM 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 ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> <li>○ Monitored for administrations of all required AA-AAAS.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards/ELP Achievement Standards</b></p>	<p>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has ensured that ELP assessment results are expressed in terms that are clearly aligned with the State’s ELP standards and its ELP performance-level descriptors (e.g., evidence of a clear description of the process used to develop the State’s ELP achievement standards so that it is clear, for example, that the State’s cut scores were set and performance level descriptors written to reflect the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards for each grade-level and grade-band).</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p>	<p>For the I AM R/LA, mathematics, and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results for parents (e.g., please provided updated URLs for this information).</li> </ul> <p>For the ACCESS and alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State provides information about each student’s attainment of the State’s ELP standards to parents, specifically:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence that the State communicates assessment results to parents in a format that they 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> </ul> </li> </ul>



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

## July-August 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.

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 ..... 16**

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security..... 17**

**Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 19**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....20**

**Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content20**

**Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes ..... 22**

**Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 23**

**Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables..... 24**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER .....25**

**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability ..... 25**

**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility ..... 27**

**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum ..... 28**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 29**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 30**

**Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment..... 31**

**Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance ..... 32**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS .....33**

**Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 33**

**Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments..... 36**

**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations ..... 37**

**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.

..... 39

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .....41**

**Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students ..... 41**  
**Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting ..... 43**  
**Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards ..... 44**  
**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting ..... 46**

**SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS..49**

**Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments ..... 49**  
**Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments ..... 51**  
**Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments ..... 53**

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 [Indiana]**

**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> 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>1.1A Grades 3-12 ELA Content Connectors 1.1B Grades 3-10, Mathematics, Algebra, Geometry Content Connectors 1.1C Grades 4, 6 Science Biology Content Connectors 1.1D SBOE Alternate Assessment Memo 1.1E SBOE Approval of Content Connectors 1.1F Content Connector Update Alternate Standards 2018</p>	<p>Evidence of this requirement being met was not found.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State must submit evidence of formal adoption of the content connectors.</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 [Indiana]**

**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>                      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>	1.2A Indiana Process and Participants 2014 1.2B Achieve K-12 Standards Review 1.2C Indiana Chamber Recommendation 1.2D Magee Standards Review 1.2E Stotsky Standards Review 1.2F Science Standards Review 1.2G Ritz-Lubbers Letter to Sec Duncan 1.2H Indiana ELA Standards Review Committee 1.2I Indiana Mathematics Standards Review Committee 1.2J Indiana Science Standards Review Committee 1.2K College Career Panel Review Committee 2014 1.2L Public Comment Process Summary 2014 1.2M Science Standards Overview 2016 1.2N Indiana Academic Standards for Science Study for College and Career Readiness Study Report	No evidence was found specific to the Alternate Assessment.
<p><b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence for the I AM must be submitted.</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 [Indiana]**

**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>1.3A 2019-2020-Indiana-assessment-overview            1.3B 2018-2019 Indiana Assessment Windows_SBAApproved            1.3C Indiana Participation Guidance            1.3D Indiana Alternate Assessment Participant Guidance FAQ            1.3E Indiana Alternate Assessment Participation Decision Flowchart</p>	<p>The State’s evidence establishes that it provides assessments 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), and that</li> </ul> <p>The State’s <b><u>academic content assessments</u></b> are be the same assessments administered to all students in the tested grades, with the following exception:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may take an alternate assessment (I AM) aligned with alternate academic achievement 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 [Indiana]**

<p>             eighth grade and allow the student to take the State end-of-course mathematics test instead.             <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> </p>		
<p><b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

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

**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>Indiana Code that asserts participation for all: 1.4A Indiana Codes.docx <b>Additional documentation specific to students with disabilities and LEP:</b> 1.4A Indiana Codes.docx.pdf 1.4B 2018-19 Program Manual</p>	<p>The state’s evidence demonstrates that it requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system, and that it clearly communicates this requirement to all districts and 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 [Indiana]**

<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</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 [Indiana]**

**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>1.2F Indiana Science Standards Review            1.2J Indiana Science Standards Review Committee            1.2M Science Standards Overview 2016            1.5A Content Connector Project Summary            1.5B Sign in Sheet March 12            1.5C Indiana Content Connectors - Public Comment (Responses)            1.1F Content Connector Update Alternate Standards 2018</p>	<p>The evidence provides a partial demonstration that the State’s academic content standards in science were developed with meaningful consultation with local educational agencies, teachers, principals, other school leaders, and parents.</p> <p>The evidence did not demonstrate that State leaders, including Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education, or representatives of Indian tribes located in the State were consulted in the development of the Science Standards.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:            Evidence that 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>• Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State.</li> </ul> <p>in the development of the science academic content standards</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 [Indiana]

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <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>2.1A I AM Tech Reports Volumes 1 – 6</p> <p>2.1B I AM Blueprint Meeting Plan</p> <p>2.1C I AM Blueprint Workshop_Day1A_Pre-Workshop Discussion</p> <p>2.1D I AM Blueprint Workshop_Day1_AMLarge Group</p> <p>2.1E I AM Blueprint Workshop_Day1B_G3-8_ELA_RC</p> <p>2.1F I AM Blueprint Workshop_Day1B_G3-8_MASCISS_RC</p> <p>2.1G I AM Blueprint Workshop_Day1B_G10_ELA_RC</p> <p>2.1H I AM Blueprint Workshop_Day1B_G10_MASCIASS_RC</p> <p>2.1I I AM Blueprint Workshop_Day2_G3-8_CC</p> <p>2.1J I AM Blueprint Workshop_Day2_G10_CC</p> <p>2.1K Blueprint Meeting Sign-in Sheet</p> <p>2.1L Blueprint Meeting Demographics</p> <p>2.1M V2 Appendix A I AM ELA Blueprints</p> <p>2.1N V2 Appendix B I AM Mathematics Blueprints</p> <p>2.1O V2 Appendix C I AM Science Blueprints</p> <p>2.1P I AM Draft Item Specifications Meeting Plan</p> <p>2.1Q I AM Item Specifications Participants</p> <p>2.1R I AM Item Specifications Meeting Final Agenda</p> <p>2.1S I AM Item Specification Meeting Day1_AMLarge Group</p> <p>2.1T ELA I AM Item Specification Meeting breakout slides</p> <p>2.1U Mathematics I AM Item Specification Meeting breakout slides</p> <p>2.1V Science I AM Item Specification Meeting breakout slides</p> <p>2.1W I AM ELA Grade 6 Updated Item Specifications</p> <p>2.1X I AM MA Grade 6 Item Specifications</p>	<p>The issues the Peers discussed with regard to measuring Science for the EL assessment and ILEARN assessments seem to exist for the IAM as well.</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 [Indiana]**

<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>	<p>2.1Y I AM Science Grade 6 Item Specifications</p>	
<p><b>Section 2.1 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>• As the State continues to develop the alternate assessment, evidence of progress and/or completion must be submitted. Specifically with regard to this Section, there must be 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, especially for science.</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 [Indiana]**

**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><u>Evidence for Item Development:</u>                  2.1A I AM Tech Reports Volumes 1 - 6                   2.2A IN I AM ELA IDP_2019                  2.2B IN I AM Mathematics IDP 2019                  2.3C IN I AM Science IDP 2019                   2.2D I AM Content and Fairness Agenda ELA 35                  2.2E I AM Content and Fairness Agenda ELA68                  2.2F I AM Content and Fairness Agenda ELA 10                  2.2G I AM Content and Fairness Agenda Mathematics 35                  2.2H I AM Content and Fairness Agenda Mathematics 68                  2.2I I AM Content and Fairness Agenda Mathematics 10                  2.2J I AM Content and Fairness Agenda Sci SS                  2.2K I AM Content and Fairness Agenda Biology                  2.2AA V2 Appendix F Item Review Checklist                  2.2L Appendix H 2018 I AM Passage Review Committee Summary                  2.2M Appendix I 2018 I AM Content and Fairness Committee Review Summary                  2.2N I AM Content and Fairness Participants List                  2.2O Evaluations ContentandFairness   <u>Evidence for Item Performance</u>                  2.2P I AM 2019 CFC and Data Review Participants                  2.2Q Appendix J Item Data Review Training Material                  2.2R I AM 2019 Data Review Results                  2.2S V1 Appendix B. Field Test Item Statistics                  2.2T Appendix K 2019 I AM Item Data Review Committee Summary                  2.2U V2 Appendix L I AM ELA 2019-2020 Item Development Plan</p>	<p>The State has listed several items as evidence. However without the connection indicators it is not clear if the items are aligned or not. The indicator can be found using the link provided in critical element 1.1. However, these documents are not part of the evidence that has been turned in for this peer review.</p> <p>As the 10<sup>th</sup> grade math and ELA test were developed by a committee, and not ILEARN, it is not clear if these were built according to the same parameters to ensure students taking the alternate assessment can be compared to their same age peers.</p> <p>The Peers acknowledge the State’s observation stated in 2.1A Tech Report Vol. 2 p 36, “It is the intention for future I AM assessments to fully meet the I AM blueprint requirements. To ensure that the item pool can support the blueprint needs, annual item development plans will be developed based on a pool analysis against blueprint needs. The Item Development Plans for ELA, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies for the 2019–2020 I AM administration are provided in Appendices L-O. Developing and maintaining a robust operational pool aligned to I AM blueprint requirements will allow for future I AM assessment administrations to continue to yield valid and reliable test scores and proficiency-level classifications that indicate whether students taking the I AM assessment have demonstrated the knowledge and skills associated with the Indiana Content Connectors.” This statement would lead the Peers to understand that these assessment are still being developed to meet this critical element and several others. As one example, there appear to be some alignment issues, from the perspective that a number of items have a “far link” to the</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 [Indiana]**

	<p>2.2V Appendix M I AM Mathematics 2019-2020 Item Development Plan                  2.2W Appendix N I AM Science 2019-2020 Item Development Plan</p> <p><u>Evidence for Item Alignment</u>                  2.2X I AM Alignment Report                  2.2Y edCount Proposal for I AM Assessment Services Support</p>	<p>CC (versus a “near link”); for example, the 5<sup>th</sup> grade assessments (page 31 of 2.2X).</p> <p>The Peers once again acknowledge that the I AM is a “work in progress” and commend the State’s efforts to move forward with development during very difficult circumstances.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.2 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>• The State must demonstrate that it 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 process, including higher-order thinking skills.</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 [Indiana]**

**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>2.1A I AM Tech Reports Volumes 1 - 6                  1.4B 2018-19 Program Manual</p> <p>2.3A Appendix A - Technology Setup for Online Testing Quick Guide                  2.3B Appendix B - Additional Configurations and Troubleshooting Guide for Android                  2.3C Appendix C - Additional Configurations and Troubleshooting Guide for Chrome OS                  2.4D Appendix D - Additional Configurations and Troubleshooting Guide for Linux                  2.4E Appendix E - Additional Configurations and Troubleshooting Guide for Mac                  2.4F Appendix F - Additional Configurations and Troubleshooting Guide for Windows                  2.3G Appendix T - Online Test Delivery System TDS User Guide                  2.3H Appendix H - TIDE User Guide                  2.3I Accessibility-and-Accommodations Guidance-1819                  2.3J Appendix T - Online Test Delivery System TDS User Guide                  2.3K Appendix G - Technology Requirements for Online Testing Module                  2.3L Appendix I - TIDE Webinar Module                  2.3M Appendix J - Understanding Indiana's Alternate Measure                  2.3N Appendix K - I AM Educator Brochure                  2.3O Appendix L - I AM Family Brochure</p> <p>2.3P Spring 2019 Pretest Workshop Registration                  2.3Q IDOE Spring 2019 Pretest Workshop                  2.3R I AM Test Administration Training and Certification Memo_Final                  2.3S Appendix R - I AM Training FAQs</p>	<p>The State has submitted evidence to meet the requirements of this Critical Element, with the exception of established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</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 [Indiana]**

	<p>2.3T Appendix S - Test Administrator Training PowerPoint                  2.3U FINAL Training Locations                  2.3V TA Certified 05.14.2019</p> <p>2.3W Get the Scoop I AM Fall 2018 Training Registration                  2.3X I AM Overview Webinar                  2.3Y I AM Content Webinar Elementary                  2.3Z I AM Content Webinar Secondary</p> <p>2.3AA Appendix N - I AM Test Coordinator's Manual TCM                  2.3AB Appendix M - I AM Test Administration Manual TAM                  2.3AC Appendix Q - I AM Practice Test User Guide</p> <p>2.3AD I AM Feedback Survey Results</p>	
<p><b>Section 2.3 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>• The State must provide evidence that it has established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration, or submit a plan and timeline for doing so.</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 [Indiana]**

**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>2.3A 2018-19 PROGRAM MANUAL_7.18.18_FINAL                  2.4A Testing Irregularity Report_2018-19                  2.4B Spring 2019 I AM and ISTEP Gr 10 FTA Part 2 Onsite Monitoring Notification Memo                  2.4C 2018-2019 Assessment Onsite Monitoring Checklist                  2.4D Adams Central Community Schools_Spring 2019 I AM Onsite Monitoring Checklist_5-8-19                  2.4E Bloomfield School District_Spring 2019 I AM Onsite Monitoring Checklist_4-29-19                  2.4F Warsaw Community Schools_Spring 2019 I AM Onsite Monitoring Checklist_5-8-19                  2.4G Corrective Action Plan                  2.4H Jefferson Corrective Action Plan Spring 2019                  2.4I I AM Case Summary Report for Peer Review                  2.4J Communication Log 2019 Spring Test Windows                  2.4K AIR-IDOE Test Window Action Log_I AM                  2.4L 2018-2019 Protocol for Reporting Investigating Alleged Breaches                  2.4M 2018-2019 Social Media or Unallowable Devices Concern Report Form                  2.4N 2018-2019 Testing Concerns and Security Violations Report</p>	<p>The evidence clearly demonstrates that the State adequately monitors the administration of its State alternate assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required .</p>		

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

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

**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>2.1A I AM Tech Reports Volumes 1 - 6</p> <p>2.5A ILEARN-I AM-IREAD-3-User-Roles-and-Responsibilities-102618</p> <p>2.5B (CTC) Test Security Integrity Training_2018-2019_final</p> <p>2.5C 2018-2019 CTC Test Security Training Completion</p> <p>2.5D 2018-2019 Code of Ethical Practices and Procedures</p> <p>2.5E 2018-2019 Indiana Testing Security and Integrity Agreement</p> <p>2.4K 2018-2019 Protocol for Reporting Investigating Alleged Breaches</p> <p>2.4M 2018-2019 Social Media or Unallowable Devices Concern Report Form</p> <p>2.4N 2018-2019 Testing Concerns and Security Violations Report</p>	<p>Test security is adequately covered by the evidence submitted.</p> <p>The State has a procedure in place to detect and report test irregularities, but does not have a procedure for remediation based on the irregularities.</p>
<b>Section 2.5 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>• The State must demonstrate that it has established a procedure for remediation based on assessment irregularities, or submit a plan and timeline to do so.</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 [Indiana]**

**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>Evidence for Test Security:</b>                  2.3A 2018-19 PROGRAM MANUAL_7.18.18_FINAL                  2.5B (CTC) Test Security Integrity Training_2018-2019_final                  2.5D 2018-2019 Code of Ethical Practices and Procedures</p> <p><b>Evidence for Student Security:</b>                  2.6A Student Test Number Description                  2.6B STN2020 Lookup v12.19.19</p>	<p>The State has procedures in place to protect the integrity of the test administration and scoring and to protect student level data. However, the evidence does not present a clear procedure for protecting personally identifiable data by defining a consistent minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.6 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State must submit evidence of a consistent minimum N count for score reporting, or provide a rationale for why the differences in the minimum reporting number across reports is appropriate.</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 [Indiana]**

**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>2.2X I AM Alignment Report 2.2Y edCount Proposal for I AM Assessment Services Support</p> <p>3.1A Appendix E Item Type Examples 3.1B ELA Grade 8 RIR 3.1C Mathematics Grade 10 RIR 3.1D Science Grade 4 RIR 3.1E ELA Paper Forms 35 3.1F ELA Paper Forms 68_10 3.1G Mathematics Paper Forms 35 3.1H Mathematics Paper Forms 68_10 3.1Ia Science G4 Paper Form 3.1Ib Science G6 Paper Form 3.1Ic Biology Paper Form 3.1J I AM Scoring Specifications_2018-2019</p>	<p>There are several pieces of evidence that would indicate that the state has documented validity. However, as these assessments are new, validity will need to be monitored and adjusted.</p> <p>It is unclear if these assessment items will meet the depth and breadth of the standards, especially in the area of science. The science standards are three-dimensional standards and seem to only be aligned through the lens of the science and engineering practices.</p> <p>Additionally, there are deficiencies noted in the area of range of knowledge. This is noted in the alignment study and raises further alignment questions that must be addressed.</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 [Indiana]

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 type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The State must submit evidence that the alternate assessment items meet the depth and breadth of the standards, especially in the area of science, or submit a plan and timeline for meeting this requirement.</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 [Indiana]**

**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>3.2A I AM COG LAB REPORT_FINAL 2.2X I AM Alignment Report 2.2Y edCount Proposal for I AM Assessment Services Support</p>	<p>The document includes evidence that the assessment items require demonstration and application of knowledge and skills in the areas of math, ELA, and science.</p> <p>There is incomplete evidence that the science assessment addresses the depth and breadth of the standards, in that items are said to address all three dimensions. However, the science items are only set up to report out on students use of the SEPs through the use of the DCIs (content) and not on the content itself. Also, the SEPs are not reported out individually but as part of a cluster of practices.</p> <p>It is also unclear how items that are covered in a grade band range from 6-8 are validated as students take the science assessment at 6<sup>th</sup> grade before they are expected to fully grasp the understanding of that standard.</p> <p>Evidence that the I AM taps the intended cognitive processes to a degree that establishes test validity was not found.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.2 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>• The State must submit evidence that the I AM taps the intended cognitive processes to a degree that establishes test validity.</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 [Indiana]**

**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>2.1A I AM Tech Reports Volumes 1 - 6</p> <p>3.3A V1 Appendix A. Operational Item Statistics</p> <p>3.3B V1 Appendix C. Test Characteristic Curves</p> <p>3.3C V1 Appendix D. Distribution of Scale Scores and Standard Deviations</p> <p>3.3D V1 Appendix E. Distribution of Reporting Category Scores</p> <p>3.3E V4 Appendix B. Conditional Standard Error of Measurement</p>	<p>It is unclear how validity is figured for the science assessment, which is based on science processes, while ELA and math are based on the entire scope of the content connectors.</p> <p>The evidence related to mathematics and ELA seem to support this critical element.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.3 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>• The State must submit evidence of validity based on internal structure for the science alternate assessment when that evidence becomes available.</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 [Indiana]**

**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>
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.	2.1A I AM Tech Reports Volumes 1 - 6	Evidence for this Critical Element was not found.
<b>Section 3.4 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State must submit evidence of how its alternate assessment results are associated with other variables.</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 [Indiana]

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>2.1A I AM Tech Reports Volumes 1 - 6            3.3A_V1_Appendix A. Operational Item Statistics            3.3B V1_Appendix C. Test Characteristic Curves            3.3C V1_Appendix D. Distribution of Scale Scores and Standard Deviations            3.3D V1_Appendix E. Distribution of Reporting Category Scores            2.2S V1_Appendix B. Field Test Summaries            3.3E V4_Appendix B. Conditional Standard Error of Measurement            4.1A V4 Appendix A. Reliability Coefficients            4.1B V4 Appendix B. Conditional Standard Error of Measurement</p>	<p>The evidence submitted seems to meet the requirements of this critical element.</p> <p>The Peers look forward to receiving reliability estimates based on operational items when those data become available.</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 [Indiana]**

<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 4.1 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> <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 [Indiana]**

**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>2.1A I AM Tech Reports Volumes 1 – 6                  2.2AA V2 Appendix F Item Review Checklist                  3.3A_V1_Appendix A. Operational Item Statistics</p>	<p>The evidence submitted appears to meet the requirements of this critical element.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.2 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>		

---

<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 [Indiana]**

**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>2.1W I AM ELA Grade 6 Updated Item Specifications                  2.1X I AM MA Grade 6 Item Specifications                  2.1Y I AM Sci Grade 6 Item Specifications                  2.1A I AM Tech Reports Volumes 1 – 6                  2.2X I AM Alignment Report                  3.3C V1 Appendix D. Distribution of Scale Scores and Standard Deviations                  3.3D V1 Appendix E. Distribution of Reporting Category Scores</p>	<p>The evidence provided for math and ELA appears to meet the requirements for this Critical Element. However, there seems to be a discrepancy when it comes to science. For example, ESS1.a.1 and LS4.a.1 are both said to evaluate student use of modeling and questioning whereas the standard statements indicated students should describe and investigate. This discrepancy in the development guidance calls into question whether the assessment provides adequate measure across the full performance continuum.</p>
<p><b>G, although 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>• The State must provide evidence that the science assessment provides adequate measure across the full performance continuum.</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 [Indiana]**

**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>2.1A I AM Tech Reports Volumes 1 – 6 4.4A Sample ISR Interpretive Guide</p>	<p>The evidence submitted seems to meet the requirements of this critical element for ELA and mathematics. However, the science assessment reports out on processes (practices) when it would seem the questions are based on content according to the sample questions provided. (See Document at 2.1Y.)</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>• The State must provide evidence that it 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 academic achievement standards for science.</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 [Indiana]**

**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>2.1A I AM Tech Reports Volumes 1 – 6                      3.3C V1 Appendix D. Distribution of Scale Scores and Standard Deviations                      3.3D V1 Appendix E. Distribution of Reporting Category Scores</p>	<p>As this assessment is new it is not clear if the assessment can yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years at this time.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.5 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>• The State must submit evidence, if and when it uses multiple forms, that the forms yield consistent score interpretations across school years.</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 [Indiana]**

**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><u>or a native language version of the academic content assessment</u></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>2.1A I AM Tech Reports Volumes 1 - 6 2.2X I AM Alignment Report</p>	<p>This appears to be a work in progress and needs to be addressed by the State in future reviews.</p> <p>Document 2.2X identifies a number of issues that the State must address to meet the requirements of this Critical Element.</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State must demonstrate the comparability of all versions of its 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 [Indiana]**

**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>2.1A I AM Tech Reports Volumes 1 - 6</p> <p>4.7A Indiana Alt I AM Technical Scope for A1 051619</p> <p>2.2X I AM Alignment Report</p> <p>2.3AD I AM Feedback Survey Results</p> <p>4.7B Indiana TAC Members</p> <p>4.7C Oct 9_10 2019 Indiana TAC notes_I AM</p> <p>4.7D I AM Test Design Issues_01102020_final</p>	<p>Bullet 1: We understand that IDOE is working to fully address this requirement, and we look forward to receiving the results of their work.</p> <p>Bullet 2: This requirement appears to be met by on-line postings.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.7 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>The State must submit evidence of its ongoing assessment system maintenance, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system, when such evidence becomes available</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 [Indiana]**

**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>1.4A Indiana Codes.docx.pdf</p> <p>1.3C Indiana Participation Guidance 1.3D Indiana Alternate Assessment Participant Guidance FAQ 1.3E Indiana Alternate Assessment Participation Decision Flowchart</p> <p>5.1A Accessibility Guide and Toolkit Final 5.1B Indiana IIEP Walkthrough for TORs 5.1C Indiana IIEP Walkthrough for District Administrators 5.1D Accommodations for State Testing Memo 5.1E ILEARN and I AM Accessibility memo 5.1F ILEARN and IAM Calculator Policy Update memo 2.3H Accessibility-and-Accommodations Guidance-1819</p> <p>5.1G Data Layout Grid 5.1H TA2019 Data Layout (v02.28.2019) 5.1I Accommodations Audit Protocol 5.1J Accommodation Memo 5.1K Accommodations Audit Email 5.1L TIPPECANOE SCHOOL CORP Accommodations Audit Response #7685</p>	<p>Information in 5.1A Accessibility Guide and Toolkit Final offers graduation requirements and waiver information that must be made clear to parents through means other than only links on a website.</p> <p>The Peers note the State’s comment that, beginning with the 2019-2020, information will also be pulled from the Individual Learning Profile (ILP), a new system to be used by Indiana educators for ELP students.</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 [Indiana]**

<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>		

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 [Indiana]**

<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 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>• The State must submit a plan and timeline for making information available to parents through means in addition to links in a web site.</li> </ul>		

<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 [Indiana]**

**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>2.3H Accessibility-and-Accommodations Guidance-1819                      5.1A Accessibility Guide and Toolkit Final                       5.2A IDOE EL Guidebook                      5.2B Making Decisions on an EL Individual Student Basis</p>	<p>The evidence provided appears to meet this requirement.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.2 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 [Indiana]**

**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><u>academic achievement</u></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>2.1A ILEARN Technical Report                  2.3H Accessibility-and-Accommodations Guidance-1819                  5.1A Accessibility Guide and Toolkit Final                  5.1D Accommodations for State Testing Memo                  5.1E ILEARN and I AM Accessibility memo                  5.1F ILEARN and IAM Calculator Policy Update memo                  2.3H Accessibility-and-Accommodations Guidance-1819</p> <p>5.3A I AM Accessibility Framework                  5.3B Non-Standard Assessment Accommodation Request</p>	<p>The evidence appears to meet this requirement.</p> <p>The Peers acknowledge that allowances are made for Braille. However even with the embossed materials it does not state whether human assistance is allowed to help with descriptors of items such as maps and charts.</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 [Indiana]**

<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>
students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.		
<b>Section 5.3 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> <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 [Indiana]**

**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>1.4B 2018-19 Program Manual                  2.3H Accessibility-and-Accommodations Guidance-1819                  2.4A Testing Irregularity Report_2018-19                  2.4C 2018-2019 Assessment Onsite Monitoring Checklist                  2.4I I AM Case Summary Report for Peer Review                  2.4J Communication Log 2019 Spring Test Windows                  2.4K AIR-IDOE Test Window Action Log_I AM                  2.4M 2018-2019 Social Media or Unallowable Devices Concern Report Form                  2.4N 2018-2019 Testing Concerns and Security Violations Report                  2.5D 2018-2019 Code of Ethical Practices and Procedures                  2.5E 2018-2019 Indiana Testing Security and Integrity Agreement                  5.1A Accessibility Guide and Toolkit Final</p> <p>5.4A 1% cap memo to CTCs.11.25.19                  5.4B 2018-19 Justifications                  5.4C Alternate Assessment Participation Training 2019-2020</p>	<p>Documents include evidence that State’s policies are consistent and appropriate for addressing students with special needs including IEP, 504, and EL populations. There is also evidence provided that there is a procedure in place to address students that may need special accommodations that do not fall into these categories.</p> <p>1.4B 2018-19 Program Manual Section 6 provides evidence that the all students will have the opportunity to engage in practice items to ensure familiarity with the tools and accommodations within the testing format. Section 6 also stated that some accommodation features would be available during practice sessions, however, did not give any detail to what accommodations would or would not be available during the practice. To ensure all students are able to perform the necessary functions of the assessment, it should be made clear what accommodation features are not available during practice.</p> <p>Section 6 item 6 states, ‘The Test Coordinator is responsible for making sure Test Examiners are aware of all test accommodations a student will need prior to a test session and for ensuring that Test Examiners receive training to provide appropriate accommodations.’ Although this document provides a statement to ensure that test examiners are familiar with the accommodations, it should also be important to note that examiners should be familiar with the students especially in situations where the student needs to have more regular interactions. Such situations might include: scribe, human reader, interpreter, or assistance for visually impaired or Deaf and hard of hearing.</p> <p>Following the administration of the alternate assessment, Indiana reviews data associated to ensure the 1% cap is</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 [Indiana]**

<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>
		maintained. 5.4A-5.4C includes information regarding this review and follow up.
<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State must submit evidence that accommodations are provided on practice tests and operational tests to the extent required by the IEP or 504.</li> <li>• The State must demonstrate that the tests are administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> <li>• The State must demonstrate that tests are monitored for administration of the alternate assessment.</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 [Indiana]**

**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>6.1A I AM Policy PLD Meeting Minutes_080118          6.1B Standard Setting ILEARN Executive Summary          6.1C ILEARN Cut Score Memo          6.1D SBOE Minutes July 25 2019</p>	<p>The evidence submitted by the State seems to meet the requirements of this critical element.</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 [Indiana]**

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 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 [Indiana]**

**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>6.2A I AM Technical Report 2018-2019                      6.2A Appendix A - Standard Setting Panelists                      6.2B Appendix E - Standard Setting Educator Panel - Readiness Form</p>	<p>The evidence submitted by the State seems to meet the requirements of this critical element. However, the State should work to increase the diversity and representation of an appropriate range of expertise when convening future panels.</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> <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 [Indiana]**

**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>6.2A V6_I AM Technical Report 2018-2019 6.2B Appendix A - Standard Setting Panelists</p> <p>6.3A I AM Policy PLD PPT 6.3B I AM Policy PLD Meeting Participants 6.3C I AM Policy PLDs State Board Memo 6.3D I AM PLD LARGE GROUP PPT 6.3E I AM PLD BREAKOUT PPT 6.3F I AM PLDs Groups and Sign In 6.3G I AM Range PLDs State Board Memo 6.3H I AM Final PLDs_For SBOE Approval</p>	<p>The evidence submitted by the State seems to meet the requirements for this critical element. The Peers note, with some concern, that many of the content connectors are very similar to the general education standards. It would seem that these connections are not rewritten to reflect the population for which they are intended, as general education standard have only been edited to omit some wording. Examples include:</p> <p>Content Connector     <b>6.RL.3.1.a.1:</b> Analyze how a particular sentence, chapter, scene, or stanza fits into the overall structure of a work of literature.</p> <p>IAS Standard         <b>6.RL.3.1:</b> Analyze how a particular sentence, chapter, scene, or stanza fits into the overall structure of a work of literature and contributes to the development of the theme, characterization, setting, or plot.</p> <p>Content Connector     <b>6.LS.4.a.1:</b> Investigate how changes in biotic and abiotic components in a given habitat can be beneficial or detrimental to native plants and animals.</p> <p>IAS Standard         <b>6.LS.4:</b> Investigate and use data to explain how changes in biotic and abiotic components in a given habitat can be beneficial or detrimental to native plants and animals.</p> <p>Content Connector     <b>6.ESS.1.a.1:</b> Describe the role of gravity and inertia in maintaining the regular and predictable motion of celestial bodies.</p> <p>IAS Standard         <b>6.ESS.1:</b> Describe the role of gravity and inertia in maintaining the regular and predictable motion of celestial bodies.</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 [Indiana]**

<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.		As the alternate assessment is meant to assess students with the most severe cognitive disabilities (a very small percent of the student population who have been identified as needed special education services), there should be evidence that these standards are appropriately adjusted for this student population.
<b>Section 6.3 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> <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 [Indiana]**

**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>6.4A 2018-2019 Timeline of Important Events          6.4B I AM ISR          6.4C IN IAM ISR Guide_03132019          6.4D Webinar 1 Registration Teachers          6.4E Webinar 3 Registration Administrators          6.4F Interpreting and Responding to Summative Scores for Teachers of Students with Significant Needs          6.4G Interpreting and Responding to Summative Scores for the Classroom Teacher Presentation          6.4H Interpreting and Responding to Summative Scores for School and Corporation Administrators Presentation          6.4I Final Attendance Report Webinar 1 Topic 2_6-11-19 Teachers Sig Needs          6.4J Final Attendance Report Webinar 2 Topic 1_6-5-19 Teachers          6.4K Final Attendance Report Webinar 1 Topic 3_6-7-19 Administrators          6.4L CARS Action Plan for Classroom Teachers          6.4M Resource Web Links for Interpreting and Responding to Summative Data for Teachers of Students with Significant Needs          6.4N Resources and References for Webinar Interpreting and Responding to Summative Scores for Teachers of Students with Significant Needs          6.4O Online Reporting System User Guide          6.4P Online Reporting System (ORS) Webinar Module          6.4Q Indiana I AM Parent Brochure_Updated          6.4R Indiana I AM Parent Brochure_Spanish</p>	<p>The evidence provided appears to meet this requirement.</p> <p>The documents listed below provide evidence that reports are sent out to stakeholders and that explanation of scores and reporting are available.</p> <p>IDOE provided a series of webinars for teachers, teachers of students with significant disabilities, and school administrators to best understand summative assessments.</p> <p>Additional guidance to stakeholders is posted on the IDOE Website:  <a href="#">I AM Sample Items and Scoring</a></p> <p>The Online Reporting System is also available for stakeholders to obtain student score information.</p> <p>Parent brochures are utilized to assist in parent understanding of the assessment.</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 [Indiana]**

<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>○ 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>		

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 [Indiana]**

<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 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p data-bbox="191 293 667 326"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p data-bbox="191 354 976 386"><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul data-bbox="247 386 829 418" 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 [Indiana]**

**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 [Indiana]**

<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>		
<p><b>Section 7.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 [Indiana]**

**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 [Indiana]

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 [Indiana]**

**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 [Indiana]**

<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.

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

## July-August 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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)

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 ..... 16**  
**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security..... 17**  
**Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 19**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....20**  
**Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content20**  
**Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes ..... 22**  
**Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 23**  
**Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables..... 24**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER .....25**  
**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability ..... 25**  
**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility ..... 27**  
**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum ..... 28**  
**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 29**  
**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 30**  
**Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment..... 31**  
**Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance ..... 32**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS .....33**  
**Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 33**  
**Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments..... 36**  
**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations ..... 37**  
**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.



..... 39

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .....41**

**Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students ..... 41**  
**Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting ..... 43**  
**Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards ..... 44**  
**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting ..... 46**

**SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS..49**

**Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments ..... 49**  
**Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments ..... 51**  
**Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments ..... 53**

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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

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

**Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of English Language Proficiency 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>                      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>Met in prior peer review</p>
<p><b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>x<u>  </u> No additional evidence is required; met in prior peer review.</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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**Critical Element 1.2 – Coherent and Progressive ELP Standards that Correspond to the State’s 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 the State’s ELP standards:</u></b> • Evidence that the ELP standards contain language proficiency expectations that reflect the language needed for English learners (ELs) to acquire and demonstrate their achievement of the knowledge and skills identified in the State’s academic content standards appropriate to each grade-level/grade-band.</p>	<p><i>1.2-3 2012 Amplification of The English Language Development Standards</i></p> <p><i>1.2-4 Alignment Study between the Common Core State Standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics and the WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards, 2007 Edition, PreKindergarten through Grade 12</i></p> <p><i>1.2-5 K–12 English Language Development Standards Validation 2016</i></p> <p><b>r1.2-1</b> Alignment Between the Kentucky Core Content for Assessment and the WIDA Consortium English Language Proficiency Standards</p> <p><b>r1.2-2</b> Alignment Analysis of Key Practice Language Functions from the Framework for English Language Proficiency Development Standards corresponding to the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Mathematics and the WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards, 2007 and 2012 Edition, PreKindergarten through Grade 12; Correspondence Analysis of Florida state Grade 12 Calculus Standards and WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards</p> <p><b>r.1.2-3</b> WIDA Can Do Descriptors, Key Uses Edition, Grades 4-5</p> <p><b>r.1.2-4</b> Peer Review of IN WIDA Standards RFQ</p> <p><b>r1.2-5</b> WIDA Timeline for Revisions to ELP Standards</p>	<p>For the State’s ELP standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the ELP standards contain language proficiency expectations that reflect the language needed for English learners (ELs) to acquire and demonstrate their achievement of the knowledge and skills identified in the State’s academic content standards appropriate to each grade-level/grade-band is included.</li> </ul> <p>The Peers note that the State has recently completed (or, allowing for COVID-related interruptions, is in the process of completing) an alignment study between WIDA Standards and the Indiana Academic Standards. The State must submit the report, their interpretation of its findings, and a plan and timeline for addressing any issues that are raised.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ 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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

<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><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>	<p>An alignment study between WIDA Standards and the Indiana Academic Standards must be submitted by the State with the interpretation of its findings, and a plan and timeline for addressing any issues that are raised.</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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**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>r1.3-1 Advancing ALTELLA: Alternate Assessment Redesign</p>	<p>Alternate ACCESS for ELLs currently does not have a Kindergarten form. In collaboration with the State of Minnesota, WIDA states submitted a US Department of Education Competitive Assessment Grant to develop a Kindergarten form of Alternate ACCESS, and in September 2019, Minnesota and WIDA states received notification that this proposal was funded.</p> <p>This is insufficient to meet this critical element. Indiana needs to provide kindergarten students an alternate ELP assessment.</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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

<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>		
<p><b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement</b></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 the alternate ELP assessment is available in kindergarten.                 </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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**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>See critical element 1.3.</p>	<p>Alternate ACCESS for ELLs currently does not have a Kindergarten form. In collaboration with the State of Minnesota, WIDA states submitted a US Department of Education Competitive Assessment Grant to develop a Kindergarten form of Alternate ACCESS, and in September 2019, Minnesota and WIDA states received notification that this proposal was funded.</p> <p>This is insufficient to meet this critical element. Indiana needs to provide kindergarten students an alternate ELP assessment, so that it can demonstrate that all ELs in kindergarten, including ELs with significant cognitive disabilities participate in the ELP assessment..</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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

<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><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the alternate ELP assessment is available in kindergarten.</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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging ELP 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>NA</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable as the state adopted their ELP standards prior to December 2015.</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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**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>1.4-1</b> Chapter 6 WIDA Program</p> <p><b>2.1-1</b> ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 Spring 2017 Interpretive Guide for Score Reports</p> <p><b>2.1-2</b> Annual Technical Report for ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 Online English Language Proficiency Test, Series 401, 2016–2017 Administration</p> <p><b>2.1-3</b> Alternate ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 Spring 2017 Interpretive Guide for Score Reports</p> <p><b>2.1-4</b> Annual Technical Report for ALTERNATE ACCESS for ELLs® English Language Proficiency Test, Series 101, 2012–2013 Administration</p> <p><b>2.2-8</b> Alternate ACCESS Form 100 Test Specifications</p> <p><b>r2.1-1</b> Summary of ACCESS 2.0 Online Field Testing for Series 403 Listening and Reading</p> <p><b>r2.1-2</b> Folder Selection Graphs Listening 501</p> <p><b>r2.1-3</b> Folder Selection Graphs Reading 501</p> <p><b>r2.1-4</b> ACCESS for ELLs Series 402 Online Reading&amp;Listening Item Difficulty Visualizations</p> <p><b>r2.1-5</b> ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Assessment Proficiency Level Scores Standard Setting Project Report</p> <p><b>r2.1-6</b> 2018-19 WIDA Assessment Guidance</p>	<p>For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation that both assessments are aligned to the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Statement of the purposes and intended uses of results.</li> <li>o Test blueprints.</li> <li>o Processes to ensure that the ELP assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s ELP standards and reflects appropriate inclusion of the range of complexity found in the standards (e.g., detail about the routing rules, detail of the item selection process for paper forms to ensure it adheres to the blueprint).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>For ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation that the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the multi-stage adaptive administrations.</li> <li>• Documentation that proficiency determinations are made with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled.</li> </ul> <p>The evidence submitted seems to meet the requirements for this critical element.</p> <p><b>DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.</b></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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

<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>		
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or  DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.</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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**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>2.2-2</b> The ASSETS Consortium English Language Proficiency Assessment for Grades 1-12</p> <p><b>2.2-3</b> ACCESS Test Development Cycle</p> <p><b>2.2-11</b> Item Writing Handbook for ACCESS for ELLs 2.0® Listening and Reading Assessments</p> <p><b>r2.2-1</b> ACCESS for ELLs® Test Development Cycle</p> <p><b>r2.2-2</b> WIDA-ACCESS Test Development Team</p>	<p>Evidence provided for ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items (e.g., timeline of development, qualifications of item writers, item-writing training, item review processes and reviewer qualifications, field test processes for each domain, and technical advisory committee review).</li> </ul> <p>Evidence provided for the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess ELP (e.g., involvement of experts with knowledge of ELs with significant cognitive disabilities)</li> </ul> <p>The evidence submitted seems to meet the requirements for this critical element.</p> <p><b>DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.</b></p>
<b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><b>DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.</b></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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**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>2.3-1</b> ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 2016-2017 Test Administrator Manual</p> <p><b>2.3-7</b> 2018-2019 Test Policy Handbook for State Education Agencies</p> <p><b>r2.3-1</b> ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Overview for Test Coordinators</p> <p><b>r2.3-2</b> Technology User Guide</p>	<p>For ACCESS: • Evidence is needed of established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration</p> <p>Document r2.3-2 identifies steps that be taken to minimize the likelihood of technology issues during test administration and r2.3-1 provides training for on-line administration but evidence of how technology challenges that do occur should be addressed was not found.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>X</b> 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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)

- The State submit a plan and timeline for developing and disseminating contingency plans, or evidence documenting that this has already been done.

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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**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>
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.		Met in prior peer review
<b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</b>		
_x_ No additional evidence is required; met in prior peer review.		

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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**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>r2.5-1</b> Corrective Action Plan</p> <p>2.3-7 2018-2019 Test Policy Handbook for State Education Agencies</p> <p><b>r2.5-2</b> IDOE Pretest Workshop Slides</p>	<p>For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of remediation following any test security incidents.</li> <li>• Evidence of the investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities (e.g., forensic analysis and plans to address concerns).</li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of policies and procedures that prevent 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.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Specifically, evidence for the Alternate ACCESS of policies and procedures to protect the integrity of the test given that the test form is unchanged for the past several years.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>According to the documents irregularities in testing are documented and reported to IDOE but needs to include a plan for how it responds to test irregularities.</p> <p>According to the notes provided, it would also seem the State is partnering with Caveon Test Security to incorporate a process for managing test security and remediation. Although a plan is in place to implement a more robust security protocol in the future, one does not seem to be in place at this time.</p>
<b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State must submit evidence of how it responds to testing irregularities</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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)

- The State must submit evidence as to how the security of the Alternate ACCESS is maintained.

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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**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>r2.6-1</b> WIDA AMS Security and Confidentiality Agreement</p> <p><b>r2.6-2</b> Student Test Number Description</p> <p><b>r2.6-3</b> 2018-2019 Code of Ethical Practices and Procedures</p>	<p>For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies and procedures to protect the integrity of test-related data in test administration (e.g., how data are protected by all parties, including during handoffs).</li> <li>• Policies and procedures to maintain secure student-level data that protect student privacy and confidentiality (e.g., guidelines for districts and schools).</li> </ul> <p>The evidence submitted seems to meet this critical element</p> <p>Document <b>r2.6-3</b> 2018-2019 Code of Ethical Practices and Procedures provides evidence that procedures to maintain security at all levels are addressed.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**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><i>r.1.2-4 Peer Review of IN WIDA Standards RFQ</i></p> <p><b>r3.1-1</b> Conducting a series of alignment studies</p>	<p>For ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s ELP assessment and the ELP standards the assessment is designed to measure in terms of language knowledge and skills and the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards across all proficiency levels, domains, and modalities identified therein.</li> <li>• Documentation of alignment between the State’s ELP standards and the language demands implied by, or explicitly stated in, the State’s academic content standards.</li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of adequate linkage to the State’s ELP standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and that the breadth of content and linguistic complexity determined in test design is appropriate for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul> <p>The studies proposed in Document r3.1-1 appear to largely, and possibly completely, meet this requirement. The State must submit a description of what progress has been made since the memo proposing the studies was written, and a plan and timeline for completing any unfinished elements.</p> <p>Overlaying the entirety of Section 3 is the Peers concern about the meaning of validity when there are discrepancies with the language/vocabulary used within the assessment. Although this is not necessarily a concern to be addressed in Section 3, it definitely is an issue that the State must resolve.</p> <p><b>DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the</b></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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)

and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.		Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.
<b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The State must submit a description of what progress has been made since the memo proposing a series of alignment studies was written, and a plan and timeline for completing any unfinished elements.</li></ul> <p>DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.</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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**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><i>2.1-2 Annual Technical Report for ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 Online English Language Proficiency Test, Series 401, 2016–2017 Administration</i></p> <p><i>r2.2-1 ACCESS for ELLs® Test Development Cycle</i></p> <p><i>r2.2-2 WIDA-ACCESS Test Development Team</i></p>	<p>For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended language processes appropriate for each grade level/grade-band as represented in the State’s ELP standards.</li> </ul> <p>It would seem that the documents provided indicated that there is adequate validity evidence that the assessments tap the intended processes appropriated for each grade level. However, it is unclear as how validity is reached if there are discrepancies with the language/vocabulary used within the assessment.</p> <p>Evidence for Alternate ACCESS was not found.  <b>DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.</b></p>
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State must submit evidence that the Alternate ACCESS measures the intended cognitive processes.</li> </ul> <p><b>DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.</b></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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**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>3.1-10</b> <i>Exploring Domain-General and Domain-Specific Linguistic Knowledge in the Assessment of Academic English Language Proficiency</i></p> <p><b>3.3-1</b> <i>ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Construct Validity Study</i></p> <p><b>6.2-1</b> <i>WIDA Consortium Report on 2016-2018 Boxplot Analyses Results</i></p>	<p>For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of the assessments are consistent with the subdomain structures of the State’s ELP standards (e.g., an explanation of how the included statistical analyses relate to the validity framework for the assessments).</li> </ul> <p>The documents provide evidence that scoring, and reporting structures are consistent for the ACCESS test only. The Peers note that there is currently being a study conducted on the Alternate ACCESS.</p> <p><b>DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.</b></p>
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State must submit a plan and timeline for completion of the current study, as well as a timeline for reporting findings and actions taken.</li> </ul> <p><b>DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.</b></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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**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><i>3.4-8 The Bridge Study between Tests of English Language Proficiency and ACCESS for ELLs®</i></p> <p><i>3.4-9 Intersections: Applied Linguistics as a Meeting Place</i></p>	<p>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</li> </ul> <p>Document 3.4-8 pp6-23 and 3.4-9, pp 209-233 appear to meet this requirement for ACCESS. Evidence for Alternate ACCESS was not found.</p> <p><b>DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.</b></p>
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s Alternate ACCESS scores are related as expected with other variables.</li> </ul> <p><b>DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.</b></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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER**

**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability**

<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 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><i>2.1-2 Annual Technical Report for ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 Online English Language Proficiency Test, Series 401, 2016–2017 Administration</i></p> <p><i>2.1-4 Annual Technical Report for ALTERNATE ACCESS for ELLs® English Language Proficiency Test, Series 103, 2015–2016 Administration</i></p> <p><i>2.1-5 Annual Technical Report for ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 Paper English Language Proficiency Test, Series 401, 2016–2017 Administration</i></p> <p><b>r4.1-1</b> Annual Technical Report for ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 Online English Language Proficiency Test, Series 402, 2017–2018 Administration</p>	<p>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of test reliability, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Reliability by subgroups;</li> <li>o 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>o Evidence that reliability statistics are used to inform ongoing maintenance and development. For ACCESS:</li> </ul> </li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of an EL’s ELP. For the Alternate ACCESS:</li> <li>• Evidence of reliability, including test information functions for overall composite scores</li> </ul> <p>R4.1.1 The Annual Technical Report for ACCESS for ELs provides the evidence needed to meet this critical element.</p> <p>The Peers acknowledge that WIDA has already been in communication with the Center for Applied Linguistics to modify the next editions of the annual technical reports [<b>documents 2.1-2, 2.1-4, and 2.1-5</b>] to add subgroup reliabilities.</p> <p>Further, WIDA will add a chapter of TIFs for all composite domains in the Alternate ACCESS annual technical report. The WIDA content and psychometrics teams are currently working to increase the precision of test forms across all proficiency levels and have identified a need for more items targeting proficiency levels 5 and 6.</p> <p><b>DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review</b></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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

<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>
		for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.
<b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or <b>DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.</b>		

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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**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><i>2.1-4 Annual Technical Report for ALTERNATE ACCESS for ELLs® English Language Proficiency Test, Series 103, 2015–2016 Administration</i></p> <p><i>2.2-16 Accessibility and Accommodations Supplement</i></p> <p><i>2.3-1 ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 2016-2017 Test Administrator Manual</i></p> <p><b>r4.2-1</b> Bias Review Checklist</p> <p><b>r4.2-2</b> Bias &amp; Sensitivity Review Training</p>	<p>For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in design, development, and analysis (e.g., the implementation of universal design principles, to the extent practicable, during item development and review, and additional differential item functioning analyses to include more student subgroups).</li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</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 EL students and fair across student groups, including ELs with disabilities, in their design, development, and analysis, guidance and instructions on appropriate instructional supports that can be used during the assessment, particularly for Braille and alternate modes of communication</li> </ul> <p>The State notes that a DIF study regarding ACCESS is currently underway or may by this time have already been completed. The cited evidence appears to meet the requirements of the remaining requirements.</p> <p><b>DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.</b></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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**Section 4.2 Summary Statement**

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- The State must submit the results of its DIF study once it is complete.

DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA's ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.

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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**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>For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for ELP assessments, including performance for EL students with high and low levels of ELP.</li> </ul> <p>The State noted in Critical Element 4.1 that WIDA is working to increase the precision of the performance estimates generate by ACCESS. Evidence addressing the same concerns for Alternate ACCESS was not found.</p> <p><b>DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.</b></p>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State must submit evidence from WIDA concerning the precision of the ACCESS performance estimates when it is available.</li> <li>• The State must address this Critical Element for Alternate ACCESS.</li> </ul> <p><b>DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**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>2.3-1</b> <i>ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 2016-2017 Test Administrator Manual</i></p> <p><b>r4.4-1</b> Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Test Administration Tutorial</p> <p><b>r4.4-2</b> Alternate ACCESS for ELLs™ Writing Scoring Guide</p> <p><b>r4.4-3</b> Maintaining Rater Reliability in Scoring ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Paper Speaking Test</p> <p><b>r4.4-4</b> 2019-2020 WIDA Guidance</p>	<p>For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that if an EL has a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains/components (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) because there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected domain(s)/component(s), the State ensures that the student is assessed in the remaining domain(s)/component(s) in which it is possible to assess the student, including a description of how this will occur.</li> </ul> <p>For ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of 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 ELP standards (e.g., evidence that the scoring of speaking items on the paper form of the test is monitored.)</li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the implementation of standardized scoring procedures and protocols (e.g., definitions of key terms and test administration and scoring procedures).</li> </ul> <p>There is evidence that Els that also receive special education, or 504 services will receive accommodations as indicated on their IEP or 504 plan according to documentation. Notes attached also state: WIDA assessments allow students with disabilities to take the individual domain tests that are pertinent to their capabilities to meaningfully engage with the assessment. WIDA provides guidance on exempting students from individual domains and interpreting test scores in such scenarios, but individual states set and apply testing policies.</p> <p>The State notes that, following TAC recommendations, a formal plan will be developed to ensure that EL students</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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

		<p>who cannot engage in all domains are tested in those in which they can engage. The State must provide evidence that this plan has been developed and adopted for ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS</p> <p>When students take Alternate ACCESS, all domains (Listening, Reading, Writing, and Speaking) are scored locally by test administrators in individual Student Response Booklets. Test administrators must prepare for the scoring of each of the sections by following guidance provided in the annually published <i>Test Administrator Manual</i>. [document 2.3-1]</p> <p>Evidence of cross-year comparability for Alternate ACCESS was not found.</p> <p><b>DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.</b></p>
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State must submit a plan and timeline for ensuring that EL students who cannot engage in all domains are tested in those in which they can engage</li> <li>• The State must submit evidence for the cross-year comparability of Alternate ACCESS administrations.</li> </ul> <p><b>DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.</b></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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**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><i>2.1-2 Annual Technical Report for ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 Online English Language Proficiency Test, Series 401, 2016–2017 Administration</i></p> <p><i>2.1-5 Annual Technical Report for ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 Paper English Language Proficiency Test, Series 401, 2016–2017 Administration</i></p> <p><b>r4.5-1</b> Alternate ACCESS CDF Curves</p>	<p>.</p> <p>For ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all forms adequately represent the State’s ELP standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across settings, particularly for the listening domain (e.g., rationales for why equating is not done for the paper versions of the reading and listening domains and rationales for the use of the anchor item sets).</li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all forms adequately represent the State’s ELP standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across settings (e.g., evidence that using the same test items every year does not impact validity).</li> </ul> <p>The documents provide some evidence that all forms represented were studied, however there did not seem to be evidence presented that looked at the results of all the assessments within and across settings.</p> <p>Notes stated that Listening and Reading domains were consistent and comparable, for the pencil and paper version only. However it is unclear as to how the online version of the Listening domain test was equated with the paper and pencil version</p> <p>The Peers acknowledge the State’s position as to why the Alternate ACCESS 400 series CDF curve differs from the other two curves. We would be interested in knowing what other hypotheses the State considered and why they were not accepted.</p> <p><b>DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the</b></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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)

		Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.
<b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The State must submit evidence of comparability of the listening assessment formats.</li></ul> DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA's ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.		

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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**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><u>or a native language version of the academic content assessment</u></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>No additional information required  <b>DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.</b></p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required or  <b>DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.</b></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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**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>1.2-4 Alignment Study between the Common Core State Standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics and the WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards, 2007 Edition, PreKindergarten through Grade 12</p> <p>R1.3-1 Advancing ALTELLA: Alternate Assessment Redesign</p>	<p>For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.</li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system.</li> </ul> <p>Links were provided showing that testing information was posted on the States website. Other notes included steps the State is taking to ensure a system for monitoring, maintaining and improving the quality of the assessment system is in place.</p> <p>The Peers recognize the disruption caused by COVID in so many areas, and look forward to receiving the updated WIDA technical report when it is available. We also recognize that unforeseeable events may have severely disrupted plans and timelines (not to mention everything else), and look forward to the State providing evidence as soon as possible.</p>
<b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State must submit the WIDA Technical Report when it becomes available.</li> <li>The State must provide evidence of technical quality for the Alternate ACCESS when available.</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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**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><i>2.2-16 Accessibility and Accommodations Supplement</i></p>	<p>For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of policies that require the inclusion of an EL with a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains (i.e., ensuring that the student will be assessed based on the remaining components in which it is possible to assess the student).</li> </ul> <p>Evidence for this Critical Element needs to be submitted by the State when it becomes available.</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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

<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>		

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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

<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"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State must submit evidence of how it provides for the inclusion of students with disabilities, when such evidence becomes available.</li> </ul>		

<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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**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>N/A</p>
<p><b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**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>2.1-4</b> <i>Annual Technical Report for ALTERNATE ACCESS for ELLs® English Language Proficiency Test, Series 103, 2015–2016 Administration</i></p> <p><b>2.2-16</b> <i>Accessibility and Accommodations Supplement</i></p> <p><b>2.2-17</b> <i>The WIDA Accessibility and Accommodations Framework</i></p> <p><b>2.3-1</b> <i>ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 2016-2017 Test Administrator Manual</i></p> <p><b>5.3-7</b> <i>ACCESS FOR ELLs 2.0® Unique Accommodations Request Form</i></p> <p><b>r5.3-1</b> ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Online Sample Items for the Public</p> <p><b>r5.3-2</b> CCSSO Accessibility Manual: How to Select, Administer, and Evaluate Use of Accessibility Supports for Instruction and Assessment of All Students</p> <p><b>r5.3-3</b> Non-Standard Assessment Accommodation Request</p> <p><b>r5.3-4</b> 2018-2019 Accessibility and Accommodations Guidance</p>	<p>For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the provided accommodations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments.</li> <li>o Do not alter the construct being assessed.</li> <li>o 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> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs</li> <li>• Evidence that accommodations do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment.</li> </ul> <p>There is evidence provided that ELs are offered appropriated accommodations which include both the UDL features and additions accommodations if necessary. There is also evidence that the State is continuing to monitor this critical element in order to make improvements.</p> <p>The Peers recognize and strongly encourage the State and WIDA in their current efforts to consider these issues not from a process framework, but as empirical questions.</p> <p><b>DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.</b></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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

<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>
students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.		
<b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State must submit a plan and timeline for making modifications to accommodations policies and procedures, along with evidence of the impact of implementing those changes.</li> </ul> <p>DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.</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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**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>Met in prior peer review.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required; met in prior peer review</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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

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

**Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of ELP 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>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the State has developed alternate ELP achievement standards, evidence that it has adopted them only for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who cannot participate in the regular ELP assessment even with appropriate accommodations.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence for this Critical Element was not found.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>    </u> <u>  </u>X_ 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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

<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>The State must submit evidence that academic achievement standards have been adopted and apply to all students, or submit a plan and timeline for doing so.</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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**Critical Element 6.2 – ELP 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>6.1-3 Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Standard Setting Study: Technical Brief</b></p>	<p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State used a technically sound method and process for setting ELP achievement standards, such that cut scores are developed for every grade/grade band, content domain/language domain, and/or composite for which proficiency-level scores are reported.</li> </ul> <p>There is evidence provided within the document that the State used a technically sound method and process for setting ELP achievement standards, such that cut scores are developed for every grade/grade band, content domain/language domain, and/or composite for which proficiency-level scores are reported for students taking ACCESS or the alternate ACCESS assessment.</p> <p>DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required or  DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.</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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned ELP 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>r3.1-1 <i>Conducting a series of alignment studies</i></p>	<p>For ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that ELP assessment results are expressed in terms that are clearly aligned with the State’s ELP standards and its ELP performance level descriptors.</li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the State has developed alternate ELP achievement standards, evidence that the alternate ELP achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level/grade-band ELP standards and reflect professional judgment of the highest ELP achievement standards possible for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence for this critical element was not found. The Peers look forward to receiving this information when it is available.</p> <p><b>DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.</b></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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

<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><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State must submit evidence that its academic achievement standards are aligned with postsecondary education entrance requirements.</li> </ul> <p>DEPARTMENT NOTE: INDIANA’s ELP submission is subject to a common peer review for all WIDA states, which was held in the Winter of 2021. Please see the attached WIDA peer review notes.</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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

**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>6.4-2 ALTERNATE ACCESS for ELLs SPRING 2018</b> <i>Interpretive Guide for Score Reports Grades 1-12</i></p>	<p>For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State reports to the public its assessment results on ELP for all ELs including the number and percentage of ELs attaining ELP.</li> <li>Evidence that the State provides coherent and timely information about each student’s attainment of the State’s ELP standards to parents that 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>Evidence that student reports are, upon request by an individual with a disability, provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that performance level descriptors are included on student score reports.</li> </ul> <p>Document 6.4-2 pp. 14-28 and 32-34 appear to meet this requirement for both ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS with regard to coherence and timeliness. Evidence for all remaining requested items was not found, We understand that some of the responses are in process and look forward to receiving them upon completion of these studies.</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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

<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>○ 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>		

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 Indiana ELP Assessment (WIDA ACCESS)**

<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 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State must submit evidence that all aspects of this Critical Element have been met, or submit a plan and timeline for meeting them.</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.

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

## January-March 2021 State ELP 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 WIDA

Contents

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

**Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of ELP Standards for All English Learners ..... 4**

**Critical Element 1.2 – Coherent and Progressive ELP Standards that Correspond to the State’s Academic Content Standards ..... 5**

**Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments..... 8**

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

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

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

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

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development ..... 15**

**Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration..... 18**

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration ..... 21**

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security..... 22**

**Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 25**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....27**

**Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content27**

**Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Linguistic Processes..... 31**

**Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 33**

**Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables..... 35**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER .....37**

**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability ..... 37**

**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility ..... 41**

**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum ..... 44**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 46**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 49**

**Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment..... 52**

**Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance ..... 53**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS .....55**

**Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 55**

**Critical Element 5.2 – DOES NOT APPLY to ELP Assessment Peer Review57**

**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations ..... 58**

**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.

..... 62

**SECTION 6: ELP ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .....64**

**Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of ELP Achievement Standards for All Students ..... 64**  
**Critical Element 6.2 – ELP Achievement Standards Setting ..... 65**  
**Critical Element 6.3 –Aligned ELP Achievement Standards ..... 67**  
**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting ..... 69**

**SECTION 7: DOES NOT APPLY TO ELP ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW .....71**

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 WIDA**

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

**Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of ELP Standards for All English Learners**

<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 English language proficiency (ELP) standards:</i></p> <p>The State formally adopted K-12 ELP standards for all ELs in public schools in the State.</p>		<p>This critical element will be addressed by the state.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 WIDA**

**Critical Element 1.2 – Coherent and Progressive ELP Standards that Correspond to the State’s 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><i>For ELP standards:</i> The ELP standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing;</li> <li>• address the different proficiency levels of ELs; and</li> <li>• align to the State academic content standards (see definition<sup>1</sup>). The ELP standards must contain language proficiency expectations that reflect the language needed for ELs to acquire and demonstrate their achievement of the knowledge and skills identified in the State’s academic content standards appropriate to each grade-level/grade-band in at least reading/language arts, mathematics, and science.</li> </ul>	<p>1.2-3 2012 Amplification of The English Language Development Standards</p> <p>1.2-4 Alignment Study between the Common Core State Standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics and the WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards, 2007 Edition, PreKindergarten through Grade 12</p> <p>1.2-5 K–12 English Language Development Standards Validation 2016</p> <p>r1.2-1 Alignment Between the Kentucky Core Content for Assessment and the WIDA Consortium English Language Proficiency Standards</p> <p>r1.2-2 Alignment Analysis of Key Practice Language Functions from the Framework for English Language Proficiency Development Standards corresponding to the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Mathematics and the WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards, 2007 and 2012 Edition, PreKindergarten through Grade 12; Correspondence</p> <p>Analysis of Florida state Grade 12 Calculus Standards and WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards</p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For the State’s ELP standards:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Science, evidence that the English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards contain language proficiency expectations that reflect the language needed for English Learners (ELs) to acquire and demonstrate their achievement of the knowledge and skills identified in the State’s academic content standards appropriate to each grade-level/grade-band.</li> </ul> <p><b>Science</b> The WIDA consortium notes point out that WIDA is planning to do a science alignment study as part of an additional revision.</p> <p>Document r1.2-3 is a list of “can-do” statements; they are not the standards.</p> <p>Evidence is not provided with regards to alignment to the State academic content standards for science. According to WIDA Consortium Response (p. 3), “to date, there has not been an alignment study between the ELPD Framework’s science key practices and the WIDA ELP Standards.” WIDA plans to conduct an alignment study in early spring, 2021. The peers request that documentation submitted for this study include methods, findings, and a description of any corrective action needed with a timeline for addressing corrective action. The study should also explicitly lay out how independence in the alignment study was maintained</p>

<sup>1</sup> see page 24 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.htm](http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.htm)

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 WIDA**

<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>r.1.2-3 WIDA Can Do Descriptors, Key Uses Edition, Grades 4-5</p>	<p>(given the alignment study will be conducted by an affiliated organization - WCEPS).</p> <p>If the planned alignment study examines the relationship between the language requirements of NGSS and the ELP WIDA standards this would provide evidence for those states that have adopted NGSS. States that have not adopted NGSS would need to do an additional alignment study. Documentation of required alignment for non-NGSS consortia members must be provided.</p> <p>Document r1.2-2 shows evidence of an alignment study between the key practice language functions (recount, explain, argue, discuss) from the ELPD Framework’s English Language Arts and Mathematics and the WIDA ELP Standards. Results were not encouraging, particularly for pre-K to grade 2. In general, across all ELA and mathematics practices and all clusters, a majority of the DOK and range of knowledge acceptability findings did not meet the criterion of 75% (pp. 6-7).</p> <p>It concerns the peers that the alignment studies, the standards for ELP and the content standards are all from varying in years. Also, if a state is not using clear base CCSS, the provided evidence does not respond to the critical element (CE). To clarify: the peers would like to see documentation that the current WIDA standards are: 1) aligned in all areas as required to the current CCSS. 2) each state must provide evidence either of using the version of CCSS that WIDA has provided alignment evidence to support, OR evidence of alignment to the current standards being used by the state.</p> <p>States will need to provide evidence of either using the version of CCSS that WIDA has provided alignment evidence to support or evidence of alignment to the standards being used by the state.</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 WIDA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p data-bbox="176 358 632 386">___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p data-bbox="176 418 978 446">__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p data-bbox="176 479 1822 506">The peers are once again asking for the same evidence that was previously requested because evidence was not found that addressed the previous request.</p> <p data-bbox="176 539 541 566"><b>For the State’s ELP standards:</b></p> <ul data-bbox="235 571 1938 727" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="235 571 1938 662">• For Science, evidence that the English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards contain language proficiency expectations that reflect the language needed for English Learners (ELs) to acquire and demonstrate their achievement of the knowledge and skills identified in the State’s academic content standards appropriate to each grade-level/grade-band.</li> <li data-bbox="235 662 1938 727">• For reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics, evidence of alignment of its current ELP standards to the State’s academic content standards, including a plan to address findings of the previous alignment study</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 WIDA

### Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State’s assessment system includes an <b><i>annual general and alternate ELP assessment</i></b> (aligned with State ELP standards) administered to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All ELs in grades K-12.</li> </ul>	Reviewed by Department Staff Only	Reviewed by Department Staff Only
<b>Section 1.3 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.

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA**

**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>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State has policies that require the inclusion <i>of all public elementary and secondary ELs in the State’s ELP assessment</i>, including ELs with disabilities.</li> </ul>	Reviewed by Department Staff Only	Reviewed by Department Staff Only
<b>Section 1.4 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 WIDA

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State has developed or amended challenging <i>ELP</i> 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>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>	<p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 WIDA**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**  
**Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <i>the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards</i>, 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 <i>the State’s ELP standards</i>, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that the ELP assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <i>the State’s ELP standards</i> and reflects appropriate inclusion of the range of complexity found in the standards.</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> <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</li> </ul>	<p>2.1-1 ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 Spring 2017 Interpretive Guide for Score Reports</p> <p>2.1-2 Annual Technical Report for ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 Online English Language Proficiency Test, Series 401, 2016–2017 Administration</p> <p>2.1-3 Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Spring 2017 Interpretive Guide for Score Reports 2.1-4 Annual Technical Report for ALTERNATE ACCESS for ELLs® English Language Proficiency Test, Series 103, 2015–2016 Administration 2.2-8 Alternate ACCESS Form 100 Test Specifications</p> <p>r2.1-1 Summary of ACCESS 2.0 Online Field Testing for Series 403 Listening and Reading</p> <p>r2.1-2 Folder Selection Graphs Listening 501</p> <p>r2.1-3 Folder Selection Graphs Reading 501</p> <p>r2.1-4 ACCESS for ELLs Series 402 Online Reading &amp; Listening Item Difficulty Visualizations</p> <p>r2.1-5 ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Assessment Proficiency Level</p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that both assessments are aligned to the depth and breadth of the State's ELP standards, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Statement of the purposes and intended uses of results.</li> <li>o Test blueprints.</li> <li>o Processes to ensure that the ELP assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State's ELP standards and reflects appropriate inclusion of the range of complexity found in the standards (e.g., detail about the routing rules, detail of the item selection process for paper forms to ensure it adheres to the blueprint).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>General statements of the purposes and intended uses of results for ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS is found in documents 2.1-1 (p.3 &amp; 7-12) and 2.1-2 (p. 5); however, specific details like determinations of levels and the meaning and purpose of the levels are not provided. Identification of students who have attained EL proficiency (exit decisions) are mentioned in the technical report (2.2-1), but the description of the purpose does not include the richness of how this assessment is being used in the field provision of services, accommodations decision, etc.)</p> <p>WIDA needs to provide more structure with regard to usage and intended purposes. The original peer notes state: “Because decision rules vary by state, states will need to address how the scores are used and interpreted for their students.” It is still unclear how the states address this.</p> <p>Document 2.1-2 (p. 22) describes a process to create test</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 WIDA**

<p>determination for all reporting. If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be <i>entirely</i> administered through a portfolio.</p>	<p>Scores Standard Setting Project Report</p>	<p>maps and blueprints to ensure that all folders are aligned to the proper WIDA Standard and properly organized by WIDA Standard and tier in the test maps. The peers did not find a clear test blueprint that specified how the assessment is constructed to represent the breadth and depth of the standards, and the cognitive complexity.</p> <p>As specified in the critical element, the blueprints should support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. The current evidence does not support how the test is constructed with regard to the 8 scores on the student reports.</p> <p>Typically, minimum/maximum number of items in each standard/subdomain is included in the blueprint.</p> <p>It was unclear how the five standards are taken and turned into the four subscales.</p> <p>The issues identified by the peers were the same for ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS. Additionally, there were two issues identified below for ACCESS.</p> <p><b>For ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the multi-stage adaptive administrations.</li> </ul> <p>R2.1-1 there is not an explanation for or justification of the negative item difficulties on stage 7. For example, Reading Grades 2-3 Stage 9 has a higher average item difficulty than Stage 10. Another example is item 28 stated item difficulty is out of the typical range. Peers had questions as to the average item difficulty across stages and grade spans. The submitted evidence requires more explanation to allow the peers to understand if the submitted evidence meets the critical element.</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 WIDA**

		<p>R2.1-2 and r2.1-3 indicate that the tiers represent increasing levels of difficulty and provide information on how folders are replaced. There is no indication of the sufficiency of the item pool to support the multi-tiered selection process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that proficiency determinations are made with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled.</li> </ul> <p>Document r.2.1-5 (pp. 32-40) provides evidence that proficiency determinations are made on vertically-equated scale scores that take into account the grade in which the student is enrolled, but the document does not contain a firm positive statement that determinations are based on grade when grade banding is used for this assessment. This critical element also indicates that all reporting must also be by assigned grade. The use of grade bands may create overly ambitious language demands at the lowest grade level in the band, and be too low at the highest grade level in the band. If state academic content standards are graded, then the language demands would also be graded, which would make it difficult to show alignment between the content standards and the assessment.</p>
--	--	---

**Section 2.1 Summary Statement**

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

**For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:**

- Evidence that both assessments are aligned to the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards, including:
  - o Statement of the purposes and intended uses of results.
  - o Test blueprints.
  - o Processes to ensure that the ELP assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s ELP standards and reflects appropriate inclusion of the range of complexity found in the standards (e.g., detail about the routing rules, detail of the item selection process for paper forms to ensure it adheres to the blueprint).

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 WIDA

**For ACCESS:**

- Evidence that the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the multi-stage adaptive administrations.
- Evidence that proficiency determinations are made with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled.

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 WIDA**

**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 English language proficiency based on the <i>State’s ELP standards</i> in terms of content and language processes.</li> </ul>	<p>2.2-2 The ASSETS Consortium English Language Proficiency Assessment for Grades 1-12</p> <p>2.2-3 ACCESS Test Development Cycle</p> <p>2.2-11 Item Writing Handbook for ACCESS for ELLs 2.0® Listening and Reading Assessments</p> <p>r2.2-1 ACCESS for ELLs® Test Development Cycle</p> <p>r2.2-2 WIDA-ACCESS Test Development Team</p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items (e.g., timeline of development, qualifications of item writers, item-writing training, item review processes and reviewer qualifications, field test processes for each domain, and technical advisory committee (TAC) review).</li> </ul> <p>Document 2.2-2 (pp. 14-21) provides evidence of test design principles, including simplicity and consistency, construct fidelity, age-level appropriateness, bias and sensitivity, accessibility. Document 2.2-11 provides guidance to external item writers on developing Listening and Reading items for ACCESS. R2.2-2 gives minimum qualifications but does not give evidence of the qualifications of the ACTUAL item writers.</p> <p>Document r2.2-1 provides information on the procedures to develop and select items as part of the annual plan for operational item refreshment. The section on Item Writing provides evidence that only individuals who have successfully completed item writing training are selected to write items. Items undergo a multi-step process that includes reviews regarding content and cognitive complexity alignment, sensitivity and fairness, and field testing (pp. 9-10). WIDA’s ACCESS for ELLs Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) provides support, reviews all test-related technical reports, and advises on the psychometric issues of testing and any proposed policy changes with psychometric implications. (p. 36).</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 WIDA**

		<p>Though some information is provided in the previously described document, and although the selected item writers are typically current teachers in WIDA Consortium states (r2.2-1, p. 9), the provided documentation does not meet the request. What are the grade levels of the teachers? How many years of experience do they have? What content do these teachers teach? Do these teachers have experience with EL students? What is the demographic diversity of the recruited teachers?</p> <p><b>For Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess ELP (e.g., involvement of experts with knowledge of ELs with significant cognitive disabilities).</li> </ul> <p>Evidence was not found by the peers which indicated whether experts with knowledge of ELs with significant cognitive disabilities were included in item development.</p> <p>The WIDA response (p. 9) states that WIDA does not refresh Alternate ACCESS items annually. The items were first operationally administered in 2014 and have been used annually since that year. WIDA notes that item development and test specs are in revision. WIDA is planning “an initial draft of new item development materials” for July of 2021. Upon resubmission, the draft should be submitted to the Department for review.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.2 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> <p><b>For ACCESS:</b></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 WIDA

- Evidence needs to be provided of reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items, specifically detailed information about the qualifications of item writers (e.g., grade levels taught, years' experience, demographic diversity) and reviewer qualifications e.g., grade levels taught, years' experience, demographic diversity).

### **For Alternate ACCESS:**

- Evidence of reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess ELP (e.g., involvement of experts with knowledge of ELs with significant cognitive disabilities, grade levels taught, years' experience, demographic diversity).

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 WIDA**

**Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>2.3-1 ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 2016-2017 Test Administrator Manual</p> <p>r2.3-1 ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Overview for Test Coordinators</p> <p>r2.3-2 Technology User Guide</p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of established communication to educators of clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations (e.g., guidelines or recommended qualifications of test administrators including volunteers, training of volunteers, and qualifications and training for the human providers of accommodations).</li> </ul> <p>2.3-1 provides evidence for the dissemination and implementation of standardized test administration policies and procedures to familiarize Test Coordinators with the components of the ACCESS (pp. 1-139)</p> <p>Document r2.3-1 provides evidence of procedures to familiarize Test Coordinators with the components of the ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 test, Training Requirements and Resources, Test Preparation Resources, and Coordinating the Grades 1-12 online and paper tests.</p> <p>The peers did not find evidence regarding guidelines for individuals who are actually administering the assessment and for individuals who provide accommodations.</p> <p>2.3-1 (p. 11) indicates that all test administrators must complete training, but the peers did not find the requirements for test administrators or the accommodation providers (e.g., Must the individuals be certified? . Can other school staff be used? . . .non-employees 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 WIDA**

		<p>volunteers). If this varies by state, each state should provide evidence regarding who can administer the assessment and provide accommodations.</p> <p>The peers did not find information about whether volunteers are allowed (the peers DO NOT recommend the use of volunteers); but, if they are allowed, information needs to be provided about how communication is provided for them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instruction 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 (e.g., content of training modules, evidence that training is required for test administrators and evidence of participation in such training).</li> </ul> <p>2.3-1 provides evidence of standardized test administration policies and procedures to familiarize Test Coordinators with the components of the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS (pp. 140-165). The peers did not find evidence regarding how the consortia ensures that the individuals who administer the assessment are properly trained (e.g., training rosters, percentage of test administrators who were properly trained, a description of the process for reviewing the training of the test administrators), as well as a plan for addressing any issues identified.</p> <p><b>For ACCESS:</b> Evidence of established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</p> <p>R2.4-1 is a troubleshooting guide that helps, but it does not</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 WIDA**

		<p>provide the level guidance necessary to ensure smooth continuance in the event of a technology issue (e.g., when computer locks up, power flashes off, etc.).</p> <p>No evidence of specific procedures is provided for catastrophic disruptions of online testing, such as power outages, fire, storms, death, etc., or what to do in the case of online pauses, loss of Internet connectivity, and other disruptions.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.3 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> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of established communication to educators of clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations (e.g., guidelines or recommended qualifications of test administrators including volunteers if used, training of volunteers if used, and qualifications and training for the human providers of accommodations).</li> <li>• Evidence of established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instruction 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 (e.g., content of training modules, evidence that training is required for test administrators and evidence of participation in such training).</li> </ul> <p><b>For ACCESS:</b></p> <p>Evidence of established comprehensive contingency plans to address possible technology challenges and other catastrophic events during test administration.</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 WIDA**

**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>
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 ELP assessments and the AELPA.	Reviewed by Department Staff Only	Reviewed by Department Staff Only
<b>Section 2.4 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 WIDA**

**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 the general ELP assessments and the AELPA.</li> </ul>	<p>2.3-7 2018-2019 Test Policy Handbook for State Education Agencies</p> <p>r2.5-1 Caveon Web Patrol Health Check and Key Insights</p> <p>r2.5-2 Caveon Test Security Audit Report for WIDA</p> <p>r2.5-3 Caveon Data Forensics Report</p> <p>r2.5-4 WIDA Psychometric Research Plan on Data Forensics</p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of policies and procedures that prevent 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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Specifically, evidence for Alternate ACCESS of policies and procedures to protect the integrity of the test given that the test form is unchanged for the past several years.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence of detection of test irregularities.</li> <li>• Evidence of remediation following any test security incidents.</li> <li>• Evidence of the investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities (e.g., forensic analysis and plans to address concerns).</li> </ul> <p>WIDA has contracted the services of a test security vendor (Caveon) to help prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results. Evidence is not provided that the Caveon services and audits included the Alternate ACCESS.</p> <p>It is good that WIDA has contracted with a test security organization. However, security audits and the other submitted evidence do not address this critical element. This critical element requires evidence of “policies and</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 WIDA**

		<p>procedures...”</p> <p>Caveon has conducted a number of test and security audits, including a security audit of the assessment cycle from item development to score reporting (r2.5-2) and a data forensics analysis of student and test data for the 2019-2020 assessment year (r.2.5-3). There have been no widespread security breaches, though findings from this analysis identified security anomalies in one district and three states.</p> <p>The peers routinely see policies that require item developers to sign a confidentiality agreement, and an example of this confidentiality agreement is often included in submitted evidence. Also, routinely the peers see policies and procedures stating the consequences and actions taken when a test security violation occurs. Typical test maintenance involves monitoring of item drift that could indicate a security breach. Follow-up procedures were not described when security breaches were found.</p> <p>WIDA has plans to continue web security and data forensic analyses with this vendor in 2021 (r2.5-4). It is unclear how WIDA works with the states on the follow-up investigation and how this is communicated to the states. It would be helpful to see updated Test Policy Handbook for State Education Agencies (2.3-7). Also, an SOW or plan for how data forensics will be handled would be important. This documentation would include requirements for training (e.g., yearly). The peers would like to see established test security policies and procedures.</p>
--	--	--

**Section 2.5 Summary Statement**

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

**For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:**

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 WIDA

- Evidence of policies and procedures that prevent 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.
  - Specifically, evidence for Alternate ACCESS of policies and procedures to protect the integrity of the test given that the test form is unchanged for the past several years.
- Evidence of detection of test irregularities (e.g., failure to provide accommodations, documentation of how test irregularities are reported).
- Evidence of remediation following any test security incidents.
- Evidence of the investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA**

**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>r2.6-1 WIDA AMS Security and Confidentiality Agreement</p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies and procedures to protect the integrity of test-related data in test administration (e.g., how data are protected by all parties, including during handoffs).</li> </ul> <p>The online WIDA AMS Security and Confidentiality Agreement (r2.6-1) is a one-page form that provides evidence of general procedures that approved users must follow when handling data. This agreement specifies that users must follow FERPA; however, actual policies on which the Agreement is based were not provided and there is not a full description of the procedures. Other than the use of passwords, there is no evidence regarding rules and procedures for secure transfer of student-level data (e.g., encryption).</p> <p>It is unclear which assessments the security and confidentiality agreement provided as evidence (r2.6.1) applied to. Does it apply to both the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS?</p> <p>Policies and procedures to maintain secure student-level data that protect student privacy and confidentiality (e.g., guidelines for districts and schools).</p> <p>The provided evidence does not fully respond to the original request based on the peer review. Specifically, there is not a discussion or documentation of the procedures in place to ensure the data is protected. For example, the process of passing student data from testing device to the servers scoring and storing data. When reports</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA

		<p>are being created, what are the technical methods being used to ensure the person accessing is the actual authorized user?</p> <p>This peer panel is not rendering judgement on minimum n-size. This will be addressed by the individual states in the consortium.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.6 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> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies and procedures to protect the integrity of test-related data in test administration (e.g., how data are protected by all parties, including during handoffs).</li> <li>• Policies and procedures to maintain secure student-level data that protect student privacy and confidentiality (e.g., guidelines for districts and schools).</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 WIDA**

**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><i>The State’s ELP assessments</i> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s ELP standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s ELP assessment and the ELP standards the assessment is designed to measure in terms of language knowledge and skills, the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards, across all proficiency levels, domains, and modalities identified therein;</li> <li>• Documentation of alignment (as defined) between the State’s ELP standards and the language demands implied by, or explicitly stated in, the State’s academic content standards;</li> <li>• If the State administers an AELPA aligned with alternate ELP achievement standards, the assessment shows adequate linkage to the State’s ELP standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and that the breadth of content and linguistic complexity</li> </ul>	<p>r3.1-1 Executive Committee Notes – 3/3/20</p> <p>r3.1-2 Alternate ACCESS and Alternate Model Performance Indicator Alignment Studies Report</p> <p>r3.1-3 Draft Alternate Can Do Descriptors</p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s ELP assessment and the ELP standards the assessment is designed to measure in terms of language knowledge and skills and the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards across all proficiency levels, domains, and modalities identified therein.</li> <li>• Documentation of alignment between the State’s ELP standards and the language demands implied by, or explicitly stated in, the State’s academic content standards.</li> </ul> <p>Due to the pandemic, planned alignment studies have not yet taken place. r3.1-1 (p. 5) provides evidence of alignment studies tentatively set for the spring/summer of 2021, including an alignment study of the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ online and paper versions of ACCESS to the WIDA 2007 and 2012 ELP Standards</li> <li>○ WIDA Standards to State Content Standards</li> </ul> <p>The proposed alignment study only appears to address part of the issues found in the original peer review. The proposed study should give evidence of alignment between the assessment and the consortium’s developed standards, there is no guarantee the state has adopted the WIDA standards as their ELP standards. Caution must be used to ensure that the alignment study applies to the state when being considered during a state review. Consideration must be given to states that have modified CCSS as their content standards to ensure the ELP standards meet the language</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 WIDA

<p>determined in test design is appropriate for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>		<p>demands of the adopted state content standards.</p> <p>Documentation should also be provided that explicitly lays out how independence in the alignment study was maintained (given the alignment study will be conducted by an affiliated organization - WCEPS).</p> <p><b>For Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of adequate linkage to the State's ELP standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and that the breadth of content and linguistic complexity determined in test design is appropriate for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities</li> </ul> <p>The alignment between the alternate assessment, and the 2007 and 2012 standards gives a lot of flex in the alignment since the consortium is not clearly stating a single set of standards. It is also worthy of note that the newest of those standards were updated 8 years ago.</p> <p>R3.1-2 documents the alignment study conducted between 1) the Alternate ACCESS and the Model performance indicators and 2) the alternate (APIs) and model performance indicators (MPIs). Page 11 in the summary provides the criteria for the study. On page 26, there is a discussion of the findings. Specifically, none of the alt ACCESS assessments include writing tasks related to the math strand. It seems like this is an alignment issue if the assessment is supposed to measure all the standards across the language proficiency levels. Results were mixed (pp. 24-26). For example, the alignment study found that “the Alternate ACCESS was “acceptably aligned,” to WIDA’s AMPIs”, while the linking study “did not identify AMPIs linked to WIDA’s language of Social Studies Standards.” Results will be used to support ongoing maintenance and new Alternate ACCESS item development (p. 26).</p> <p>Document r3.1-3 provides evidence of draft Alternate Can Do Descriptors created at a 2019 WIDA’s national,</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 WIDA**

		<p>invitational meeting to support educators in the instruction of ELs with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Page 16 of the WIDA Consortium Response states that this “work is also being used to both update WIDA’s original AMPIs, including expectations in the area of the language of Social Studies, and to support new AMPI development.” Providing the list of can-do descriptors does not support the validity of them.</p> <p>It would be helpful to see more specifics such as a timeline for when these findings will be addressed and details about how a stakeholder discussion would be conducted around the acceptability of “current item limitations and variation by grade” (p. 26).</p> <p>Note: USDOE specifies that the alignment study is independent. R3.1-2 (Table 6, p. 6) indicates that WIDA staff facilitated the panels even though on page 24, it states that facilitators didn’t participate in ratings/discussions. In future alignment studies, provide clarity regarding how independence was ensured.</p> <p>As WIDA moves forward with the redesign processes, the consortia should be cognizant of the impact on alignment.</p>
--	--	---

**Section 3.1 Summary Statement**

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

**For ACCESS:**

- Documentation of adequate alignment between the State's current ELP assessment and the current ELP standards the assessment is designed to measure in terms of language knowledge and skills and the depth and breadth of the State's ELP standards across all proficiency levels, domains, and modalities identified therein.
- Documentation of alignment between the State's current ELP standards and the language demands implied by, or explicitly stated in, the State's current academic content standards.

**For Alternate ACCESS:**

- Evidence of adequate linkage to the State's ELP standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and that the breadth of content and linguistic

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 WIDA

complexity determined in test design is appropriate for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

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 WIDA**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap <i>the intended language processes</i> appropriate for each grade level/grade-band as represented in the State’s ELP standards.</p>	<p>2.1-2 Annual Technical Report for ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 Online English Language Proficiency Test, Series 401, 2016–2017 Administration</p> <p>r2.2-1 ACCESS for ELLs® Test Development Cycle</p> <p>r2.2-2 WIDA-ACCESS Test Development Team</p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended language processes appropriate for each grade level/grade-band as represented in the State's ELP standards.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>ACCESS</u></p> <p>The provided evidence does not address the requests from the original peer review. The evidence does not support the assertion that the assessment taps the intended linguistic processes for each grade or grade cluster. While document r2.2-1 (p. 9, pp. 11-12) provides evidence of procedures associated with the test development cycle to ensure that ACCESS content is appropriate to each grade-level cluster, and document r2.2-2 identifies experience working with ELs as a requisite for some positions in the test development team, there is no specific evidence in these documents about actual procedures or expertise designed to evaluate the linguistic complexity of the vocabulary, graphics and other content features of an item that could impact the measurement of the intended language processes. The peers were concerned that language development experts appear not to have been included in the panel making expert judgment. The peers suggest being explicit between how the items are reviewed and who does the review process. The reviewers’ judgement as to the language process being demonstrated should also be captured.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Alternate ACCESS</u></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 WIDA

		Evidence for this CE needs to be provided for the Alternate ACCESS. It was unclear how evidence provided applies to the Alternate ACCESS.
<b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  <b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended language processes appropriate for each grade level/grade-band as represented in the State's ELP 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 WIDA**

**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 <i><b>ELP standards</b></i> on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>3.1-10 Exploring Domain-General and Domain-Specific Linguistic Knowledge in the Assessment of Academic English Language Proficiency</p> <p>3.3-1 ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Construct Validity Study</p> <p>6.2-1 WIDA Consortium Report on 2016-2018 Boxplot Analyses Results</p> <p>r.3.3-1 Alternate ACCESS for ELLs (Alt-ACCESS) Construct Validity Study</p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of the assessments are consistent with the subdomain structures of the State’s ELP standards (e.g., an explanation of how the included statistical analyses relate to the validity framework for the assessments).</li> </ul> <p>The studies in R3.3-1 and 3.3-1 are appreciated and do explore the higher-level structures. The CE requires evidence that the 4 domains being scored are separate domains and not repeatedly scoring the same domain or a significantly overlapping domain multiple times. The structural equation models (SEM) analysis presented does not clearly speak to the issue and does not provide an explanation of how the study is evidence of 4 separate domains scored separately in the 4 sub-scores. The exploratory factor analysis indicates the presence of one strong factor with some overlap between the next two factors. The reporting and use of subscores for instructional decisions is not supported by the evidence provided.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.3 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> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of the assessments are consistent with the subdomain structures of the State’s ELP standards (e.g., an explanation of how the included statistical analyses relate to the validity framework for 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 WIDA

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 WIDA**

**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>3.4-8 The Bridge Study between Tests of English Language Proficiency and ACCESS for ELLs®</p> <p>3.4-9 Intersections: Applied Linguistics as a Meeting Place</p> <p>r3.4-1 Examining the relationship between the WIDA Screener and ACCESS for ELLs assessments</p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>ACCESS</u></p> <p>The new study (r3.4-1) was helpful and provides evidence of relationships between ACCESS and the WIDA screener. It provides evidence that scores on Screener provide an initial measure of a student’s academic English language proficiency (p. 5), are strongly predictive of ACCESS scores.</p> <p>3.4-8 provides limited evidence and predates the current WIDA assessment (study date is 2006).</p> <p>3.4-9 (page 220) shows the results of a structural equation model (SEM) indicating relationships to math achievement (criterion validity). This relationship could indicate a problematic issue with the measure because high correlations between varying disciplines could indicate measuring the wrong construct. Year of study is unknown. Because WIDA has gone through so many iterations of its standards, it was difficult to know which set of standards was being studied.</p> <p>Studies showing how the ACCESS scores are correlated to screener scores or other EL assessments does not provide the necessary evidence. The evidence needs to show that students who score higher on ACCESS also perform better on (for example) state ELA content assessments. The</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 WIDA**

		<p>studies need to be performed using a current set of the assessments. The point of this CE is to provide valid evidence supporting the assertion that the ACCESS assessments are measuring the ELP constructs in ways that impact student performance on related measures.</p> <p>Like many CE's this evidence is easier to provide and develop if there is a strong relationship between the assessments, the content standards, and a Theory of Action. This relationship becomes the foundation for the validity argument (theory).</p> <p align="center"><u>Alternate ACCESS</u></p> <p>No evidence was submitted for this type of validity for the Alternate ACCESS.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.4 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> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables (e.g., relationship between ACCESS scores and other linguistic measures).</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 WIDA

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 (<i>for ELP assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable</i>);</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 <i>an EL’s English proficiency</i>.</li> </ul>	<p>2.1-2 Annual Technical Report for ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 Online English Language Proficiency Test, Series 401, 2016–2017 Administration</p> <p>2.1-4 Annual Technical Report for ALTERNATE ACCESS for ELLs® English Language Proficiency Test, Series 103, 2015–2016 Administration</p> <p>2.1-5 Annual Technical Report for ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 Paper English Language Proficiency Test, Series 401, 2016–2017 Administration</p> <p>2.1-6 Annual Technical Report for ALTERNATE ACCESS for ELLs® English Language Proficiency Test, Series 403, 2018–2019 Administration</p> <p>r4.1-1 Annual Technical Report for ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 Paper English Language Proficiency Test, Series 403, 2018–2019 Administration</p> <p>r4.1-5 Annual Technical Report for ALTERNATE ACCESS for ELLs® English Language Proficiency Test, Series 403, 2018-2019 Administration</p> <p>r4.1-6 Using Multistage Testing to Enhance Measurement of an English Language</p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of test reliability, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Reliability by subgroups;</li> <li>o 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>o Evidence that reliability statistics are used to inform ongoing maintenance and development.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>For ACCESS, WIDA’s latest editions of the Annual Technical Report (2018-2019) provides evidence of subgroup test reliability by gender, ethnicity and IEP status for the online test (r4.1-2, pp. 2-289 to 2-295) and the paper test (r4.1-4, pp. 2-411 to 2-418). The peers would recommend looking at reliability by home language and SES.</p> <p>For ACCESS, WIDA’s latest editions of the Annual Technical Report (2018-2019) provides a) evidence of overall indices related to the accuracy and consistency of classification, as well as Cohen’s kappa; b) accuracy and consistency information conditional on proficiency level, and c) indices of classification accuracy, including the false-positives and the false-negatives, and consistency at the cut points for the online test (r4.1-2, pp. 2-316 to 2-341, and the paper test (r4.1-4, pp. 2-437 to 2-466).</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 WIDA**

<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>Proficiency Test</p> <p>r4.1-7</p> <p>Figures for Using Multistage Testing to Enhance Measurement of an English Language Proficiency Test</p>	<p>WIDA’s latest editions of the Annual Technical Report (2018-2019) provides evidence of test information function (TIF) curves to inform item selection and forms creation to target each test form to the intended proficiency levels for the online test (r4.1-2, pp. 2-263 to 2-286) and for the paper test (r4.1-4, pp. 2-369 to 2-408). However, the provided TIF curves for writing call many assumptions about the assessment into question. The almost bimodal nature is not normally seen in a well-functioning assessment. These same concerns are repeated for Speaking. Additionally, the cut scores for the speaking preA are so far away from the area of high accuracy that it calls into question the usefulness of the preA speaking assessment.</p> <p>The issue is that the TIFs show that the test is information function is not always highest at the upper levels of the PLs see r4.1-2 page 277-279). Also, accuracy and consistency measures for some composite scores and domains appeared low (see for example r4.1-2 p. 2-138).</p> <p>The provided evidence does not fulfill the request from the initial peer review and does not support the assertion that the assessments being reviewed met this CE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of an EL's ELP.</li> </ul> <p>According to the WIDA submission notes: “Each year in April and May, WIDA and its test development vendor (Center for Applied Linguistics) establish an annual refreshment plan for ACCESS for ELLs. The purpose of this plan is to identify slots within the multi-stage adaptive design where new folders of items and tasks should be developed. WIDA commits to consistently target high PL Listening items over</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 WIDA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>the course of the next two to three years, until the gaps in the item pool are filled. This plan will assist in deepening the pool of items that appropriately target PLs 5 and 6 on Listening.” The peers would like to see evidence that items at the various levels were actually produced and put into the bank.</p> <p><b>For Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of reliability, including test information functions (TIFs) for overall composite scores.</li> </ul> <p>R4.1-5 provides TIFs for the alternate ACCESS but the results were not compelling as evidence of the reliability of the assessment. In particular, peers noted that the cut scores are not in typical locations for a TIF curve. Further explanation or an action plan would be needed for this evidence to become sufficient.</p> <p>R4.1-5 provides TIFs for the four domains but not for the overall test. The peers would like to see this evidence.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.1 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> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of test reliability, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Acceptable consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results, or a plan to improve the consistency and accuracy;</li> <li>o Evidence that reliability statistics are used to inform ongoing maintenance and development.</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 WIDA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>For ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of an EL's ELP.</li> </ul> <p><b>For Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of reliability, including test information functions (TIFs) for overall composite scores.</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 WIDA**

**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For all State ELP assessments,</i> assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition<sup>2</sup>).</p> <p><i>For ELP assessments,</i> the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all EL students and fair across student groups, including ELs with disabilities, in their design, development, and analysis.</p>	<p>2.1-4 Annual Technical Report for ALTERNATE ACCESS for ELLs® English Language Proficiency Test, Series 103, 2015–2016 Administration</p> <p>2.2-16 Accessibility and Accommodations Supplement</p> <p>2.3-1 ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 2016-2017 Test Administrator Manual</p> <p>r4.2-1 Bias Review Checklist</p> <p>r4.2-2 Bias &amp; Sensitivity Review Training</p> <p>r4.2-3 Comparison of DIF methods 10</p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in design, development, and analysis (e.g., the implementation of universal design principles, to the extent practicable, during item development and review, and additional differential item functioning (DIF) analyses to include more student subgroups).</li> </ul> <p>Documents r4.2-3 (reading and listening only) and r4.1-5 provide evidence of evaluation bias through DIF analysis of performance by gender and ethnicity (students of Hispanic ethnic background versus students of non-Hispanic ethnic background) and impact analysis on subgroup. Document r4.2-3 provides evidence that WIDA is conducting a study on differential item functioning (DIF) based on disability status (i.e., IEP status) to examine whether the questions are biased against students with IEP accommodations (p. 1). It is an attempt to address fairness and accessibility for a variety of students. Study results are expected to be completed by February 2021.</p> <p>There is limited evidence in either the ACCESS or Alternate ACCESS technical manuals that DIF analyses are conducted beyond ethnicity and gender (r4.1-2 and r4.1-5).</p> <p>Document r4.1-5 provides evidence of DIF analyses to</p>

<sup>2</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 WIDA**

		<p>compare the performance of students on the Alternate ACCESS by gender and ethnicity (students of Hispanic ethnic background versus students of non-Hispanic ethnic background). The focus on Hispanic students (and not additional racial/ethnic groups) is a limitation of the study.</p> <p>Evidence provided of bias and sensitivity review training and checklists (r4.2-1 and 2).</p> <p>The peers could not find information about Universal Design during item development and review for the ACCESS or Alternate ACCESS. Nor was there in any discussion of methods used to ensure equal access of ELs with disabilities who have different needs and characteristics (r2.2-1).</p> <p>The peers typically see evidence for this CE that includes the number of items flagged for bias and the results of the bias review for these items.</p> <p><b>For Alternate ACCESS:</b></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 EL students and fair across student groups, including ELs with disabilities, in their design, development, and analysis, guidance and instructions on appropriate instructional supports that can be used during the assessment, particularly for Braille and alternate modes of communication.</li> </ul> <p>Alternate ACCESS appears not to meet federal requirements. The WIDA response states that “Alternate ACCESS is not provided in Braille or any alternate mode of communication.”</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 WIDA

### Section 4.2 Summary Statement

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

#### **For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:**

- Evidence that the assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in design, development, and analysis (e.g., the implementation of universal design principles, to the extent practicable, during item development and review, and additional differential item functioning (DIF) analyses to include more student subgroups).

#### **For Alternate ACCESS:**

- Evidence that the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all EL students and fair across student groups, including ELs with disabilities, in their design, development, and analysis, guidance and instructions on appropriate instructional supports that can be used during the assessment, particularly for Braille and alternate modes of communication.

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 WIDA**

**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 <i>ELP assessments</i>, including performance for EL students with high and low levels of English language proficiency and with different proficiency profiles across the domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing.</p>	<p>(WIDA Response: For detail on the reliability of ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS, see the response to peers' request for Critical Element 4.1.)</p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for ELP assessments, including performance for EL students with high and low levels of ELP.</li> </ul> <p>Test Information graphs seem to indicate that the test in some cases provides little information at key cut scores. (see for example r4.1-2, p. 281-286). This indicates that the tests might not be adequately measuring students across the continuum of abilities especially in higher grades (page 263 for discussion of TIF).</p> <p>The WIDA response for this CE referred to CE 4.1. WIDA's response to CE 4.1 does not provide sufficient evidence to support the assertion that the assessments provide adequately precise estimates of student performance across the full performance continuum. In fact, the peers are concerned that the opposite is true; the provided evidence elucidates the problems with the estimates of student performance on these assessments.</p> <p>Evidence was not provided for the Alternate ACCESS.</p> <p>In addition to previously requested evidence, the peers recommend that WIDA also include the remediation plan for correcting the varying inaccuracy of estimates identified in the evidence the consortium provided in responding to element 4.1.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA

<b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:		
<b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for ELP assessments, including performance for EL students with high and low levels of ELP.</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 WIDA**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments (and <i>for ELP assessments, any applicable domain or component sub-tests</i>) that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s <i>ELP standards</i>.</p> <p><i>For ELP assessments</i>, if an English learner has a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains/components (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) such that there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected domain(s)/component(s), the State must provide a description of how it will ensure that the student is assessed in the remaining domain(s)/component(s) in which it is possible to assess the student, and a description of how this will occur.<sup>3</sup></p>	<p>2.3-1 ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 2016-2017 Test Administrator Manual</p> <p>4.4-7 Less Than Four Domains_ Creating an Overall Composite Score for English Learners with Individualized Education Plans</p> <p>r4.4-1 Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Test Administration Tutorial</p> <p>r4.4-2 Alternate ACCESS for ELLs™ Writing Scoring Guide</p> <p>r4.4-3 Maintaining Rater Reliability in Scoring ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Paper Speaking Test</p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that if an EL has a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains/components (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) because there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected domain(s)/component(s), the State ensures that the student is assessed in the remaining domain(s)/component(s) in which it is possible to assess the student, including a description of how this will occur.</li> </ul> <p>WIDA’s notes discuss states setting and applying testing policy. A paper was provided to guide states in selecting a method for creating a composite score (4.4-7) WIDA provided documentation about the scoring of the speaking test and shows the certification process for the raters (p. 4-5, r4.4-3). There was information on how states could monitor speaking scores on pages 5-6. WIDA does not monitor these scores. The application of local scoring procedures and protocols is ultimately under direction and authority of each member state. Which, if accurate, would mean that each state using the assessment needs to submit evidence of scoring procedures and protocols to meet this CE.</p> <p><b>For ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of standardized scoring procedures and protocols that are designed to produce reliable and</li> </ul>

<sup>3</sup> See full reference in regulation, 34 CFR § 200.6(h)(4)(ii) (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 WIDA**

	<p>meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State's ELP standards (e.g., evidence that the scoring of speaking items on the paper form of the test is monitored).</p> <p>r4.4-3 provides evidence of standardized scoring procedures and protocols to produce reliable results and interpretation of spoken response scored in real time by the test administrator on the paper form of the ACCESS Speaking test, and that the scores are reported according to the WIDA English language proficiency standards. The procedures and protocols include quality controls for inter-rater reliability to ascertain how often readers are in exact, adjacent, and nonadjacent agreement with each other, ensuring that an acceptable agreement rate is maintained. WIDA considers a minimally acceptable rate of reliability to be 70% (p. 2). No evidence was provided that there was consistent monitoring of scoring of speaking items on the paper form.</p> <p>As a way to verify the accuracy of scoring, it would have been helpful if WIDA had provided an example of an internal report containing daily and cumulative inter-rater reliability agreement results for the scoring of the paper form of the Speaking test. Also, evidence of invalidation of test scores that reflect improbable gains and that cannot be satisfactorily explained through changes in student populations or instruction would be helpful.</p> <p><b>For Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the implementation of standardized scoring procedures and protocols (e.g., definitions of key terms and test administration and scoring procedures).</li> </ul> <p>The application of local scoring procedures and protocols is ultimately under direction and authority of each member state. Which, if accurate, would mean that each state using the assessment needs to submit evidence of scoring</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 WIDA**

		procedures and protocols to meet this CE.
<b>Section 4.4 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 ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that if an EL has a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains/components (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) because there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected domain(s)/component(s), the State ensures that the student is assessed in the remaining domain(s)/component(s) in which it is possible to assess the student, including a description of how this will occur.</li> </ul> <p><b>For ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of 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 ELP standards (e.g., evidence that the scoring of speaking items on the paper form of the test is monitored).</li> </ul> <p><b>For Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the implementation of standardized scoring procedures and protocols (e.g., definitions of key terms and test administration and scoring procedures).</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 WIDA**

**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 <i><b>ELP assessments</b></i> within or across grade-spans, ELP levels, or school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s <i><b>ELP standards</b></i> and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across settings.</p>	<p>2.1-2 Annual Technical Report for ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 Online English Language Proficiency Test, Series 401, 2016–2017 Administration</p> <p>2.1-5 Annual Technical Report for ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 Paper English Language Proficiency Test, Series 401, 2016–2017 Administration</p> <p>r4.5-1 Alternate ACCESS CDF Curves</p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all forms adequately represent the State's ELP standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across settings, particularly for the listening domain (e.g., rationales for why equating is not done for the paper versions of the reading and listening domains and rationales for the use of the anchor item sets).</li> </ul> <p>Document 2.1.2 (pp. 54-56) provides evidence of a procedure known as common-item equating to ensure the comparability of results on new forms to the older forms.</p> <p>Page 29 of the WIDA Response states that when the “online version of ACCESS was created, the Listening domain test was equated with that of the paper version using a common-person linking method, as there were no common Listening items between versions in the first year of ACCESS Online.” In the first year there were no Listening items, but these many years later, it would be expected that data would be provided for Listening. Since WIDA reports on four domains, it appears that the foundation of the assessment is based on the separation of those skills and abilities. Assuming the four domains represent different content, it is important to equate across all four domains.</p> <p>Page 29 of the WIDA Response also states that the “Reading domain tests were linked using anchor item sets, ensuring the online version of the test maintained the same scale as the paper version.”</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 WIDA**

		<p>The way the paper version is treated either makes it a different form or a different version. Thus, either here or in 4.6 the equating needs to be addressed to meet one or the other CE's.</p> <p>The grade span forms and changes by school year are not adequately addressed in the provided evidence.</p> <p><b>For Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all forms adequately represent the State's ELP standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across settings (e.g., evidence that using the same test items every year does not impact validity).</li> </ul> <p>r4.5-1 shows scale scores by proportions of students for each form of Alternate ACCESS. The curves do not provide evidence that the forms represent the ELP standards. WIDA provided evidence of comparability in terms of score distribution but it is not responsive to the request. It would be helpful to have the results of the linking study and a plan for equating to ensure there has not been drift over time. In short, using the same items for 7 years is normally considered a risk to validity which then calls into question the ability to provide consistent score interpretations.</p>
--	--	---

**Section 4.5 Summary Statement**

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

**For ACCESS:**

- Evidence that all forms adequately represent the State's ELP standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and

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 WIDA

across settings, particularly for the listening domain (e.g., rationales for why equating is not done for the paper versions of the reading and listening domains and rationales for the use of the anchor item sets).

### **For Alternate ACCESS:**

- Evidence that all forms adequately represent the State's ELP standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across settings (e.g., evidence that using the same test items every year does not impact validity).

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 WIDA**

**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), 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>r4.6-1 Exploring Scoring Discrepancies in ACCESS Writing Assessments: Why do handwritten responses score higher than keyboard responses? (Poster)</p> <p>4.6-6 Series 400 ACCESS Paper and Online Comparability Report</p> <p>r4.6-2 Draft comparability report ACCESS501 effect size graph</p>	<p>This CE was met in the initial submission</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 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 WIDA**

**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>2.1-4 Annual Technical Report for ALTERNATE ACCESS for ELLs® English Language Proficiency Test, Series 103, 2015–2016 Administration</p> <p>r1.3-1 Advancing ALTELLA: Alternate Assessment Redesign</p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State's website.</li> </ul> <p>WIDA response (p. 32) states that “each member state takes responsibility for making the technical quality of the ACCESS tests available to the public”. To support this effort, WIDA provides redacted versions of the Annual Technical Report available to member states to post publicly.” Documents r4.1-2 is an example of the full annual technical report for ACCESS.</p> <p>Document r4.1-5 is an example of the full annual technical report for Alternate ACCESS.</p> <p>Since WIDA is deferring this requirement to the states, the states must meet this requirement.</p> <p><b>For Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence was found that WIDA received a grant to do this, however, a grant is not going to fund the recurring cycle. Evidence could not be found in r1.3-1 that the redesign would result in a “system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system”.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA

<b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:		
<b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State's website. (If WIDA is differing than states will need to meet this CE).</li></ul>		
<b>For Alternate ACCESS:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence of a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system.</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 WIDA**

**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<sup>4</sup> 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>For ELP assessments</b>, policies that require the inclusion of an EL with a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) such that there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected component (the State must assess the student’s English language proficiency based on the remaining components in which it is possible to assess the student).</li> </ul>	<p><b>2.2-16</b> <i>Accessibility and Accommodations Supplement</i></p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of policies that require the inclusion of an EL with a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains (i.e., ensuring that the student will be assessed based on the remaining components in which it is possible to assess the student)</li> </ul> <p>Document 2.2-16 (p. 4) provides evidence of the participation expectations for all ELs with disabilities. WIDA’s accessibility supplement/manual is in process of being revised. This evidence was insufficient during the previous peer review and it is still insufficient. There needs to be evidence of a clear policy requiring students to take as many domains as they are capable of participating in, and a procedure for producing an overall score based on the domains assessed. The WIDA response indicates that a revised accessibility supplement/manual will be released in Fall, 2021, but the delay caused students in 2020 to lack the inclusion that these guidelines would allow.</p> <p>According to WIDA response (p. 26), “Alternate ACCESS is not provided in Braille or any alternate mode of communication.”</p> <p>Evidence was not sufficient to meet this CE.</p>

<sup>4</sup> For ELP peer review, this refers to ELs with disabilities.

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 WIDA**

<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 5.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p data-bbox="176 324 1953 357"><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p data-bbox="176 381 1953 414"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p data-bbox="176 446 1953 479"><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul data-bbox="231 511 1953 576" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of policies that require the inclusion of an EL with a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains (i.e., ensuring that the student will be assessed based on the remaining components in which it is possible to assess the student.</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 WIDA

### Critical Element 5.2 – DOES NOT APPLY to ELP Assessment Peer Review

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>Note: This critical element does not apply to ELP assessments, as the requirements only apply to the inclusion of ELs in <b>academic assessments</b>.</li> </ul>		
<b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<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 WIDA**

**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 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 students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</li> </ul>	<p>2.1-4 Annual Technical Report for ALTERNATE ACCESS for ELLs® English Language Proficiency Test, Series 103, 2015–2016 Administration</p> <p>2.2-16 Accessibility and Accommodations Supplement</p> <p>2.2-17 The WIDA Accessibility and Accommodations Framework</p> <p>2.3-1 ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 2016-2017 Test Administrator Manual</p> <p>5.3-7 ACCESS FOR ELLs 2.0® Unique Accommodations Request Form</p> <p>r5.3-1 ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Online Sample Items for the Public</p> <p>r5.3-2 CCSSO Accessibility Manual: How to Select, Administer, and Evaluate Use of Accessibility Supports for Instruction and Assessment of All Students</p> <p>r5.3-3 WIDA Research Agenda Supporting English Learners with Disabilities</p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the provided accommodations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student's need(s) to participate in the assessments.</li> <li>o Do not alter the construct being assessed.</li> <li>o 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> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>It is unclear if WIDA requires all states to implement accommodations as outlined in the provided evidence or if states are permitted to alter these.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>ACCESS</u></p> <p>Document 5.3-3 provides evidence of WIDA’s research studies at various stages of completion to verify the appropriateness and effectiveness of allowable accommodations to allow student participation in the WIDA assessments. For example, Page 6 provides evidence of an Accessibility and Accommodations use studies scheduled for summer 2021 to investigate 1) the efficacy of ACCESS’s current accommodations; 2) common practices across the consortium in selecting accessibility tools and accommodations for students taking ACCESS; and 3) how IEP team members understand and differentiate accessibility tools and accommodations for English language proficiency assessments and content assessments.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>Evidence not yet available.</p> <p>Document r4.1-2 (p. 35) states that accommodations should not “affect the validity and reliability of the interpretation of the scores for their intended purposes.” Similarly, document 2.2-16 (p. 6) states that accessibility supports identified as likely to compromise the validity of the assessment and invalidate students’ results are excluded from the Accessibility and Accommodations Supplement. However, neither documents provide evidence of what procedures are used to accomplish this goal.</p> <p>WIDA is currently developing evaluation tools for the assessment using the updated CCSSO Accessibility Manual. The work will be completed in 2021. WIDA should submit documentation to peer review when completed.</p> <p>WIDA has provided a timeline and comprehensive research agenda for supporting ELs with disabilities. These studies will address important information across a range of topics including DIF, reporting, performance differences for Els with and without accommodations.</p> <p>The submitted evidence is hopeful, yet it is insufficient to meet the requirements of this CE at this time.</p> <p align="center"><u>Alternate ACCESS</u></p> <p>Evidence specific to the Alternate ACCESS not found.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul> <p>5.3.7 provides a process for other accommodations to be considered for ACCESS (but not specifically Alternate ACCESS.)</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 WIDA**

<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>For Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence specific to Alternate ACCESS was not found.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that accommodations do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment</li> </ul> <p>Evidence specific to Alternate ACCESS was not found.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the provided accommodations:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student's need(s) to participate in the assessments.</li> <li>o Do not alter the construct being assessed.</li> <li>o 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> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>For Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs.</li> <li>• Evidence that accommodations do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment</li> <li>• Evidence of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</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 WIDA

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 WIDA**

**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 ELP assessments, and AELPA.</li> </ul>		<p>The CE requires state specific evidence to meet.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ 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 WIDA

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b><i>For ELP standards:</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State adopted ELP achievement standards that address the different proficiency levels of ELs;</li> <li>• If the State has developed alternate ELP achievement standards, it has adopted them only for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who cannot participate in the regular ELP assessment even with appropriate accommodations.</li> </ul>		<p>The CE requires state specific evidence to meet.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 WIDA

Critical Element 6.2 – ELP Achievement Standards Setting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>ELP achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate ELP achievement standards</i></b>, such that:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Cut scores are developed for every grade/grade band, content domain/language domain, and/or composite for which proficiency-level scores are reported.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>6.1-3 Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Standard Setting Study: Technical Brief</p> <p>r6.2-1 Alternate ACCESS for ELLs to Dynamic Learning Maps Analysis</p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State used a technically sound method and process for setting ELP achievement standards, such that cut scores are developed for every grade/grade band, content domain/language domain, and/or composite for which proficiency-level scores are reported.</li> </ul> <p>Document 6.1-3 (pp. 12-15) provides evidence of a procedure based on a series of logistic regression analyses to derive cut scores for the Alternate ACCESS proficiency levels. In addition to the cut scores for each domain, cut scores were also determined for four composite scores: Oral Language, Comprehension, Literacy, and Overall. The derivation of cut scores was based on the rationale that the English language proficiency development of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities does not increase dramatically from one grade level to the next, and that the same cut scores are used for all grade clusters (from grades 1 to 12) by domain to help detect growth in English language proficiency from year to year. Table 6-A presents the cuts for four domain scores and four composite scores (p. 15). Sufficient data were not presented. For example, if a logistic regression was done, the logistic regression should be shown in the report. CE 6.2 requires that “cut scores are developed for every grade/grade band, content domain/language domain, and/or composite for which proficiency-level scores are reported.”</p> <p>Document r6.2-1 provides evidence of a WIDA’s study to support states’ reclassification criteria for students who participate in Alternate ACCESS. To this end, the study</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 WIDA**

<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>examined the relationship between Alternate ACCESS and Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM), a content assessment for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities used in several WIDA states. Findings from the study showed that the Alternate ACCESS overall composite proficiency level of P2 (Emerging) best indicates that a student will receive an At Target or Advanced performance level on DLM ELA, mathematics and science assessments (p. 16). The study presented is interesting, however it appears DLM assigns performance levels against grade level standards, not a single standard across multiple grade levels. This is a reclassification study, not a standard setting study.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.2 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> <p><b>For Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State used a technically sound method and process for setting ELP achievement standards, such that cut scores are developed for every grade/grade band, content domain/language domain, and/or composite for which proficiency-level scores are reported.</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 WIDA**

**Critical Element 6.3 –Aligned ELP 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><i>For ELP achievement standards:</i></b>                      The State has ensured that ELP assessment results are expressed in terms that are clearly aligned with the State’s ELP standards, and its ELP performance-level descriptors.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate ELP achievement standards for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate ELP achievement standards should be linked to the State’s grade-level/grade-band ELP standards, and should reflect professional judgment of the highest ELP achievement standards possible for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>r3.1-1                      Conducting a series of alignment studies</p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that ELP assessment results are expressed in terms that are clearly aligned with the State’s ELP standards and its ELP performance level descriptors.</li> </ul> <p>Studies described have not yet been completed. Document r3.1-1 provides evidence of proposed WIDA’s studies to ensure that ELP assessment results are expressed in terms that are clearly aligned with the State’s ELP standards and its ELP performance-level descriptors. The proposed work includes a) an alignment study in Summer 2021 of the online and paper versions of ACCESS to the WIDA 2007 and 2012 ELP Standards, and b) a Spring 2021 correspondence study between WIDA’s ELP Standards and state career and college ready science standards.</p> <p>The evidence provided by the state does not address the requested evidence from the initial peer review. In short, alignment studies will not demonstrate that the process for developing performance level descriptors was done in a technically appropriate manner as in the industry standard methods and the requirements of this CE.</p> <p><b>For Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the State has developed alternate ELP achievement standards, evidence that the alternate ELP achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level/grade-band ELP standards and reflect professional judgment of the highest ELP achievement standards possible for</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 WIDA**

<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>ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p> <p>Document r3.1-2 provides evidence of the relationship between the Alternate ACCESS and WIDA’s ELP standards (see Critical Element 3.1 above) based on a 2020 two-part study designed to 1) explore the alignment between Alternate ACCESS and the Alternate Model Performance Indicators (AMPIs), assessable downward extensions of the Model Performance Indicators (MPIs) from ELP standards; and 2) examine the linkage between the AMPIs and MPIs.</p> <p>The WIDA response to this request referred to CE 3.1 which WIDA did not provide sufficient evidence to meet. This lack of sufficient evidence also applies to this CE.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.3 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> <p><b>For ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that ELP assessment results are expressed in terms that are clearly aligned with the State's ELP standards and its ELP performance level descriptors.</li> </ul> <p><b>For Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the State has developed alternate ELP achievement standards, evidence that the alternate ELP achievement standards are linked to the State's grade-level/grade-band ELP standards and reflect professional judgment of the highest ELP achievement standards possible for ELs who are 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 WIDA

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on <b>English language proficiency for all ELs including the number and percentage of ELs attaining ELP</b>.</p> <p>For the <b>ELP assessment</b>, the State provides coherent and timely information about each student’s attainment of the State’s ELP standards to parents that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports the <b>ELs’ English proficiency</b> in terms of the State’s grade level/grade-band ELP standards (including performance-level descriptors);</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</li> </ul>	<p>6.4-3 ALTERNATE ACCESS for ELLs SPRING 2018 Interpretive Guide for Score Reports Grades 1-12</p> <p>r6.4-1 ADI-PPT-Notes-10.25.19, See pp.15, 16, 24-26.</p> <p>r6.4-2 LEA-Notes-12.11.19, See pp. 4, 5.</p> <p>r6.4-3 ADI-Notes-12.19.19, See p.1.</p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State's reporting of assessment results facilitates timely interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</li> <li>• Evidence that the State provides coherent and timely information about each student's attainment of the State's ELP standards to parents that 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>• Evidence that student reports are, upon request by an individual with a disability, provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> </ul> <p>The provided response contains no evidence that WIDA facilitates timely interpretations and use of results nor provides coherent and timely information about each student’s attainment of the ELP standards which were two of the three critical evidences requested for this CE.</p> <p>There is no evidence submitted regarding the availability of a student’s assessment information in an alternative format upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability.</p> <p>These aspects of this critical element will need to be addressed by states if the consortium does not provide evidence of meeting this CE.</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 WIDA**

<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>individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</p>		<p><b>For Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that performance level descriptors are included on student score reports.</li> </ul> <p>Document 2.1-3 (p. 21) provides evidence that Alternate ACCESS English language proficiency (performance) levels for the productive and receptive language domains are included on the Alternate ACCESS Individual Student Report.</p> <p>The Alternate ACCESS ISR included additional subscales that are not the four domains. These subscales do not appear to have been included in the initial peer review and the peers are concerned that there is not sufficient evidence of reliability and validity nor are there standards set for these subscales.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.4 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> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State's reporting of assessment results facilitates timely interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</li> <li>• Evidence that the State provides coherent and timely information about each student's attainment of the State's ELP standards to parents that 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>• Evidence that student reports are, upon request by an individual with a disability, provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> </ul> <p><b>For Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Due to the new evidence submitted for this review, it appears the original review lacked information on the three subscales that appear on the Alternate ACCESS ISR. An explanation of the three subscales including validity, standards, reliability, standard setting etc. needs to be provided.</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 WIDA**

<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>

SECTION 7: DOES NOT APPLY TO ELP ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW

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.