



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

September 23, 2021

The Honorable Sydnee Dickson
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Utah State Board of Education
PO Box 144200
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111-4200

Dear Superintendent Dickson:

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 Utah State Board of Education (USBE) to prepare for the English Language Proficiency (ELP) assessment peer review, which occurred in March 2021. Specifically, USBE resubmitted evidence regarding ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS. Please note that a separate decision letter will be sent regarding USBE's academic and alternate assessment submission for reading/language arts and mathematics which also occurred in March 2021.

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

- General ELP assessment (ACCESS): **Partially meets requirements**
- Alternate ELP assessment (Alternate ACCESS): **Partially meets requirements**

The components that substantially meet requirements meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The Department expects that USBE should be able to provide this additional information within one year.

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

400 MARYLAND AVE., SW, WASHINGTON, DC 20202
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 Utah may not be able to submit all of the required information within one year. Because USBE must submit additional information, the Department will continue the condition on the State's 2021 Title I, Part A grant award. This condition will remain until all of the evidence has been resubmitted and peer reviewed. If the outcome of the re-review by peers indicates full approval, then the condition will be removed. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action.

The specific list of items required for USBE to submit is enclosed with this letter. I request that USBE submit a plan within 30 days outlining when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. Upon submission of the plan, the Department will reach out to USBE 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.

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: Darin Nielsen, Assistant Superintendent of Student Learning
Patty Norman, Deputy Superintendent
Ann-Michelle Neal, Accountability Specialist

Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed to Meet the Requirements for Utah’s Use of the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS as English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards	For the State’s ELP standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For mathematics, evidence of alignment of its current ELP standards to the State’s academic content standards.
2.1 – Test Design and Development	For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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"> ○ Evidence that the test blueprints include the number of items for each standard and subdomain. ○ Evidence of a description of the item selection process for paper test forms that adheres to the test blueprints.
2.2 – Item Development	For the ACCESS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). For the Alternate ACCESS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 included experts with knowledge of ELs with significant cognitive disabilities including their grade levels taught, years of experience, and demographic diversity).
2.3 – Test Administration	For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of State specific established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration
2.5 – Test Security	For the ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Detection of test irregularities. ○ Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments. ○ Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.

	<p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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), specifically, to protect the integrity of the test given that the test form is unchanged for the past several years.
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p>	<p>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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).
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p>	<p>For the ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. <p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p>	<p>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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"> ○ Items are reviewed based on the linguistic complexity of the vocabulary, graphics, and other content features of the items. ○ The panel reviewing the items include language development experts. ○ The State documents the reviewers’ judgments of the language processes being demonstrated by the item.
<p>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p>	<p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.
<p>4.1 – Reliability</p>	<p>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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"> ○ 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).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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. <p>For the ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Documentation of adequate reliability for its 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). <p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Documentation of adequate reliability for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards (e.g., evidence of TIF for the overall assessment).
<p>4.2 – Fairness and accessibility</p>	<p>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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).
<p>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p>	<p>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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.
<p>4.4 – Scoring</p>	<p>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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"> ○ 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. ○ Evidence of the State’s scoring procedures and protocols. <p>For the ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence that the State consistently ensures the accuracy of scoring item given on the paper test forms.

<p>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p>	<p>For the ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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"> ○ Evidence of an equating plan for the paper test forms of the listening and reading tests. ○ Evidence of a rationale for using anchor item sets for the reading tests. <p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
<p>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p>	<p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system. • Evidence that adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.
<p>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p>	<p>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the requirements for assessing ELs with disabilities who cannot be assessed in all four domains (i.e., ensuring that the student will be assessed based on the remaining components in which it is possible to assess the student).
<p>5.3 – Accommodations</p>	<p>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation that the State makes available appropriate accommodations and 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). • Evidence of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.
<p>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p>	<p>For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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"> ○ Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered. ○ Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice. ○ Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL. ○ Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. ○ Monitored for administrations of all required ELP assessments, and AELPA.
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p>	<p>For the ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence that the State adopted ELP achievement standards that address the different proficiency levels of ELs.
<p>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p>	<p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence that the State used a technically sound method and process for setting ELP standards, such that cut scores are developed for every grade-level/grade-band, content domain/language domain, and/or composite for which proficient-level scores are reported (e.g., evidence of the reliability of the cut scores and the validity of recommended interpretations since the same cut scores are used for all grade-level clusters).
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</p>	<p>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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).
<p>6.4 – Reporting</p>	<p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence that the Alternate ACCESS assessment results are included in the publicly reported ELP results.

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 UTAH

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS4

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..... 6

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments.. 7

Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments..... 8

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS9

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development 9

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development 11

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration..... 12

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration 14

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security..... 15

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 16

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....17

Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content17

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Linguistic Processes..... 19

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 20

Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables..... 21

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER22

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability 22

Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility 24

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum 25

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 26

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 27

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment..... 28

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 29

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS30

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 30

Critical Element 5.2 – DOES NOT APPLY to ELP Assessment Peer Review32

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations 33

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.

..... 35

SECTION 6: ELP ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING37

Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of ELP Achievement Standards for All Students 37

Critical Element 6.2 – ELP Achievement Standards Setting 38

Critical Element 6.3 –Aligned ELP Achievement Standards 39

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting 40

SECTION 7: DOES NOT APPLY TO ELP ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW41

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR UTAH

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>No additional evidence needed</p>	<p>No additional evidence needed</p>
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</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"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR UTAH

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>For ELP standards: The ELP standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing; • address the different proficiency levels of ELs; and <p>align to the State academic content standards (see definition¹). 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.</p>	<p>e1.2.1 Utah Core State Standards for Science k_12. P 15</p> <p>e1.2.2 Common Core to Utah Core Standards Comparison for ELA</p>	<p>The State has provided evidence of science standards and ELA standards that are aligned with Common Core (e.1.2.1), though they have not provided any evidence related to mathematics.</p> <p>The State did not offer evidence that supports this critical element. See WIDA Review.</p>
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] <p>See WIDA Review.</p>		

¹ 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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR UTAH

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 <i>annual general and alternate ELP assessment</i> (aligned with State ELP standards) administered to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All ELs in grades K-12. 	Department staff note that the State’s evidence met the requirements for this critical element in the 2019 peer review.	NA
Section 1.3 Summary Statement		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR UTAH

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	Department staff note that the State’s evidence met the requirements for this critical element in the 2019 peer review.	NA
<p>Section 1.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR UTAH

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"> • State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education). • Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas). • Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State. • Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents. 	<p>Department staff note that the State’s evidence met the requirements for this critical element in the 2019 peer review.</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR UTAH

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"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <i>the State’s ELP standards</i>, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. • 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. • 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. • 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 	<p>e2.1.1 UT-ID-Placement-Guidance. P. 2-3 e2.1.2 Utah ESSA Plan. P. 19-20, 24-25, 76. e2.1.3 AccountabilityTechnicalManual. P. 18-20, 49-52 e2.1.4 Interpretive Guide for Score Reports2020 e2.1.5 ACCESS-Score-Reports-Parent-Guide2020 e2.1.6 Finding-Your-Students-Superpowers-Flyer</p>	<p>The State has provided evidence related to identification (2.1.1) and reclassification with a score of 5 (2.1.2). Additionally, they have provided some evidence related to the use of results (2.1.4, 2.1.5, 2.1.6). The peers did not see particular scores specific to UT to indicate different proficiency bands.</p> <p>The critical element was partially addressed, but additional evidence may be available in the WIDA review.</p> <p>See WIDA 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 UTAH

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.		
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
<input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or		
<input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: See WIDA 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 UTAH

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess student English language proficiency based on the <i>State’s ELP standards</i> in terms of content and language processes. 		
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR UTAH

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>e2.3.1 Board Rule R277_716. P. 3 e2.3.2 Test Administration Training Monitoring Example. P. 1 e2.3.3 ACCESS Test Administrator Agenda 2019. P. 1 e2.3.4 USBE Test Administration Training 2020. P. 1 e2.3.6 DRC Insight Technology User Guide. P. 127-150 e2.3.7 Technology Troubleshooting Guide. P. 1-3 e2.3.8 DRC Network Evaluation and Troubleshooting Guide. P. 2-3 e2.3.9 Test Administration Training Roster 12e2.5.1 e2.6.1 WIDA UTAH CONTRACT 2020 p. 21 WIDA Client Services Summary.9.20. P. 1</p>	<p>Evidence supports State implementation of policies and procedures for standardized test administration.</p> <p>E2.3.9 provided a list of individuals/district that participated in the training, documenting that training took place.</p> <p>Contingency plans are to call DRC and fill out a form (e.2.3.8), but a more local, immediate chain of contacts is necessary 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 UTAH

Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
<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">• Evidence that the State has a local contingency plan to address possible technology challenges during test administration.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR UTAH

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
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.	Department staff note that the State’s evidence met the requirements for this critical element in the 2019 peer review.	NA
Section 2.4 Summary Statement		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR UTAH

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. • Application of test security procedures to the general ELP assessments and the AELPA 	<p>e2.5.1 WIDA Client Services Summary. P. 1-3 e2.5.2 DRC Weekly Contact Log. P. 1-3 e2.5.3 Speaking Plagiarism Email to LEAs. P. 1 1.3.3. Testing Ethics Policy. P. 2-4</p>	<p>Processes are in place at the vendor level; however, the State needs to present evidence that pertains to prior to testing or during testing. A testing irregularity report from Caveon should be included. More evidence should be provided related to detection of test irregularities, remediation, and investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities at the local level.</p>
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</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"> • A testing irregularity report from Caveon • More evidence related to detection of test irregularities, remediation, and investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities at the local level. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR UTAH

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p>e2.6.1 WIDA UTAH CONTRACT 2020. P. 21-28</p>	<p>Most components for resubmission are addressed, at least minimally, in the indicated evidence.</p> <p>Detailed evidence is needed specific to how WIDA data are protected by the State, including who has access to WIDA data on a local level.</p>
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</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"> • Evidence as to how WIDA data are protected by the State, including who has access to WIDA data on a local level 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR UTAH

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><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"> • 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; • 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; • 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 		<p>The State did not offer evidence that supports this critical element. See WIDA 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 UTAH

determined in test design is appropriate for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.		
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
<input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or		
<input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:		
See WIDA 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 UTAH

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>The State did not offer evidence that supports this critical element. See WIDA Review.</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>See WIDA 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 UTAH

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s <i>ELP standards</i> on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>		<p>The State did not offer evidence that supports this critical element. See WIDA Review.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>See WIDA 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 UTAH

Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.		The State did not offer evidence that supports this critical element. See WIDA Review.
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>See WIDA 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 UTAH

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population (<i>for ELP assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable</i>); • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of <i>an EL’s English proficiency</i>. 		<p>The State did not offer evidence that supports this critical element. See WIDA 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 UTAH

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>See WIDA 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 UTAH

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 definition²).</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>The State did not offer evidence that supports this critical element. See WIDA Review.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>See WIDA Review.</p>		

² see page 28 of “*A State’s Guide to the U.S. Department of Education’s Assessment Peer Review Process*”, September 24, 2018 available at: www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR UTAH

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>The State did not offer evidence that supports this critical element. See WIDA Review.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>See WIDA 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 UTAH

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.³</p>		<p>The State did not offer evidence that supports this critical element. See WIDA Review.</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>See WIDA Review.</p>		

³ 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)

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR UTAH

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers multiple forms of <i>ELP assessments</i> within or across grade-spans, ELP levels, or school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s <i>ELP standards</i> and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across settings.</p>		<p>The State did not offer evidence that supports this critical element. See WIDA Review.</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>See WIDA 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 UTAH

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 		<p>The State did not offer evidence that supports this critical element. See WIDA Review.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>See WIDA 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 UTAH

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and • Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website. 	<p>e4.7.1 WIDA Year in Review 17-18 e4.7.2 USBE ELP Resources Website Screenshot</p>	<p>The evidence supports meeting the resubmission requirements to fulfill Critical Element 4.7.</p>
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</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"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR UTAH

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students⁴ 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"> • For ELP assessments, 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). 	<p>1.4.1 Utah's Participation and Accommodations Policy 2019-2020. P. 11, 17-18, 21, 24 1.4.3 Utah ESSA Consolidated State Plan. P. 76-77 e5.3.2 WIDA Less Than Four Domains Calculation Guidance</p>	<p>The evidence supports meeting the resubmission requirements to fulfill Critical Element 5.1.</p>

⁴ 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 UTAH

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<p data-bbox="176 293 1953 326"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p data-bbox="176 350 1953 383"><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul data-bbox="233 383 814 415" style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR UTAH

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"> Note: This critical element does not apply to ELP assessments, as the requirements only apply to the inclusion of ELs in academic assessments. 		
Section 5.2 Summary Statement		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR UTAH

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs; • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. • Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment. 	<p>e5.3.1 UT ACCESS checklist. P. 2 e5.3.2 WIDA Less Than Four Domains Calculation Guidance 1.4.3 Utah ESSA Consolidated State Plan. P. 76</p> <p>English Language Proficiency Assessment (WIDA Consortium) e5.3.1 UT ACCESS ELLs Online Checklist, p. 2 e5.3.2 WIDA Less Than Four Domains Calculation Guidance 1.4.3 Utah ESSA Consolidated State Plan, p. 76</p>	<p>The evidence supports meeting the resubmission requirements to fulfill Critical Element 5.3.</p>
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR UTAH

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"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR UTAH

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures; • Monitored for administrations of all required ELP assessments, and AELPA. 	<p>e5.4.1 Test Observation Email e5.4.2 USBE WIDA Observation Form. P. 4-5 e5.4.3 Test Administrator WIDA Observation Survey P. 2-3 e5.4.4 Administrator WIDA Assessment Observation Survey. P. 4 e5.4.5 ACCESS Data File Layout. P. 4-5</p>	<p>Though the State provides email evidence of a plan to conduct test observations, the number of recipients was very small. Evidence of a more systematic implementation of accommodations and their alignment between classroom usage and assessment implementation is necessary. Results from observation forms/survey are warranted. Additional evidence of the sampling plan used for observations, inclusive of the sample size, is required.</p>
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</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 UTAH

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a more systematic implementation of accommodations and their alignment between classroom usage and assessment implementation is necessary. • Results from observation forms/surveys are warranted. • Additional evidence of the sampling plan used for observations, inclusive of the sample size. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR UTAH

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><i>For ELP standards:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State adopted ELP achievement standards that address the different proficiency levels of ELs; • 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. 		<p>The State did not offer evidence that supports this critical element. See WIDA Review.</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] <p>See WIDA 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 UTAH

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"> • <i>ELP achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate ELP achievement standards</i>, such that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cut scores are developed for every grade/grade band, content domain/language domain, and/or composite for which proficiency-level scores are reported. • 		<p>See WIDA Review.</p>
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>See WIDA 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 UTAH

Critical Element 6.3 –Aligned ELP Achievement Standards

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For ELP achievement standards:</i> 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>The State did not offer evidence that supports this critical element. See WIDA Review.</p>
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>See WIDA 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 UTAH

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 <i>English language proficiency for all ELs including the number and percentage of ELs attaining ELP</i>.</p> <p>For the <i>ELP assessment</i>, 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"> • Reports the <i>ELs’ English proficiency</i> in terms of the State’s grade level/grade-band ELP standards (including performance-level descriptors); • Are provided in an understandable and uniform format; • Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian; • Upon request by a parent who is an 	<p>6.4.8 Utah School Report Card School Profile 6.4.9 Utah School Report Card School Performance 6.4.10 Data Gateway Screen Captures e6.4.3 Utah School Report Card EL Progress Details e6.4.4 School Report Card FAQ., P. 3 e6.4.5 Utah School Report Card Parent FAQ</p>	<p>The evidence supports meeting the resubmission requirements to fulfill Critical Element 6.4.</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 UTAH

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.		
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or <input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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.

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 ASSESSMENTS4

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 OPERATIONS11

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 – OTHER37

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 STUDENTS55

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 REPORTING64

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 REVIEW71

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For ELP standards:</i> The ELP standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing; • address the different proficiency levels of ELs; and • align to the State academic content standards (see definition¹). 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. 	<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>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</p> <p>For the State’s ELP standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Science 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>

¹ 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

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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>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
Section 1.2 Summary Statement		
<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">For the State’s ELP standards:</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 data-bbox="235 667 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 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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 <i>annual general and alternate ELP assessment</i> (aligned with State ELP standards) administered to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All ELs in grades K-12. 	Reviewed by Department Staff Only	Reviewed by Department Staff Only
Section 1.3 Summary Statement		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	Reviewed by Department Staff Only	Reviewed by Department Staff Only
Section 1.4 Summary Statement		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR 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"> • State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education). • Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas). • Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State. • Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents. 	<p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>	<p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR 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"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <i>the State’s ELP standards</i>, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. • 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. • 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. • 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 	<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 & Listening Item Difficulty Visualizations</p> <p>r2.1-5 ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Assessment Proficiency Level</p>	<p>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</p> <p>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that both assessments are aligned to the depth and breadth of the State's ELP standards, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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). <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 & 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>For ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the multi-stage adaptive administrations. <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"> • Evidence that proficiency determinations are made with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled. <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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess student English language proficiency based on the <i>State’s ELP standards</i> in terms of content and language processes. 	<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>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</p> <p>For ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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). <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>For Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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). <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>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</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>For 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

- 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"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>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>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</p> <p>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). <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"> • 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). <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>For ACCESS: 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>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</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>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). • 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). <p>For ACCESS:</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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
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
Section 2.4 Summary Statement		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. • Application of test security procedures to the general ELP assessments and the AELPA. 	<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>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</p> <p>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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"> 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. • Evidence of detection of test irregularities. • Evidence of remediation following any test security incidents. • Evidence of the investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities (e.g., forensic analysis and plans to address concerns). <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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p>r2.6-1 WIDA AMS Security and Confidentiality Agreement</p>	<p>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</p> <p>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). <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>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</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>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). • Policies and procedures to maintain secure student-level data that protect student privacy and confidentiality (e.g., guidelines for districts and schools). 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><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"> • 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; • 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; • 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 	<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>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</p> <p>For ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. <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"> ○ online and paper versions of ACCESS to the WIDA 2007 and 2012 ELP Standards ○ WIDA Standards to State Content Standards <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>For Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <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>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</p> <p>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <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.
Section 3.2 Summary Statement		
<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>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s <i>ELP standards</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>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</p> <p>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). <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>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</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>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the 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>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</p> <p>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables. <p 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>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</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>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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"> • 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>); • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of <i>an EL’s English proficiency</i>. 	<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>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</p> <p>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of test reliability, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Reliability by subgroups; o Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results; o Evidence that reliability statistics are used to inform ongoing maintenance and development. <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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<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"> • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of an EL's ELP. <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>For Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of reliability, including test information functions (TIFs) for overall composite scores. <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>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</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>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of test reliability, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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; o Evidence that reliability statistics are used to inform ongoing maintenance and development. 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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>For ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of an EL's ELP. <p>For Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of reliability, including test information functions (TIFs) for overall composite scores. 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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 definition²).</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 & Sensitivity Review Training</p> <p>r4.2-3 Comparison of DIF methods 10</p>	<p>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</p> <p>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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). <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>

² see page 28 of “*A State’s Guide to the U.S. Department of Education’s Assessment Peer Review Process*”, September 24, 2018 available at: www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR 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>For Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</p> <p>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <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

Section 4.3 Summary Statement		
<input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:		
For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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.³</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>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</p> <p>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <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>For ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of standardized scoring procedures and protocols that are designed to produce reliable and

³ 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)

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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>For Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the implementation of standardized scoring procedures and protocols (e.g., definitions of key terms and test administration and scoring procedures). <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.
Section 4.4 Summary Statement		
<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>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>For ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). <p>For Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the implementation of standardized scoring procedures and protocols (e.g., definitions of key terms and test administration and scoring procedures). 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers multiple forms of <i>ELP assessments</i> within or across grade-spans, ELP levels, or school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s <i>ELP standards</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>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</p> <p>For ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). <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>For Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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). <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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<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>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website. 	<p>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>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</p> <p>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State's website. <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>For Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system. <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

Section 4.7 Summary Statement		
<input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:		
For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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).		
For Alternate ACCESS:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence of a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students⁴ 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"> • For ELP assessments, 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). 	<p>2.2-16 <i>Accessibility and Accommodations Supplement</i></p>	<p>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</p> <p>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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) <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>

⁴ 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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<p data-bbox="176 324 1953 357">___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p data-bbox="176 381 1953 414">__X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p data-bbox="176 446 1953 479">For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul data-bbox="231 511 1921 568" style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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"> Note: This critical element does not apply to ELP assessments, as the requirements only apply to the inclusion of ELs in academic assessments. 		
Section 5.2 Summary Statement		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs; • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. • Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment. 	<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>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</p> <p>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the provided accommodations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student's need(s) to participate in the assessments. o Do not alter the construct being assessed. 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. <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"> • Evidence of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. <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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures; • Monitored for administrations of all required ELP assessments, and AELPA. 		<p>The CE requires state specific evidence to meet.</p>
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</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">• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR 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><i>For ELP standards:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State adopted ELP achievement standards that address the different proficiency levels of ELs; • 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. 		<p>The CE requires state specific evidence to meet.</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR 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"> • <i>ELP achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate ELP achievement standards</i>, such that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cut scores are developed for every grade/grade band, content domain/language domain, and/or composite for which proficiency-level scores are reported. 	<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>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</p> <p>For Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<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>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</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>For Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For ELP achievement standards:</i> 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>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</p> <p>For ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <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>For Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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>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>
Section 6.3 Summary Statement		
<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>For ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>For Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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 English language proficiency for all ELs including the number and percentage of ELs attaining ELP.</p> <p>For the ELP assessment, 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"> • Reports the ELs’ English proficiency in terms of the State’s grade level/grade-band ELP standards (including performance-level descriptors); • Are provided in an understandable and uniform format; • Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian; • Upon request by a parent who is an 	<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>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</p> <p>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • Evidence that student reports are, upon request by an individual with a disability, provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent. <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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</p>		<p>For Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that performance level descriptors are included on student score reports. <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>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</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>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • Evidence that student reports are, upon request by an individual with a disability, provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent. <p>For Alternate ACCESS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 		

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

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.