



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

September 20, 2022

The Honorable Kurt Steinhaus  
Secretary of Education  
New Mexico Public Education Department  
300 Don Gasper Avenue  
Santa Fe, NM 87501

Dear Secretary Steinhaus:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (Department's) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). I appreciate the efforts of the New Mexico Public Education Department (NMPED) to prepare for the peer review which occurred in March 2022.

State assessment systems provide essential information that States, districts, schools, 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, including students with disabilities and English learners. 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 NMPED's submission and the Department found, based on evidence received, that the components of New Mexico's ELP assessment system meet some but not all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of the ESEA. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own internal analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- General ELP assessment (ACCESS): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- Alternate ELP assessment (Alternate ACCESS): **Partially meets requirements of the ESEA.**

The list of items required for NMPED to submit is enclosed with this letter. **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA** means that the components of the State's General ELP assessment (ACCESS) meets most of the requirements of the statute and regulations, but some additional information is required. The Department expects that NMPED will likely be able to provide this additional information within one year.

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

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

**Partially meets requirements of the ESEA** means that the components of the State’s Alternate ELP assessment (Alternate ACCESS) does not meet many of the requirements of the statute and regulations and/or NMPED will need to provide substantial additional information to demonstrate that it meets the requirements. The Department expects that NMPED may need more than one year to submit all of the required information.

Because additional evidence is required, the Department is continuing the condition on the State’s Title I grant award related to those components of the assessment system. To satisfy this condition, NMPED must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. The condition will remain until all required 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 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.

I request that NMPED 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 NMPED to schedule the next peer review. Resubmission of the State’s documentation for peer review should occur once the State has all remaining evidence for a particular assessment component.

I also want to take this opportunity to review the peer review status of the other ESEA-required assessments administered by the State, based upon our current records:

- General assessments in reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics for high school (Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC)): Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.<sup>1</sup>
- Alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) in R/LA and mathematics for grades 3-8 and high school (National Center and State Collaborative/Multi-State Alternate Assessment (NCSC/MSAA)): Partially meets requirements of the ESEA.<sup>2</sup>

We are currently planning assessment peer reviews for winter 2023 (submission of documentation by January 6, 2023) and summer 2023 (submission of documentation by June 30, 2023). We look forward to meeting a mutually agreeable time to schedule peer reviews for any of the State’s assessment components where additional evidence is needed. Also, please remember that if NMPED makes significant changes to any of its assessments, the State must submit information about those changes to the Department for review and approval.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/nclbfinalassess/nm8.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/nclbfinalassess/nm7.pdf>

Thank you for your ongoing commitment to improving educational outcomes for all students. I appreciate the work you are doing to improve your schools and provide a high-quality education for your students. If you have any questions, please contact my staff at: [ESEA.Assessment@ed.gov](mailto:ESEA.Assessment@ed.gov).

Sincerely,

/s/

James F. Lane, Ed.D.  
Senior Advisor, Office of the Secretary  
Delegated the Authority to Perform the  
Functions and Duties of the Assistant Secretary  
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

cc: Lynn Vasquez, Director, Office of Assessment

**Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed for New Mexico’s Assessment System to Meet ESEA Requirements**

Critical Element	Evidence Needed
<b>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</b>	<p><b>For the State’s English language proficiency (ELP) standards:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s ELP standards align to the State’s academic content standards, specifically:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of completed standards-to-standards alignment studies of WIDA’s ELP standards and the language demands expected by the State’s culturally relevant standards in reading/language arts (R/LA) and science (including methods, findings, and timelines for addressing any findings).</li> <li>○ Evidence of timelines for addressing any findings in WIDA’s alignment studies between its ELP standards and the common core state standards (CCSS) in R/LA and mathematics and the next generation science standards (NGSS).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>1.3 – Required Assessments</b>	<p><b>For the Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s assessment system includes an annual alternate ELP assessment aligned with State ELP standards (e.g., evidence that the State has implemented Alternate ACCESS for kindergarten once it becomes available).</li> </ul>
<b>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</b>	<p><b>For the Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As noted in critical element 1.3, evidence that the State’s assessment system includes an annual alternate ELP assessment for kindergarten aligned with State ELP standards.</li> </ul>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b>	<p><b>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that measure the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards, and reflect appropriate inclusion of the range of complexity found in the standards, specifically:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence that the test blueprints include the number of items for each standard and subdomain.</li> <li>○ Evidence of a description of the item selection process for paper test forms that adheres to the test blueprints.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>2.2 – Item Development</b>	<p><b>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student ELP based on the State’s ELP standards in terms of content and language processes, specifically:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of the qualifications of item reviewers such as their grade levels taught, years of experience, and demographic diversity (for ACCESS only).</li> <li>○ Evidence that the item development process includes experts with knowledge of English learners (ELs) with significant cognitive disabilities and their grade levels taught, years of experience, and demographic diversity (for Alternate ACCESS only).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>2.5 – Test Security</b>	<p><b>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p>

Critical Element	Evidence Needed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results, specifically:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of how WIDA works with member States on follow-up investigations and how information is communicated to States, including, for ACCESS, a plan to address the test security findings.</li> <li>○ Evidence that school and district staff are being trained on how to detect test irregularities (e.g., with training records, attendance sheets) (for both assessments).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>For the Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of State policies and procedures to prevent and detect test irregularities (e.g., evidence of these policies both during test development and test administration to protect the integrity of the test given that it has remained unchanged for the past several years).</li> </ul>
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p>	<p><b>For the ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s assessment measures the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s ELP standards, specifically:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence that the completed WIDA alignment and correspondence studies are relevant to New Mexico given that its R/LA standards are a combination of the Common Core State Standards and a set of culturally relevant R/LA standards and its science standards are a combination of the Next Generation Science Standards and a set of culturally relevant science standards.</li> <li>○ Evidence of a plan to address any issues identified in the alignment and correspondence studies.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>For the Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s assessment measures the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s alternate ELP standards (e.g., evidence of a plan to address any issues identified in the alignment and linking studies).</li> </ul>
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></p>	<p><b>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessments tap the intended language processes appropriate for each grade-level/grade-band as represented in the State’s ELP standards, specifically:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence that items are reviewed based on the linguistic complexity of the vocabulary, graphics, and other content features of the items.</li> <li>○ Evidence that the panel reviewing the items include language development experts.</li> <li>○ Evidence that the State documents the reviewers’ judgments of the language processes being demonstrated by the items.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p>	<p><b>For the Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Evidence Needed
<p><b>4.1 - Reliability</b></p>	<p><b>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate reliability for the State’s assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of a plan to improve the consistency and accuracy of the assessments since the values are low in some cases (e.g., ACCESS listening domain grade one levels 2-5). (for both assessments).</li> <li>○ Evidence of a plan to address the precision of the test forms in speaking and writing across all proficiency levels which could eliminate the almost bimodal nature of the test information function (TIF) curves (for both assessments).</li> <li>○ Evidence that the new folders of items and tasks developed as a result of the annual refreshment plan have been included in the item bank (for ACCESS only).</li> <li>○ Evidence of adequate reliability for the State’s assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards (e.g., evidence of TIF for the overall assessment [for Alternate ACCESS only]).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b></p>	<p><b>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all ELs and fair across student groups, including ELs with disabilities, with respect to design, development, and analysis, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of completed differential item functioning (DIF) analyses based on disability status (for both assessments).</li> <li>○ Evidence of the role that universal design plays in the design, development, and analysis stages (for Alternate ACCESS only).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></p>	<p><b>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the ELP assessments provide an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum including performance for ELs with high and low levels of ELP and with different proficiency profiles across the domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Evidence requested for critical element 4.1 (Reliability) will satisfy this critical element.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p>	<p><b>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its ELP assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s ELP standards, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence that the State has adopted one of WIDA’s methods (or some other appropriate method) for calculating a student’s composite score in cases where the student’s disability precludes the student from taking all of the required domains including a rationale for selecting the scoring procedure.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Critical Element	Evidence Needed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of the State’s scoring procedures and protocols, including how paper test forms of the speaking test are monitored (e.g., evidence of remote or in-person observations of scoring).</li> </ul>
<p><b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b></p>	<p><b>For the ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence that the State ensures that all forms of the assessment adequately represent the State’s ELP standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across settings, specifically:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of an equating plan for the paper test forms of the listening and reading tests.</li> <li>○ Evidence of a rationale for using anchor item sets for the reading tests.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>For the Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence that the State ensures that all forms of the assessment adequately represent the State’s alternate ELP standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across settings (e.g., evidence of a plan for equating the test forms).</li> </ul>
<p><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></p>	<p><b>For the Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence that the State has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system (e.g., minutes from technical advisory committee meetings, evidence of the State’s established and clear criteria for analyzing the assessment system, a deliberative cycle for reviewing and updating the State’s assessment).</li> </ul>
<p><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p>	<p><b>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 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., completed work products or research studies to demonstrate that the provided accommodations are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, do not alter the construct being assessed, and allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations).</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b></p>	<p><b>For the Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence that, 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 (e.g., evidence of an official letter or email from the State Secretary of Education informing schools and districts of the formal adoption of alternate ELP achievement standards or meeting minutes describing the official adoption of alternate ELP achievement standards).</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b></p>	<p><b>For the Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence that the State used a technically sound method and process for setting ELP standards, such that cut scores are developed for every</li> </ul>



Critical Element	Evidence Needed
	<p>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>
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b></p>	<p><b>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has ensured that ELP assessment results are expressed in terms that are clearly aligned with the State’s ELP standards and its ELP performance-level descriptors (e.g., evidence of a clear description of the process used to develop the State’s ELP achievement standards so that it is clear, for example, that the State’s cut scores were set and performance level descriptors written to reflect the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards for each grade-level and grade-band).</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p>	<p><b>For the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State provides coherent and timely information about each student’s attainment of the State’s ELP standards to parents that are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian. Also, upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent, specifically:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence on how the State ensures that parents are informed about how to request an oral or written translation of assessment results (e.g., include this information on the State’s website for parents and districts, have materials that specify how parents can receive/request this information).</li> <li>○ Evidence that student reports can be provided to parents with disabilities (e.g., specify on the State’s website that assessment reports are ADA-compliant and/or provide a sample report that is ADA-compliant).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>For the Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State reports an EL student’s English proficiency in terms of the State’s grade-level/grade-band ELP standards including performance level descriptors (e.g., evidence that the individual student report includes performance level descriptors similar to what is done for ACCESS).</li> </ul>



U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## January-March 2021 State ELP Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA**

**Contents**

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

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

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

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

**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..... 9**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS ..... 10**

**Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development ..... 10**

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development ..... 11**

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

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration ..... 13**

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security..... 14**

**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..... 18**

**Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 18**

**Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables..... 19**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER..... 20**

**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability ..... 20**

**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility ..... 21**

**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum ..... 21**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 22**

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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..... 24**

**Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment ..... 25**

**Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance ..... 26**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS..... 28**

**Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 28**

**Critical Element 5.2 – DOES NOT APPLY to ELP Assessment Peer Review29**

**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations ..... 30**

**Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations  
..... 32**

**SECTION 6: ELP ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING ..... 33**

**Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of ELP Achievement Standards for All  
Students..... 33**

**Critical Element 6.2 – ELP Achievement Standards Setting ..... 34**

**Critical Element 6.3 –Aligned ELP Achievement Standards ..... 35**

**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting ..... 36**

**SECTION 7: DOES NOT APPLY TO ELP ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW ..... 65**

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR 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><b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

<sup>3</sup> see page 24 of “*A State’s Guide to the U.S. Department of Education’s Assessment Peer Review Process*”, September 24, 2018 available at: [www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html](http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html)

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA**

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

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><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>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><b>For the State’s ELP standards:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Science, evidence that the English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards contain language proficiency expectations that reflect the language needed for English Learners (ELs) to acquire and demonstrate their achievement of the knowledge and skills identified in the State’s academic content standards appropriate to each grade-level/grade-band.</li> <li>• For reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics, evidence of alignment of its current ELP standards to the State’s academic content standards, including a plan to address findings of the previous alignment study</li> </ul>		

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



## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA

### **Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
The State’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"> <li>• All ELs in grades K-12.</li> </ul>	Reviewed by Department Staff Only	Reviewed by Department Staff Only
<b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State has policies that require the inclusion <i>of all public elementary and secondary ELs in the State's ELP assessment</i>, including ELs with disabilities.</li> </ul>	Reviewed by Department Staff Only	Reviewed by Department Staff Only
<b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA**

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>If the State has developed or amended challenging <i>ELP</i> standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education).</li> <li>• Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas).</li> <li>• Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State.</li> <li>• Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents.</li> </ul>	<p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>	<p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA

### SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <i>the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards</i>, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <i>the State’s ELP standards</i>, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that the ELP assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <i>the State’s ELP standards</i> and reflects appropriate inclusion of the range of complexity found in the standards.</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and intended uses and interpretations of results.</li> <li>• If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting.</li> </ul>	<p>2.1-1 ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 Spring 2017 Interpretive Guide for Score Reports</p> <p>2.1-2 Annual Technical Report for ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 Online English Language Proficiency Test, Series 401, 2016–2017 Administration</p> <p>2.1-3 Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Spring 2017 Interpretive Guide for Score Reports 2.1-4 Annual Technical Report for ALTERNATE ACCESS for ELLs® English Language Proficiency Test, Series 103, 2015–2016 Administration 2.2-8 Alternate ACCESS Form 100 Test Specifications</p> <p>r2.1-1 Summary of ACCESS 2.0 Online Field Testing for Series 403 Listening and Reading</p> <p>r2.1-2 Folder Selection Graphs Listening 501</p> <p>r2.1-3 Folder Selection Graphs Reading 501</p> <p>r2.1-4 ACCESS for ELLs Series 402 Online Reading &amp; Listening Item Difficulty Visualizations</p> <p>r2.1-5 ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Assessment Proficiency Level Scores Standard Setting Project Report</p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that both assessments are aligned to the depth and breadth of the State's ELP standards, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Statement of the purposes and intended uses of results.</li> <li>o Test blueprints.</li> <li>o Processes to ensure that the ELP assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State's ELP standards and reflects appropriate inclusion of the range of complexity found in the standards (e.g., detail about the routing rules, detail of the item selection process for paper forms to ensure it adheres to the blueprint).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>General statements of the purposes and intended uses of results for ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS is found in documents 2.1-1 (p.3 &amp; 7-12) and 2.1-2 (p. 5); however, specific details like determinations of levels and the meaning and purpose of the levels are not provided. Identification of students who have attained EL proficiency (exit decisions) are mentioned in the technical report (2.2-1), but the description of the purpose does not include the richness of how this assessment is being used in the field provision of services, accommodations decision, etc.)</p> <p>WIDA needs to provide more structure with regard to usage and intended purposes. The original peer notes state: <i>“Because decision rules vary by state, states will need to address how the scores are used and interpreted for their students.”</i> It is still unclear how the states address this.</p> <p>Document 2.1-2 (p. 22) describes a process to create test maps and blueprints to ensure that all folders are aligned to</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>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>the proper WIDA Standard and properly organized by WIDA Standard and tier in the test maps. The peers did not find a clear test blueprint that specified how the assessment is constructed to represent the breadth and depth of the standards, and the cognitive complexity.</p> <p>As specified in the critical element, the blueprints should support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. The current evidence does not support how the test is constructed with regard to the 8 scores on the student reports.</p> <p>Typically, minimum/maximum number of items in each standard/subdomain is included in the blueprint.</p> <p>It was unclear how the five standards are taken and turned into the four subscales.</p> <p>The issues identified by the peers were the same for ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS. Additionally, there were two issues identified below for ACCESS.</p> <p><b>For ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the multi-stage adaptive administrations.</li> </ul> <p>R2.1-1 there is not an explanation for or justification of the negative item difficulties on stage 7. For example, Reading Grades 2-3 Stage 9 has a higher average item difficulty than Stage 10. Another example is item 28 stated item difficulty is out of the typical range. Peers had questions as to the average item difficulty across stages and grade spans. The submitted evidence requires more explanation to allow the peers to understand if the submitted evidence meets the critical element.</p>
---	--	---

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA**

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

**Section 2.1 Summary Statement**

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

**For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:**

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

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA**

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

**Section 2.2 Summary Statement**

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

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

**For Alternate ACCESS:**

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

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA

### **Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities;</li> <li>• If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p>2.3-1 ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 2016-2017 Test Administrator Manual</p> <p>r2.3-1 ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Overview for Test Coordinators</p> <p>r2.3-2 Technology User Guide</p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of established communication to educators of clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations (e.g., guidelines or recommended qualifications of test administrators including volunteers, training of volunteers, and qualifications and training for the human providers of accommodations).</li> </ul> <p>2.3-1 provides evidence for the dissemination and implementation of standardized test administration policies and procedures to familiarize Test Coordinators with the components of the ACCESS (pp. 1-139)</p> <p>Document r2.3-1 provides evidence of procedures to familiarize Test Coordinators with the components of the ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 test, Training Requirements and Resources, Test Preparation Resources, and Coordinating the Grades 1-12 online and paper tests.</p> <p>The peers did not find evidence regarding guidelines for individuals who are actually administering the assessment and for individuals who provide accommodations.</p> <p>2.3-1 (p. 11) indicates that all test administrators must complete training, but the peers did not find the requirements for test administrators or the accommodation providers (e.g., Must the individuals be certified? . Can other school staff be used? . . .non-employees or volunteers). If this varies by state, each state should provide</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>evidence regarding who can administer the assessment and provide accommodations.</p> <p>The peers did not find information about whether volunteers are allowed (the peers DO NOT recommend the use of volunteers); but, if they are allowed, information needs to be provided about how communication is provided for them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instruction support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities (e.g., content of training modules, evidence that training is required for test administrators and evidence of participation in such training).</li> </ul> <p>2.3-1 provides evidence of standardized test administration policies and procedures to familiarize Test Coordinators with the components of the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS (pp. 140-165). The peers did not find evidence regarding how the consortia ensures that the individuals who administer the assessment are properly trained (e.g., training rosters, percentage of test administrators who were properly trained, a description of the process for reviewing the training of the test administrators), as well as a plan for addressing any issues identified.</p> <p><b>For ACCESS:</b> Evidence of established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</p> <p>R2.4-1 is a troubleshooting guide that helps, but it does not provide the level guidance necessary to ensure smooth</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>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>
--	--	--

**Section 2.3 Summary Statement**

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

**For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:**

- 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).

**For ACCESS:**

Evidence of established comprehensive contingency plans to address possible technology challenges and other catastrophic events 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 WIDA**

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general ELP assessments and the AELPA.	Reviewed by Department Staff Only	Reviewed by Department Staff Only
<b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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



## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA

### Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security

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"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> <li>• Application of test security procedures to the general ELP assessments and the AELPA.</li> </ul>	<p>2.3-7 2018-2019 Test Policy Handbook for State Education Agencies</p> <p>r2.5-1 Caveon Web Patrol Health Check and Key Insights</p> <p>r2.5-2 Caveon Test Security Audit Report for WIDA</p> <p>r2.5-3 Caveon Data Forensics Report</p> <p>r2.5-4 WIDA Psychometric Research Plan on Data Forensics</p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of policies and procedures that prevent assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Specifically, evidence for Alternate ACCESS of policies and procedures to protect the integrity of the test given that the test form is unchanged for the past several years.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence of detection of test irregularities.</li> <li>• Evidence of remediation following any test security incidents.</li> <li>• Evidence of the investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities (e.g., forensic analysis and plans to address concerns).</li> </ul> <p>WIDA has contracted the services of a test security vendor (Caveon) to help prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results. Evidence is not provided that the Caveon services and audits included the Alternate ACCESS.</p> <p>It is good that WIDA has contracted with a test security organization. However, security audits and the other submitted evidence do not address this critical element. This critical element requires evidence of “policies and procedures...”</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>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.
  - 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 (e.g., failure to provide accommodations, documentation of how test irregularities are reported).
- Evidence of remediation following any test security incidents.
- Evidence of the investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results;</li> <li>• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>• To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul>	<p>r2.6-1 WIDA AMS Security and Confidentiality Agreement</p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies and procedures to protect the integrity of test-related data in test administration (e.g., how data are protected by all parties, including during handoffs).</li> </ul> <p>The online WIDA AMS Security and Confidentiality Agreement (r2.6-1) is a one-page form that provides evidence of general procedures that approved users must follow when handling data. This agreement specifies that users must follow FERPA; however, actual policies on which the Agreement is based were not provided and there is not a full description of the procedures. Other than the use of passwords, there is no evidence regarding rules and procedures for secure transfer of student-level data (e.g., encryption).</p> <p>It is unclear which assessments the security and confidentiality agreement provided as evidence (r2.6.1) applied to. Does it apply to both the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS?</p> <p>Policies and procedures to maintain secure student-level data that protect student privacy and confidentiality (e.g., guidelines for districts and schools).</p> <p>The provided evidence does not fully respond to the original request based on the peer review. Specifically, there is not a discussion or documentation of the procedures in place to ensure the data is protected. For example, the process of passing student data from testing device to the servers scoring and storing data. When reports are being created, what are the technical methods being</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>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>
--	--	---

### **Section 2.6 Summary Statement**

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

**For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:**

- 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"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s ELP assessment and the ELP standards the assessment is designed to measure in terms of language knowledge and skills, the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards, across all proficiency levels, domains, and modalities identified therein;</li> <li>• Documentation of alignment (as defined) between the State’s ELP standards and the language demands implied by, or explicitly stated in, the State’s academic content standards;</li> <li>• If the State administers an AELPA aligned with alternate ELP achievement standards, the assessment shows adequate linkage to the State’s ELP standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and that the breadth of content and linguistic complexity determined in test design is</li> </ul>	<p>r3.1-1 Executive Committee Notes – 3/3/20</p> <p>r3.1-2 Alternate ACCESS and Alternate Model Performance Indicator Alignment Studies Report</p> <p>r3.1-3 Draft Alternate Can Do Descriptors</p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State's ELP assessment and the ELP standards the assessment is designed to measure in terms of language knowledge and skills and the depth and breadth of the State's ELP standards across all proficiency levels, domains, and modalities identified therein.</li> <li>• Documentation of alignment between the State's ELP standards and the language demands implied by, or explicitly stated in, the State's academic content standards.</li> </ul> <p>Due to the pandemic, planned alignment studies have not yet taken place. r3.1-1 (p. 5) provides evidence of alignment studies tentatively set for the spring/summer of 2021, including an alignment study of the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ online and paper versions of ACCESS to the WIDA 2007 and 2012 ELP Standards</li> <li>○ WIDA Standards to State Content Standards</li> </ul> <p>The proposed alignment study only appears to address part of the issues found in the original peer review. The proposed study should give evidence of alignment between the assessment and the consortium’s developed standards, there is no guarantee the state has adopted the WIDA standards as their ELP standards. Caution must be used to ensure that the alignment study applies to the state when being considered during a state review. Consideration must be given to states that have modified CCSS as their content</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>appropriate for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>		<p>standards to ensure the ELP standards meet the language demands of the adopted state content standards.</p> <p>Documentation should also be provided that explicitly lays out how independence in the alignment study was maintained (given the alignment study will be conducted by an affiliated organization - WCEPS).</p> <p><b>For Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of adequate linkage to the State's ELP standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and that the breadth of content and linguistic complexity determined in test design is appropriate for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities</li> </ul> <p>The alignment between the alternate assessment, and the 2007 and 2012 standards gives a lot of flex in the alignment since the consortium is not clearly stating a single set of standards. It is also worthy of note that the newest of those standards were updated 8 years ago.</p> <p>R3.1-2 documents the alignment study conducted between 1) the Alternate ACCESS and the Model performance indicators and 2) the alternate (APIs) and model performance indicators (MPIs). Page 11 in the summary provides the criteria for the study. On page 26, there is a discussion of the findings. Specifically, none of the alt ACCESS assessments include writing tasks related to the math strand. It seems like this is an alignment issue if the assessment is supposed to measure all the standards across the language proficiency levels. Results were mixed (pp. 24-26). For example, the alignment study found that “the Alternate ACCESS was “acceptably aligned,” to WIDA’s AMPIs”, while the linking study “did not identify AMPIs linked to WIDA’s language of Social Studies Standards.” Results will be used to support ongoing maintenance and new Alternate ACCESS item development (p. 26).</p>
---	--	---

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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>Document r3.1-3 provides evidence of draft Alternate Can Do Descriptors created at a 2019 WIDA’s national, 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:**

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA

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

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

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA**

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

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><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of the assessments are consistent with the subdomain structures of the State's ELP standards (e.g., an explanation of how the included statistical analyses relate to the validity framework for the assessments).</li> </ul> <p>The studies in R3.3-1 and 3.3-1 are appreciated and do explore the higher-level structures. The CE requires evidence that the 4 domains being scored are separate domains and not repeatedly scoring the same domain or a significantly overlapping domain multiple times. The structural equation models (SEM) analysis presented does not clearly speak to the issue and does not provide an explanation of how the study is evidence of 4 separate domains scored separately in the 4 sub-scores. The exploratory factor analysis indicates the presence of one strong factor with some overlap between the next two factors. The reporting and use of subscores for instructional decisions is not supported by the evidence provided.</p>

**Section 3.3 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 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

**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><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>ACCESS</u></p> <p>The new study (r3.4-1) was helpful and provides evidence of relationships between ACCESS and the WIDA screener. It provides evidence that scores on Screener provide an initial measure of a student’s academic English language proficiency (p. 5), are strongly predictive of ACCESS scores.</p> <p>3.4-8 provides limited evidence and predates the current WIDA assessment (study date is 2006).</p> <p>3.4-9 (page 220) shows the results of a structural equation model (SEM) indicating relationships to math achievement (criterion validity). This relationship could indicate a problematic issue with the measure because high correlations between varying disciplines could indicate measuring the wrong construct. Year of study is unknown. Because WIDA has gone through so many iterations of its standards, it was difficult to know which set of standards was being studied.</p> <p>Studies showing how the ACCESS scores are correlated to screener scores or other EL assessments does not provide the necessary evidence. The evidence needs to show that students who score higher on ACCESS also perform better on (for example) state ELA content assessments. The studies need to be performed using a current set of 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>assessments. The point of this CE is to provide valid evidence supporting the assertion that the ACCESS assessments are measuring the ELP constructs in ways that impact student performance on related measures.</p> <p>Like many CE's this evidence is easier to provide and develop if there is a strong relationship between the assessments, the content standards, and a Theory of Action. This relationship becomes the foundation for the validity argument (theory).</p> <p align="center"><u>Alternate ACCESS</u></p> <p>No evidence was submitted for this type of validity for the Alternate ACCESS.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables (e.g., relationship between ACCESS scores and other linguistic measures).</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population (<i>for ELP assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable</i>);</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of <i>an EL’s English proficiency</i>.</li> </ul>	<p>2.1-2 Annual Technical Report for ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 Online English Language Proficiency Test, Series 401, 2016–2017 Administration</p> <p>2.1-4 Annual Technical Report for ALTERNATE ACCESS for ELLs® English Language Proficiency Test, Series 103, 2015–2016 Administration</p> <p>2.1-5 Annual Technical Report for ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 Paper English Language Proficiency Test, Series 401, 2016–2017 Administration</p> <p>2.1-6 Annual Technical Report for ALTERNATE ACCESS for ELLs® English Language Proficiency Test, Series 403, 2018–2019 Administration</p> <p>r4.1-1 Annual Technical Report for ACCESS for ELLs® 2.0 Paper English Language Proficiency Test, Series 403, 2018–2019 Administration</p> <p>r4.1-5 Annual Technical Report for ALTERNATE ACCESS for ELLs® English Language Proficiency Test, Series 403, 2018-2019 Administration</p> <p>r4.1-6 Using Multistage Testing to Enhance Measurement of an English Language</p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of test reliability, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Reliability by subgroups;</li> <li>o Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>o Evidence that reliability statistics are used to inform ongoing maintenance and development.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>For ACCESS, WIDA’s latest editions of the Annual Technical Report (2018-2019) provides evidence of subgroup test reliability by gender, ethnicity and IEP status for the online test (r4.1-2, pp. 2-289 to 2-295) and the paper test (r4.1-4, pp. 2-411 to 2-418). The peers would recommend looking at reliability by home language and SES.</p> <p>For ACCESS, WIDA’s latest editions of the Annual Technical Report (2018-2019) provides a) evidence of overall indices related to the accuracy and consistency of classification, as well as Cohen’s kappa; b) accuracy and consistency information conditional on proficiency level, and c) indices of classification accuracy, including the false-positives and the false-negatives, and consistency at the cut points for the online test (r4.1-2, pp. 2-316 to 2-341, and the paper test (r4.1-4, pp. 2-437 to 2-466).</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA**

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 information function is not always highest at the upper levels of the PLs (see r4.1-2 page 277-279). Also, accuracy and consistency measures for some composite scores and domains appeared low (see for example r4.1-2 p. 2-138).</p> <p>The provided evidence does not fulfill the request from the initial peer review and does not support the assertion that the assessments being reviewed met this CE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of an EL’s ELP.</li> </ul> <p>According to the WIDA submission notes: “Each year in April and May, WIDA and its test development vendor (Center for Applied Linguistics) establish an annual refreshment plan for ACCESS for ELLs. The purpose of this plan is to identify slots within the multi-stage adaptive design where new folders of items and tasks should be developed. WIDA commits to consistently target high PL Listening items over</p>

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>the course of the next two to three years, until the gaps in the item pool are filled. This plan will assist in deepening the pool of items that appropriately target PLs 5 and 6 on Listening.” The peers would like to see evidence that items at the various levels were actually produced and put into the bank.</p> <p><b>For Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of reliability, including test information functions (TIFs) for overall composite scores.</li> </ul> <p>R4.1-5 provides TIFs for the alternate ACCESS but the results were not compelling as evidence of the reliability of the assessment. In particular, peers noted that the cut scores are not in typical locations for a TIF curve. Further explanation or an action plan would be needed for this evidence to become sufficient.</p> <p>R4.1-5 provides TIFs for the four domains but not for the overall test. The peers would like to see this evidence.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of test reliability, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Acceptable consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results, or a plan to improve the consistency and accuracy;</li> <li>o Evidence that reliability statistics are used to inform ongoing maintenance and development.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>For ACCESS:</b></p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA

**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility**

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

<sup>4</sup> see page 28 of “*A State’s Guide to the U.S. Department of Education’s Assessment Peer Review Process*”, September 24, 2018 available at: [www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html](http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html)

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA**

		<p>ACCESS by gender and ethnicity (students of Hispanic ethnic background versus students of non-Hispanic ethnic background). The focus on Hispanic students (and not additional racial/ethnic groups) is a limitation of the study.</p> <p>Evidence provided of bias and sensitivity review training and checklists (r4.2-1 and 2).</p> <p>The peers could not find information about Universal Design during item development and review for the ACCESS or Alternate ACCESS. Nor was there in any discussion of methods used to ensure equal access of ELs with disabilities who have different needs and characteristics (r2.2-1).</p> <p>The peers typically see evidence for this CE that includes the number of items flagged for bias and the results of the bias review for these items.</p> <p><b>For Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all EL students and fair across student groups, including ELs with disabilities, in their design, development, and analysis, guidance and instructions on appropriate instructional supports that can be used during the assessment, particularly for Braille and alternate modes of communication.</li> </ul> <p>Alternate ACCESS appears not to meet federal requirements. The WIDA response states that “Alternate ACCESS is not provided in Braille or any alternate mode of communication.”</p>
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA

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

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA

### Section 4.3 Summary Statement

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

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

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

<sup>5</sup> See full reference in regulation, 34 CFR § 200.6(h)(4)(ii) (online at [https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=07e168e9e7a6c5931b4549cc15547ee9&mc=true&node=se34.1.200\\_16&rgn=div8](https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=07e168e9e7a6c5931b4549cc15547ee9&mc=true&node=se34.1.200_16&rgn=div8) )

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA**

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

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA

<b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence that if an EL has a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains/components (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) because there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected domain(s)/component(s), the State ensures that the student is assessed in the remaining domain(s)/component(s) in which it is possible to assess the student, including a description of how this will occur.</li></ul> <p><b>For ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence of standardized scoring procedures and protocols that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State's ELP standards (e.g., evidence that the scoring of speaking items on the paper form of the test is monitored).</li></ul> <p><b>For Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence of the implementation of standardized scoring procedures and protocols (e.g., definitions of key terms and test administration and scoring procedures).</li></ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA**

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

**Section 4.5 Summary Statement**

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

**For ACCESS:**

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

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

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p>r4.6-1 Exploring Scoring Discrepancies in ACCESS Writing Assessments: Why do handwritten responses score higher than keyboard responses? (Poster)</p> <p>4.6-6 Series 400 ACCESS Paper and Online Comparability Report</p> <p>r4.6-2 Draft comparability report ACCESS501 effect size graph</p>	<p>This CE was met in the initial submission</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA

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

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

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA

### Section 4.7 Summary Statement

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

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

- 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:**

- 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 students<sup>6</sup> with disabilities in the State’s assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>For ELP assessments</b>, policies that require the inclusion of an EL with a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) such that there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected component (the State must assess the student’s English language proficiency based on the remaining components in which it is possible to assess the student).</li> </ul>	<p>2.2-16 <i>Accessibility and Accommodations Supplement</i></p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of policies that require the inclusion of an EL with a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains (i.e., ensuring that the student will be assessed based on the remaining components in which it is possible to assess the student)</li> </ul> <p>Document 2.2-16 (p. 4) provides evidence of the participation expectations for all ELs with disabilities. WIDA’s accessibility supplement/manual is in process of being revised. This evidence was insufficient during the previous peer review and it is still insufficient. There needs to be evidence of a clear policy requiring students to take as many domains as they are capable of participating in, and a procedure for producing an overall score based on the domains assessed. The WIDA response indicates that a revised accessibility supplement/manual will be released in Fall, 2021, but the delay caused students in 2020 to lack the inclusion that these guidelines would allow.</p> <p>According to WIDA response (p. 26), “Alternate ACCESS is not provided in Braille or any alternate mode of communication.”</p> <p>Evidence was not sufficient to meet this CE.</p>

<sup>6</sup> For ELP peer review, this refers to ELs with disabilities.

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p data-bbox="130 298 1904 332">___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p data-bbox="130 358 1904 393">__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p data-bbox="130 423 1904 457"><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul data-bbox="191 483 1904 548" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of policies that require the inclusion of an EL with a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains (i.e., ensuring that the student will be assessed based on the remaining components in which it is possible to assess the student).</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note: This critical element does not apply to ELP assessments, as the requirements only apply to the inclusion of ELs in <b><u>academic assessments</u></b>.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures;</li> <li>• Monitored for administrations of all required ELP assessments, and AELPA.</li> </ul>		<p>The CE requires state specific evidence to meet.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ 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	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li></ul>		

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA**

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

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA

**Critical Element 6.2 – ELP Achievement Standards Setting**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM), a content assessment for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities used in several WIDA states. Findings from the study showed that the Alternate ACCESS overall composite proficiency level of P2 (Emerging) best indicates that a student will receive an At Target or Advanced performance level on DLM ELA, mathematics and science assessments (p. 16). The study presented is interesting, however it appears DLM assigns performance levels against grade level standards, not a single standard across multiple grade levels. This is a reclassification study, not a standard setting study.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>For Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State used a technically sound method and process for setting ELP achievement standards, such that cut scores are developed for every grade/grade band, content domain/language domain, and/or composite for which proficiency-level scores are reported.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA

**Critical Element 6.3 – Aligned ELP Achievement Standards**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p><i>ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</i></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**

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

**For ACCESS:**

- 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.

**For Alternate ACCESS:**

- 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 <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"> <li>• Reports the <i>ELs’ English proficiency</i> in terms of the State’s grade level/grade-band ELP standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>• Are provided in an understandable and uniform format;</li> <li>• Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian;</li> <li>• Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined</li> </ul>	<p>6.4-3 ALTERNATE ACCESS for ELLs SPRING 2018 Interpretive Guide for Score Reports Grades 1-12</p> <p>r6.4-1 ADI-PPT-Notes-10.25.19, See pp.15, 16, 24-26.</p> <p>r6.4-2 LEA-Notes-12.11.19, See pp. 4, 5.</p> <p>r6.4-3 ADI-Notes-12.19.19, See p.1.</p>	<p><b>The blue text is the additional evidence requested by previous peer reviewers.</b></p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State's reporting of assessment results facilitates timely interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</li> <li>• Evidence that the State provides coherent and timely information about each student's attainment of the State's ELP standards to parents that are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian.</li> <li>• Evidence that student reports are, upon request by an individual with a disability, provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> </ul> <p>The provided response contains no evidence that WIDA facilitates timely interpretations and use of results nor provides coherent and timely information about each student’s attainment of the ELP standards which were two of the three critical evidences requested for this CE.</p> <p>There is no evidence submitted regarding the availability of a student’s assessment information in an alternative format upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability.</p> <p>These aspects of this critical element will need to be addressed by states if the consortium does not provide evidence of meeting this CE.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</p>		<p><b>For Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that performance level descriptors are included on student score reports.</li> </ul> <p>Document 2.1-3 (p. 21) provides evidence that Alternate ACCESS English language proficiency (performance) levels for the productive and receptive language domains are included on the Alternate ACCESS Individual Student Report.</p> <p>The Alternate ACCESS ISR included additional subscales that are not the four domains. These subscales do not appear to have been included in the initial peer review and the peers are concerned that there is not sufficient evidence of reliability and validity nor are there standards set for these subscales.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State's reporting of assessment results facilitates timely interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</li> <li>• Evidence that the State provides coherent and timely information about each student's attainment of the State's ELP standards to parents that are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian.</li> <li>• Evidence that student reports are, upon request by an individual with a disability, provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> </ul> <p><b>For Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Due to the new evidence submitted for this review, it appears the original review lacked information on the three subscales that appear on the Alternate ACCESS ISR. An explanation of the three subscales including validity, standards, reliability, standard setting etc. needs to be provided.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA**

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

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

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



U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## January-May 2022 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 New Mexico

Contents

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

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

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

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

**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**..... 9

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS ..... 10

**Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development** ..... 10

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development** ..... 11

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

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration** ..... 13

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security**..... 14

**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 Content**17

**Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Linguistic Processes**..... 18

**Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure**..... 18

**Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables**..... 19

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER..... 20

**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability** ..... 20

**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility** ..... 21

**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum** ..... 21

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring**..... 22

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 24**

**Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment ..... 25**

**Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance ..... 26**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS..... 28**

**Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 28**

**Critical Element 5.2 – DOES NOT APPLY to ELP Assessment Peer Review29**

**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations ..... 30**

**Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations  
..... 32**

**SECTION 6: ELP ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING ..... 33**

**Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of ELP Achievement Standards for All  
Students..... 33**

**Critical Element 6.2 – ELP Achievement Standards Setting ..... 34**

**Critical Element 6.3 –Aligned ELP Achievement Standards ..... 35**

**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting ..... 36**

**SECTION 7: DOES NOT APPLY TO ELP ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW ..... 65**

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico

**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 requested.</p>	<p>No additional evidence requested.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico

**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><b>For ELP standards:</b> The ELP standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing;</li> <li>address the different proficiency levels of ELs; and</li> </ul> <p>align to the State academic content standards (see definition<sup>7</sup>). The ELP standards must contain language proficiency expectations that reflect the language needed for ELs to acquire and demonstrate their achievement of the knowledge and skills identified in the State’s academic content standards appropriate to each grade-level/grade-band in at least reading/language arts, mathematics, and science.</p>	<p><b><u>New Mexico-Specific Evidence:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>NM_ELP 1.2.a – New Mexico-Specific Content Standards for Science.pdf</i> ○</li> </ul>	<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested:</b> For the State’s ELP standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For science, evidence that the ELP standards 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.</li> </ul> <p><b>Science:</b> The evidence provided by the State does not meet this criterion because language proficiency expectations are not provided to demonstrate the achievement of knowledge and skills in the State’s academic content standards for science.</p> <p>Peer reviewers suggest that the State should provide the following evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State has adopted the same set of academic content standards that WIDA is using for their alignment studies (i.e., NGSS). The State might refer to its general science submission for this evidence.</li> <li>Report of the science alignment study (including methods, findings, and a timeline to address the findings) that covers both standards added by the State (NM_ELP 1.2.a) and a comprehensive set of NGSS adopted by the State.</li> </ul>
	<p><b><u>New Mexico-Specific Evidence:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>NM_ELP 1.2.b – New Mexico-Specific Content Standards for ELA.pdf</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics, evidence of alignment of its current</li> </ul>

<sup>7</sup> see page 24 of “A State’s Guide to the U.S. Department of Education’s Assessment Peer Review Process”, September 24, 2018 available at: [www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html](http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html)

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p align="center">ELP standards to the State’s academic content standards, including a plan to address findings of the previous alignment study.</p> <p><u>Math/EL</u>                      The evidence provided by the State does not meet this criterion because language proficiency expectations are not provided to demonstrate the achievement of knowledge and skills in the State’s academic content standards for reading, language arts, and math.</p> <p>Peer reviewers suggest that the State should provide the following evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has adopted the same set of academic content standards that WIDA is using for their alignment studies (i.e., CCSS). The State might refer to its general reading, language arts, and math submission for this evidence.</li> <li>• Report of the reading, language arts, and math alignment study (including methods, findings, and a timeline to address the findings) that covers both standards added by the State (NM_ELP 1.2.b) and a comprehensive set of CCSS adopted by the State.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of the adoption of academic content standards that WIDA is using for their alignment studies (i.e., CCSS, NGSS).</li> <li>• Report of the science alignment study (including methods, findings, and a timeline to address the findings) that covers both standards added by the State (NM_ELP 1.2.a) and a comprehensive set of NGSS adopted by the State.</li> <li>• Report of the reading, language arts, and math alignment study (including methods, findings, and a timeline to address the findings) that covers both standards added by the State (NM_ELP 1.2.b) and a comprehensive set of CCSS adopted by the State.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico**

**Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s assessment system includes an <i>annual general and alternate ELP assessment</i> (aligned with State ELP standards) administered to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All Els in grades K-12.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Required Assessments</b></p> <p>In a previous assessment peer review, New Mexico was asked to provide additional evidence that the alternate ELP assessment (Alternate ACCESS) is available in kindergarten.</p> <p>WIDA does not currently have a kindergarten version of Alternate ACCESS. The Department awarded Minnesota a Competitive Grant for State Assessments (CGSA) in 2019 to develop a kindergarten version of the WIDA Alternate ACCESS. New Mexico is participating in this project, which aims to administer a kindergarten alternate ELP assessment in the 2023-2024 school year.</p> <p>The State must provide evidence that it has implemented Alternate ACCESS for kindergarten once the assessment becomes available.</p>

**Section 1.3 Summary Statement**

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

For the Alternate ACCESS:

- Evidence that the State’s assessment system includes an annual alternate ELP assessment aligned with State ELP standards (e.g., evidence that the State has implemented Alternate ACCESS for kindergarten once it becomes available).

**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"> <li>The State has policies that require the inclusion of <i>all public elementary and secondary Els in the State’s</i></li> </ul>		<p><b>Including All Students in Assessments</b></p> <p>In a previous assessment peer review, New Mexico was asked to “see critical element 1.3” regarding Alternate</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 New Mexico**

<p><i>ELP assessment</i>, including Els with disabilities.</p>		<p>ACCESS. No additional evidence was requested for ACCESS.</p> <p>New Mexico still does not yet have an Alternate ACCESS assessment for kindergarten. Therefore, this critical element still applies as well.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As noted in critical element 1.3, evidence that the State’s assessment system includes an annual alternate ELP assessment for kindergarten aligned with State ELP standards.</li> </ul>		

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico**

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>If the State has developed or amended challenging <i>ELP</i> standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education).</li> <li>• Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas).</li> <li>• Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State.</li> <li>• Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents.</li> </ul>		<p>This critical element was met in the 2019 assessment peer review.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <i>the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards</i>, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <i>the State’s ELP standards</i>, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that the ELP assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <i>the State’s ELP standards</i> and reflects appropriate inclusion of the range of complexity found in the standards.</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and intended uses and interpretations of results.</li> <li>• If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the</li> </ul>	<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested:</b> See the WIDA Consortium submission.</p>	<p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b> See the WIDA Consortium submission.</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 New Mexico**

student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting. If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be <i>entirely</i> administered through a portfolio.		
<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>		
___ No additional evidence is required or  ___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

**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"> <li>• Assess student English language proficiency based on the <i>State’s ELP standards</i> in terms of content and language processes.</li> </ul>	<b>Additional Evidence Requested:</b> See the WIDA Consortium submission.	<b>For ACCESS:</b> See the WIDA Consortium submission.
<b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b>		
___ No additional evidence is required or  ___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico**

**Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of EIs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities;</li> <li>• If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p>No additional evidence requested.</p>	<p>No additional evidence requested.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico**

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general ELP assessments and the AELPA.</p>		<p>This critical element was met in the 2019 assessment peer review.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico

**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"> <li>Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> <li>Application of test security procedures to the general ELP assessments and the AELPA.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>New Mexico-Specific Evidence:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>NM_ELP 2.5.a – WIDA Site Technology Readiness Checklist.pdf</i></li> <li><i>NM_ELP 2.5.b – Technology Troubleshooting 21-22.pdf</i></li> <li><i>NM_ELP 2.5.c – 2021-2022 DTC Manual.pdf</i></li> <li><i>NM_ELP 2.5.d – 2021-2022 Testing Irregularities Supplemental Resource 2021-2022.pdf</i></li> <li><i>NM_ELP 2.5.e – Intermittent Issues During ACCESS Online Testing.pdf</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested:</b> For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of policies and procedures that prevent assessment irregularities (e.g., challenges related to technology-based assessments including hardware, software, internet connectivity, and internet access).</li> </ul> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b> The evidence provided by the State is sufficient for addressing the requested policies and procedures for technology-based assessments.</p>
	<p><b><u>New Mexico-Specific Evidence:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>NM_ELP 2.5.f – NM Test Security Training 2014.pdf</i></li> <li><i>NM_ELP 2.5.g – NM Test Security Training 2022.pdf</i></li> <li><i>NM_ELP 2.5.h – NMPED Canvas Test Security Training Module.pdf</i></li> <li><i>NM_ELP 2.5.i – NM Irregularity Tracking 2018-2019.xlsx</i></li> <li><i>NM_ELP 2.5.j – ACCESS Testing Irregularity – Middle School.pdf</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested:</b> For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of detection of test irregularities (e.g., forensic analysis or other methods).</li> </ul> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b> The evidence provided by the State indicates procedures and training related to the detection of test irregularities. However, the State should provide evidence that training is occurring (e.g., training records).</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 New Mexico

	<p><b><u>New Mexico-Specific Evidence:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 2.5.i– NM_Irregularity Tracking 2018-2019.xlsx</i></li> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 2.5.j – ACCESS Testing Irregularity – Middle School.pdf</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested:</b> For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of remediation following any test security incidents.</li> </ul> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b> The State’s evidence of remediation following any test security incidents appears to be sufficient.</p>
	<p><b><u>New Mexico-Specific Evidence:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 2.5.k –Monitoring Checklist Samples.pdf</i></li> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 2.5.l – Spring 2022 Monitoring Schedule Excerpt.pdf</i> ○ Shows Alternate ACCESS on the NMPED monitoring schedule for Spring 2022.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested:</b> For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence for the Alternate ACCESS of policies and procedures to protect the integrity of the test given that the test form is unchanged for the past several years.</li> </ul> <p><b>For Alternate ACCESS:</b> The evidence provided by the State includes some documentation for the monitoring of test administration. The State should submit more comprehensive evidence related to policies and procedures for protecting the integrity of the Alternate ACCESS. For example, the State might consider conducting a study on its own or in collaboration with WIDA that examines how the item functionality changes over time (e.g., as part of a forensic study).</p>
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed:</p> <p><b>ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of training for the detection and remediation of test irregularities (e.g., training records, attendance sheets).</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comprehensive evidence related to policies and procedures for protecting the integrity of the Alternate ACCESS (e.g., a study that examines how the item functionality changes over time).</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results;</li> <li>• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>• To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul>	<p>No additional evidence requested.</p>	<p>No additional evidence was requested</p>
<p><b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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



STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico

**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"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s ELP assessment and the ELP standards the assessment is designed to measure in terms of language knowledge and skills, the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards, across all proficiency levels, domains, and modalities identified therein;</li> <li>• Documentation of alignment (as defined) between the State’s ELP standards and the language demands implied by, or explicitly stated in, the State’s academic content standards;</li> <li>• If the State administers an AELPA aligned with alternate ELP achievement standards, the assessment shows adequate linkage to the State’s ELP standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and that the breadth of content and linguistic complexity determined in test design is appropriate for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>For Alternate ACCESS:</b> See the WIDA Consortium submission.</p>	<p><b>For Alternate ACCESS:</b> See the WIDA Consortium submission.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed:</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 New Mexico

**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
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.	<b>Additional Evidence Requested:</b> See the WIDA Consortium submission.	<b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b> See the WIDA Consortium submission.
<b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

**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
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.	<b>Additional Evidence Requested:</b> See the WIDA Consortium submission.	<b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b> See the WIDA Consortium submission.
<b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico**

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER**

**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population (<i>for ELP assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable</i>);</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of <i>an EL’s English proficiency</i>.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested:</b> See the WIDA Consortium submission.</p>	<p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b> See the WIDA Consortium submission.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or  <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 New Mexico**

**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For all State ELP assessments</i>, assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition<sup>8</sup>).</p> <p><i>For ELP assessments</i>, the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all EL students and fair across student groups, including ELs with disabilities, in their design, development, and analysis.</p>	<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested:</b> See the WIDA Consortium submission.</p>	<p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b> See the WIDA Consortium submission.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or  <input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul> </p>		

**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><b>Additional Evidence Requested:</b> See the WIDA Consortium submission.</p>	<p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b> See the WIDA Consortium submission.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or  <input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul> </p>		

<sup>8</sup> see page 28 of “*A State’s Guide to the U.S. Department of Education’s Assessment Peer Review Process*”, September 24, 2018 available at: [www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html](http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html)

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments (and <i>for ELP assessments, any applicable domain or component sub-tests</i>) that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s <i>ELP standards</i>.</p> <p><i>For ELP assessments</i>, if an English learner has a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains/components (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) such that there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected domain(s)/component(s), the State must provide a description of how it will ensure that the student is assessed in the remaining domain(s)/component(s) in which it is possible to assess the student, and a description of how this will occur.<sup>9</sup></p>	<p><b><u>New Mexico-Specific Evidence:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 4.4.a – NMPED Domain Exemption for ELs with Impairments.pdf</i></li> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 4.4.b – ACCESS and Alt ACCESS DTC Training Winter 2021-22.pdf</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested:</b> For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that if an English learner has a disability that precludes the assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains/components (listening, speaking reading, and writing) because there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected domain(s)/component(s), the State ensures that the student is assessed in the remaining domain(s)/component(s) in which it is possible to assess the student, including a description of how this will occur.</li> </ul> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b> The State provided sufficient evidence of a process and procedure for exempting a student from a domain when there are no appropriate accommodations available.</p>
	<p><b><u>New Mexico-Specific Evidence:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 4.4.c – ACCESS Test Administrator Essentials.pdf</i></li> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 4.4.d – WIDA Speaking Scoring Scale.pdf</i></li> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 4.4.e – Considerations for Scoring Oral Language.pdf</i></li> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 4.4.f – Superintendent’s Verification</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested:</b> For ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of standardized scoring procedures and protocols that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s ELP standards (e.g., evidence that the scoring of speaking items on the paper form of the test is monitored).</li> </ul> <p><b>For ACCESS:</b></p>

<sup>9</sup> See full reference in regulation, 34 CFR § 200.6(h)(4)(ii) (online at [https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=07e168e9e7a6c5931b4549cc15547ee9&mc=true&node=se34.1.200\\_16&rgn=div8](https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=07e168e9e7a6c5931b4549cc15547ee9&mc=true&node=se34.1.200_16&rgn=div8) )

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico

	<p><i>Form.pdf</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 4.4.g – Onsite Technical Assistance and Monitoring Checklist.pdf</i></li> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 2.5.k –Monitoring Checklist Samples.pdf</i></li> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 2.5.l – Spring 2022 Monitoring Schedule Excerpt.pdf</i></li> </ul>	<p>While the State provided some evidence regarding the guidance and monitoring of scoring at the local level, the submission lacks details concerning the monitoring of the scoring of speaking items that would support valid score interpretations. Peers suggest providing two types of evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• evidence of processes and documentation of locally monitored scoring of speaking (e.g., training documentation, training records, evidence of remote or in-person observations of scoring); and</li> <li>• evidence that the scoring of speaking items includes adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting consistency across scorers (e.g., scorer training and certification, clear scoring rubrics, adequate monitoring of raters, evaluation of inter-rater reliability, and/or documentation of quality control procedures).</li> </ul> <p>In addition, there is no information presented on the processes that the State uses to create a composite score when a student is not assessed in all domains. This procedure is important because it directly relates to the interpretability of the students’ composite scores.</p> <p>Peers suggest that the State should provide documentation of the processes it uses to create a composite score when a student is not assessed in all domains. For example, the State should provide evidence that it has adopted a scoring procedure for calculating a student’s composite score in cases where the student does not take all four of the required domains (e.g., adopt one of the four WIDA models), including a rationale for the scoring procedure.</p> <p><b>For the Alternate ACCESS:</b></p>
--	---	---

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico**

		The State has referred to WIDA-provided evidence of the implementation of the standardized scoring procedures and protocols for the Alternate ACCESS.
<b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed:</p> <p><b>For ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of processes and procedures for locally monitored scoring of speaking (e.g., training documentation, training records, evidence of remote or in-person observations of scoring).</li> <li>• Evidence that the scoring of speaking item includes adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting consistency across scorers (e.g., scorer certification, clear scoring rubrics, adequate monitoring of raters, evaluation of inter-rater reliability, and/or documentation of quality control procedures).</li> <li>• Documentation on the processes that the State uses to create a composite score when a student is not assessed in all domains. For example, the State should provide evidence that it has adopted a scoring procedure for calculating a student’s composite score in cases where the student does not take all four of the required domains (e.g., adopt one of the four WIDA models), including a rationale for the scoring procedure.</li> </ul>		

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
If the State administers multiple forms of <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.	<b>Additional Evidence Requested:</b> See the WIDA Consortium submission.	<b>For the Alternate ACCESS and ACCESS:</b> See the WIDA Consortium submission.

<b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico**

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico

**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"> <li>Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and</li> <li>Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>New Mexico-Specific Evidence:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>NM_ELP 4.7.a – NMPED Screenshot – State Assessments.pdf</i></li> <li><i>NM_ELP 4.7.b – Building a WIDA Assessment Screenshot</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested:</b> For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.</li> </ul> <p><b>For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:</b> The State has provided sufficient evidence that clearly shows that the technical quality of the assessments is made available to the public.</p>
	<p><b><u>New Mexico-Specific Evidence:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>NM_ELP 4.7.c – NMPED TAC Agenda, May 2019.pdf</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested:</b> For the Alternate ACCESS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system.</li> </ul> <p><b>For the Alternate ACCESS:</b> The State has provided evidence that the Alternate ACCESS was included on one TAC meeting agenda (NM_ELP 4.7.c). However, there is no evidence presented about the content of the discussions or the regularity of the inclusion of the Alternate ACCESS in the TAC meetings. In addition, the evidence does not provide information on any issues raised by the TAC or how they are addressed. Peers suggest that the State provides evidence such as minutes from the TAC meetings, evidence of the State’s established and clear criteria for analyzing the assessment system, a deliberate cycle for revising and updating the State’s assessments, and/or presentations of assessment results to TAC. The State might also include notes of internal discussions for how the State plans to address technical issues.</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 New Mexico

### Section 4.7 Summary Statement

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed:

#### **Alternate ACCESS**

- Documentation of a system for improving, maintaining, and monitoring the assessment (e.g., minutes from the TAC meetings, evidence of the State's established and clear criteria for analyzing the assessment system, a deliberate cycle for revising and updating the State's assessments, and/or presentations of assessment results to TAC).

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students<sup>10</sup> with disabilities in the State’s assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>For ELP assessments</b>, policies that require the inclusion of an EL with a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) such that there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected component (the State must assess the student’s English language proficiency based on the remaining components in which it is possible to assess the student).</li> </ul>	<p>No additional evidence requested.</p>	<p>No additional evidence requested.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

<sup>10</sup> For ELP peer review, this refers to ELs with disabilities.

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note: This critical element does not apply to ELP assessments, as the requirements only apply to the inclusion of ELs in <b>academic assessments</b>.</li> </ul>	NA	NA
<b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico

**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"> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs;</li> <li>• Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> <li>• Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>New Mexico-Specific Evidence:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 4.4.b – ACCESS and Alt ACCESS DTC Training Winter 2021-22</i></li> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 4.4.g – Onsite Technical Assistance and Monitoring Checklist</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested:</b> For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the provided accommodations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments.</li> <li>○ Do not alter the construct being assessed.</li> <li>○ Allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b> The State provided information in the form of a training PowerPoint that describes how accommodations are to be selected for students and monitored. However, evidence was not provided with regard to how, or if, the accommodations alter the construct and if the use of accommodations allows for the meaningful interpretation of results. Peers suggest providing a description of the reasonable and appropriate basis for the set of accommodations offered on the assessments (e.g., literature review, empirical research, recommendations by advocacy and professional organizations, and/or consultations with the State’s TAC). Moreover, because the State claims it adheres to WIDA’s accommodation guidelines for the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS, the WIDA consortium may have evidence to support this requirement.</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 New Mexico**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p><b><u>New Mexico-Specific Evidence:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NM_ELP – 5.3.a – Non-Standard Accommodations Request Form</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested:</b> For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul> <p><b>For the Alternate ACCESS:</b> The State provided sufficient evidence that it has a process to review and allow requests for accommodations beyond those routinely allowed (NM_ELP 5.3.a). The peers noted that this form is clear and well-constructed.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed:  <b>For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence with regard to how, or if, the accommodations alter the construct and if the use of accommodations allows for the meaningful interpretation of results (e.g., literature review, empirical research, recommendations by advocacy and professional organizations, and/or consultations with the State’s TAC).</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures;</li> <li>• Monitored for administrations of all required ELP assessments, and AELPA.</li> </ul>	<p>No additional evidence requested.</p>	<p>No additional evidence requested.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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



STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico

**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"> <li>The State adopted ELP achievement standards that address the different proficiency levels of ELs;</li> <li>If the State has developed alternate ELP achievement standards, it has adopted them only for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who cannot participate in the regular ELP assessment even with appropriate accommodations.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>New Mexico-Specific Evidence:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>NM_ELP 6.1.a – Graduation Requirements for Students with IEPs</i></li> <li><i>NM_ELP 4.4.b – ACCESS and Alt ACCESS DTC Training 2021-22</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested:</b> For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the State has developed alternate ELP achievement standards, evidence that it has adopted them only for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who cannot participate in the regular ELP assessment even with appropriate accommodations.</li> </ul> <p><b>For the Alternate ACCESS:</b> The State provided evidence that describes the test administrator training used to identify EL students who qualify to take the Alternate ACCESS (NM_ELP 4.4.b). However, there appears to be no direct evidence that the State has adopted alternate ELP achievement standards (p. 5 in NM_ELP 4.4.b, for instance, shows only that the State is using the Alternate ACCESS).</p> <p>Peers suggest providing either (a) an official letter or email from the State Secretary of Education informing schools and districts of the formal adoption of the alternate ELP achievement levels or (b) the meeting minutes describing the official adoption of the alternate ELP achievement levels.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed:</p> <p><b>For the Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State has adopted alternate ELP achievement standards (e.g., an official letter or email from the State Secretary of Education informing schools and districts of the formal adoption of the alternate ELP achievement levels or the meeting minutes describing the official adoption of the alternate ELP achievement levels).</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico

**Critical Element 6.2 – ELP Achievement Standards Setting**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>ELP achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate ELP achievement standards</i>, such that:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Cut scores are developed for every grade/grade band, content domain/language domain, and/or composite for which proficiency-level scores are reported.</li> </ul> </li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested:</b> See the WIDA Consortium submission.</p>	<p><b>For the Alternate ACCESS:</b> See the WIDA Consortium submission.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico

**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><b>For ELP achievement standards:</b> The State has ensured that ELP assessment results are expressed in terms that are clearly aligned with the State’s ELP standards, and its ELP performance-level descriptors.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate ELP achievement standards for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate ELP achievement standards should be linked to the State’s grade-level/grade-band ELP standards, and should reflect professional judgment of the highest ELP achievement standards possible for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested:</b> See the WIDA Consortium submission.</p>	<p><b>For the Alternate ACCESS and ACCESS:</b> See the WIDA Consortium submission.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico

**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"> <li>• Reports the <i>ELs’ English proficiency</i> in terms of the State’s grade level/grade-band ELP standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>• Are provided in an understandable and uniform format;</li> <li>• Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>New Mexico-Specific Evidence:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 6.4.a – NMPED Screenshot – Achievement Data.pdf</i></li> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 6.4.b – ACCESS for ELLs Proficiencies 2021.xlsx</i></li> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 6.4.c – Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Proficiencies 2021.xlsx</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested:</b> For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State reports ELP assessments for all ELs including the number and percentage of ELs attaining ELP.</li> </ul> <p><b>For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:</b> The State provided sufficient evidence that it reports ELP assessments for all ELs including the number and percentage of ELs attaining ELP.</p>
	<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested:</b> See the WIDA Consortium submission.</p>	<p><b>For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the ELP results are reported in terms of the State’s grade level/grade-band ELP standards (including performance-level descriptors). See the WIDA Consortium submission.</li> </ul>
	<p><b><u>New Mexico-Specific Evidence:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 6.4.d – NMPED Website Screenshot – Language and Culture Division.pdf</i></li> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 6.4.e – Sample Annual Parent Notification Letter.pdf</i></li> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 6.4.f – EL Toolkit, Chapter 10.pdf</i></li> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 6.4.g – EL Directors’ Meeting.pdf</i></li> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 6.4.h – Dear Colleague Letter.pdf</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested:</b> For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State provides information about each student’s attainment of the State’s ELP standards to parents that are, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, orally translated for such parent or guardian.</li> </ul> <p><b>For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:</b> The State provided some information regarding the communication to parents such as an example parent notification letter. However, it is unclear how districts inform parents about how to request an oral or written translation. Peers suggest that the State provides evidence such as a website containing information for parents and districts,</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 New Mexico**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 6.4.i – Special Education Directors’ Academy Slide Deck.pdf</i></li> </ul> <p><b><u>New Mexico-Specific Evidence:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 6.4.d – NMPED Website Screenshot – Language and Culture Division.pdf</i></li> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 6.4.e – Sample Annual Parent Notification Letter.pdf</i></li> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 6.4.f – EL Toolkit, Chapter 10.pdf</i></li> <li>• <i>NM_ELP 6.4.g – EL Directors’ Meeting.pdf</i></li> </ul>	<p>materials that specify how parents can receive/request information, etc.</p> <p><b>Additional Evidence Requested:</b> For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that student reports are, upon request by an individual with a disability, provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> </ul> <p><b>For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:</b> While the evidence provided by the State does indicate that student reports can be provided in an alternative format to parents of ELs, none of the evidence seems to mention parents with disabilities. For example, the State could specify on their website that the reports are ADA compliant or provide a sample report that is ADA compliant. In addition, despite the State’s claim that the “Dear Colleague letter” from the USDOJ and USDOE mentions parents with disabilities, the letter discusses only students with disabilities (NM_ELP 6.4.h).</p>
<b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation regarding how the State ensures that parents are informed about how to request an oral or written translation (e.g., website that provides information to parents and districts, materials that specify how parents can receive/request information, etc.).</li> <li>• Documentation that student reports can be provided in an alternative format to EL parents with disabilities. For example, the State could specify on their website that the reports are ADA compliant and/or provide a sample report that is ADA compliant.</li> </ul>		

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