



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

November 9, 2022

The Honorable Randy Watson
Commissioner of Education
Kansas State Department of Education
900 S.W. Jackson Street, Room 600
Topeka, KS 66612-1220

Dear Commissioner Watson:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (the 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 Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) to prepare for the review, which occurred in March 2022. Specifically, KSDE submitted evidence regarding its English language proficiency (ELP) assessment, KELPA.

State assessment systems provide essential information that States, districts, schools, and educators 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 KSDE's submission and the Department found, based on evidence received, that this component of Kansas' assessment system met some, but not all, of the statutory and regulatory requirements of the ESEA. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- General English language proficiency (ELP) assessment (KELPA): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**

Substantially meets requirements means that this component meets most of the requirements of the statute and regulations, but some additional information is required. The list of items required for KSDE to meet all statutory and regulatory requirements of the ESEA is enclosed with this letter. The Department expects that KSDE will likely be able to provide this additional information within one year.

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 review notes for additional suggestions and recommendations for improving your assessment system beyond what is noted in the Department's feedback.

400 MARYLAND AVE., SW, WASHINGTON, DC 20202
<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.

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 KSDE submit a plan within 30 days, outlining when it will submit all additional required documentation for peer review. Upon submission of the plan, the Department will reach out to KSDE 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 note that KSDE has not submitted evidence that it has developed and is administering an alternate ELP assessment for English learners with the most significant cognitive disabilities, as required under 34 CFR § 200.6(h)(5). Therefore, the Department is placing a condition on KSDE’s Title I, Part A grant award for fiscal year 2022. To satisfy this condition, KSDE must submit satisfactory evidence to demonstrate that it has implemented an alternate ELP assessment and that it meets all of the statutory and regulatory requirements for such assessments. The condition will remain until all required evidence has been submitted and peer reviewed. If the outcome of the review by peers indicates full approval, then the condition will be removed. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action.

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:¹

- General assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts (R/LA) for grades 3-8 and high school (KAP). **Meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- Alternate assessments of alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for grades 3-8 and high school in mathematics and R/LA (DLM-Int). **Meets requirements of the ESEA.**

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 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 KSDE makes significant changes to any of its assessments, the State must submit information about those changes to the Department for review and approval.

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.

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

Enclosures

cc: Beth Fultz, Director of Assessment

¹ See: <https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/nclbfinalassess/ks8.pdf>.

Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed for Kansas’ Assessment System to Meet ESEA Requirements (KELPA)

Critical Element	Evidence Needed
1.3 – Required Assessments	<p>For the KELPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State’s assessment system includes an annual alternate ELP assessment aligned with State ELP standards for English learners with the most significant cognitive disabilities (i.e., evidence that the State is administering an alternate KELPA).
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments	<p>For the KELPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As noted in critical element 1.3, evidence that the State’s assessment system includes an annual alternate ELP assessment aligned with State ELP standards (i.e., evidence that the State is administering an alternate KELPA).
2.5 – Test Security	<p>For the KELPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of detection of test irregularities (e.g., documentation of reported test irregularities from a recent test administration). • Evidence of investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities (e.g., results of investigations or reported test irregularities).
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	<p>For the KELPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence demonstrating the 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.
3.2 – Validity Based on Linguistic Processes	<p>For the KELPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence demonstrating the State’s ELP assessment taps the intended language processes appropriate for each grade level/grade-band as represented in the State’s ELP standards.
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	<p>For the KELPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence demonstrating the scoring and reporting structures of the assessment are consistent with the intended interpretations and uses of results.
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	<p>For the KELPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State’s ELP assessment scores are related as expected with other variables (e.g., that the English learners who are proficient on the ELP assessment have English proficiency that allows them to acquire and demonstrate their achievement of 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).
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	<p>For the KELPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence the assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance spectrum, including performance for English learners with high and low levels of English language proficiency and with different proficiency profiles across the domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing.
4.4 – Scoring	<p>For the KELPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence the assessment is 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 of identified steps to improve assessment reliability at the performance cut points and documentation demonstrating individual student reports report EL’s English

Critical Element	Evidence Needed
	<p>proficiency in terms of the State’s grade level/grade band ELP standards, including performance-level descriptors).</p>
<p>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p>	<p>KELPA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years (e.g., an equating plan or other steps to be taken to ensure changes necessary to improve test reliability at the cut points do not impact score comparability).
<p>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p>	<p>KELPA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence demonstrating the State has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment (e.g., a monitoring plan to identify potential test/item drift and make adjustments as needed to maintain the assessment’s technical quality).
<p>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p>	<p>KELPA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence demonstrating the State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all students with disabilities (e.g., availability of accommodations or supports allowing the participation of visually impaired students; evidence pertaining to the participation guidelines for ELs with significant cognitive disabilities in either the regular ELP assessment or an alternate assessment).
<p>6.4 – Reporting</p>	<p>For the KELPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that KSDE reports the English learner’s English proficiency in terms of the State’s grade-level or grade-band ELP standards (including performance-level descriptors). • Evidence that the State provides information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students. • Evidence that reports are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian. • Evidence that, 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.

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.

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS4

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

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

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

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

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

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS.....9

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development 9

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development 11

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

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration 14

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security 15

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

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY17

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

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

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

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

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER.....22

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability 22

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Kansas ELP Assessment

Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility 24

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum 25

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 26

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

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

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 29

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS.....30

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 30

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

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations 33

**Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations
..... 35**

**SECTION 6: ELP ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND
REPORTING37**

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

Critical Element 6.2 – ELP Achievement Standards Setting 38

Critical Element 6.3 –Aligned ELP Achievement Standards 39

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting 40

**SECTION 7: DOES NOT APPLY TO ELP ASSESSMENT PEER
REVIEW41**

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

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>1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual a. Chapter I.1.1 of Technical Manual (pp. 8–9)</p> <p>12 - Kansas State Board of Education minutes (p.4) August 2018 (4) Kansas State Board of Education presentation August 2018 (5) Comment narrative to accompany August 2018 presentation to the Kansas State Board of Education (8) Kansas State Board of Education Minutes September 2018 (p.2)</p>	<p>Standards adopted in 2018. Standards developed for grades k-8, and for grade bands for 9-10 and 11-12 (#1; #12.8).</p>
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Kansas ELP Assessment

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>For ELP standards: The ELP standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing; • address the different proficiency levels of ELs; and <p>align to the State academic content standards (see definition²). 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>3 - Kansas Standards for English Learners Grades K-12 adopted on September 11, 2018.</p> <p>12 – (1) Standards Committee Meeting Participants 18 and 19 - Standards Committee Meeting Agendas</p> <p>4 – Kansas English Language Arts Standards</p> <p>1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual a. Chapter I.1.2 Overview of the standards (pg. 9–10) (there is an error in section headings for I.1.2, it currently shows II.1.1)</p> <p>2 - KELPA 2021 Technical Manual a. Chapter II.1.2 Standards-Correspondence Activity Results (pp. 12–13) b. Chapter III.1.3.4 Claim 6 (p. 14)</p> <p>5 - Alignment of KELPA with 2018 Kansas Standards for English Learners (hereafter referred to as the 2018 KELP Standards): Alignment technical report a. Section A. Executive summary (pp. i–iii)</p>	<p>Domains: 4 domains (reading, writing, speaking, listening) (#1, p. 8)</p> <p>Proficiency levels: six levels - beginning (starting point), emerging, developing, approaching, proficient, mastery (#1, p. 9)</p> <p>Alignment to academic content standards: Alignment study found KELPA to be poorly aligned for Grade 1, math (#5, p. iii). State considering next steps.</p>
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional evidence needed regarding the alignment to the Grade 1 math standards. 		

² 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

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

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"> All ELs in grades K-12. 		<p>Department staff determined that the State provided evidence demonstrating all public school students in grades K-12 who have been identified as non-proficient in English are required to participate in an annual summative assessment of English language proficiency.</p> <p>Department staff were able to determine that the KDE does not currently administer an alternate English language proficiency assessment to English learners with the most severe cognitive disabilities in any grade. The alternate ELP assessment for those with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be submitted for peer review after it’s first operational administration in 2023. In the meantime, staff believe that the fact that KDE has not had an alternate ELP assessment should be memorialized in this peer review determination.</p>
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 an alternate KELPA for once it becomes available). 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Kansas ELP Assessment

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State has policies that require the inclusion <i>of all public elementary and secondary ELs in the State’s ELP assessment</i>, including ELs with disabilities. 		<p>Staff determined that the State provided sufficient evidence, including regulations requiring participation by all students identified as limited English proficient (including those who receive EL services and those whose parents have refused services) as well as participation requirements and guidance in the test administration manuals and trainings for the proper inclusion of English learners with disabilities.</p> <p>Department staff were able to determine that the KDE does not currently administer an alternate English language proficiency assessment to English learners with the most severe cognitive disabilities in any grade. The alternate ELP assessment for those with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be submitted for peer review after it’s first operational administration in 2023. In the meantime, staff believe that the fact that KDE has not had an alternate ELP assessment should be memorialized in this peer review determination.</p>
<p>Section 1.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As noted in critical element 1.3, 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 KELPA for once it becomes available). 		

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State has developed or amended challenging <i>ELP</i> standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education). • Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas). • Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State. • Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents. 		<p>Staff determined that the State provided sufficient evidence, including: KSDE advisement from the Kansas Assessment Advisory Council, participation by district English language educators, public hearings, a public review and comment period with public comments provided to the Kansas Board of Education for review before approval by the Board.</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Kansas ELP Assessment

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <i>the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards</i>, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <i>the State’s ELP standards</i>, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. • Processes to ensure that the ELP assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <i>the State’s ELP standards</i> and reflects appropriate inclusion of the range of complexity found in the standards. • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and intended uses and interpretations of results. • If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the 	<p><u>Purposes and Intended Interpretations and Uses of Results</u></p> <p>1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 1.1 Overview of English Language Standards (p. 8–9) Chapter II.1.1 Overview of the Standards (p. 9–10) Chapter I.2 Test Purposes and Uses (p. 10–11) Chapter I.3 Intended Population (p. 11) <p><u>Test Blueprints</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter II.1 Test Design and Development (p. 12) Chapter II.1.1 Test Blueprints (p.12–19) Chapter II.1.2 Test Design (p. 19–22) <p><u>Representation of Knowledge, Skills and Complexity in the Assessment</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter II.1.3 Test Construction (p. 23) Chapter II.2 Content Development (pp 23–32) <p>#5 Alignment Study Report</p>	<p>Assessment purpose is clearly articulated and describes intended construct, population, and use. (#1, p. 11-12).</p> <p>Overview of test blueprints provided in technical manual (#1, p. 12-19). There are processes to ensure that assessment tailors to knowledge and skills in ELP standards: Overall, the process to develop items was thorough and took the depth and breadth of standards (and took grade bands into account.) The peers had some concerns about the blueprints for grades 1 and 2-3 math.</p> <p>The alignment study report (#5, Table 0b) indicates that the blueprint is not met for many of the domains in grades k, 1, 2, and 3. A fuller description would be helpful to understand whether the misalignment is substantively meaningful, and whether it warrants any action for the state to address, and if so, what those actions would be.</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.

<p>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.</p>		
--	--	--

Section 2.1 Summary Statement

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Provide a plan to address the deficiencies identified in the alignment study of several grade-level tests (grades k, 1, 2, 3) that do not satisfy blueprint requirements.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Kansas ELP Assessment

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess student English language proficiency based on the <i>State’s ELP standards</i> in terms of content and language processes. 	<p><u>Processes to Develop and Select Items</u></p> <p>1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter II.1.3 Test Construction (p. 23) Chapter II.2 Content Development (p. 23–32) Chapter III.1 Validity Evidence Based on Test Content (p. 41) Chapter III.2 Validity Evidence Based on Response Process (p. 42) Chapter II.2.3.4 Data Review (p. 30–31) <p>5 - Alignment study report</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Claim 1. KELPA Items Are Aligned to KELP Standards (p. 26–28) 	<p>Item development process generally seemed appropriate, though demographic information about item writers and reviewers was not found. The technical manual described item writers and reviewers experiences with English learners, their teaching experiences, the grade levels they taught, and their geographic location (#1, pp. 26, 28), but no information was found on gender or race/ethnicity. Similarly, peers were unable to find any information about whether the writers and reviewers had experience with Els with disabilities.</p>
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide evidence regarding the gender and race/ethnicity of items developers and reviewers, as well as whether they had experience working with 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.

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p><u>Communications to the Field</u> 1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual a. Chapter II.3 Test Administration and Scoring (pp. 33–36)</p> <p>8 - 2020 KELPA Examiner’s Manual</p> <p>10 – KAP website: ksassessments.org</p> <p><u>Training to Administer Assessments and Accommodation Procedures</u> 1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual a. Chapter II.3 Test Administration and Scoring (pp. 33–36) b. Chapter V.1 Inclusion of All English Learners in KELPA (p. 87)</p> <p>8 - 2020 KELPA Examiner’s Manual a. KELPA Overview (pp. 7–9) b. Accommodations (pp. 14–15)</p> <p><u>Requirements, Administration, and Contingency Plans for Technology-Based Assessments</u> 1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual d. Chapter II.3 Test Administration and Scoring (pp. 33–36) e. Chapter II.5 Test Security (pp. 37–40)</p> <p>8 - 2020 KELPA Examiner’s Manual c. Security and Ethics (pp. 10–13) d. Before KELPA (pp. 16–20) e. During KELPA (pp. 21–28)</p>	<p><i>Has established and communicates to educators the procedures:</i> State has a test examiners’ manual (#8) and a website (#10).</p> <p><i>Receive training:</i> Training requirements for educators and test proctors described in examiners manual. Examples of training documents not provided though there are references to the KELPA Training website (https://ksassessments.org/resources-and-training). The peers were not clear regarding the required qualifications of test administrators, proctors, and accommodations providers, and whether all individuals in each of these three groups are required to receive appropriate training.</p> <p><i>Technology-based assessments:</i> Inadequate evidence of contingency plans to address possible technology challenges were provided. The peers did not find clear reference to contingency plans in situations where testing is interrupted due to technology issues, though the examiner manual briefly describes procedures for reactivating a testing session.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Kansas ELP Assessment

Section 2.3 Summary Statement

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Additional evidence is needed regarding required qualifications of test administrators, proctors, and accommodations providers, and the training requirements for all of these groups.
- More detailed evidence is needed regarding contingency plan to address possible technology challenges.

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

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>Documentation of processes and procedures for on-site in-person monitoring of assessment administration described both scheduled and unannounced on-site monitoring of test administration and included the monitoring rubric. Due to Covid-19 safety precautions, on-site monitoring was placed on hold for the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 school years. The State noted pre-pandemic monitoring would resume for the 2021-2022 school year test administration with a goal of conducting on-site monitoring of 5% - 10% of Kansas schools.</p> <p>As the KELPA is a computer-based assessment, documentation submitted described processes and procedures for real time monitoring of both system performance and test administration data.</p>
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Kansas ELP Assessment

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. • Application of test security procedures to the general ELP assessments and the AELPA. 	<p>1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter II.2 Content Development (p. 23–32) b. Chapter II.4: Monitoring Test Administration (p. 36–37) c. Chapter II.5: Test Security (pp. 37–40) <p>2 - KELPA 2021 Technical Manual</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter IV.3.4: Incident Response Manual (p. 44) <p>14 – Test Security Folder</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Test Security Guidelines (2) Test Security links (3) Fact Sheet (4) Security and Ethics Training (7, 8, & 9) Incident Summary and Resolution 	<p>Prevention of irregularities while maintaining security: State has guidelines and incident-reporting procedures. Possible consequences are identified as well as training requirements. Peers were unable to find incident report procedures.</p> <p>Detection of test irregularities: Test security guidelines describe data which are analyzed to look for testing irregularities (e.g., testing outside school hours, click history, frequency of reactivations, etc.). Peers were unable to locate information regarding data forensics or social media monitoring, and they would like to know if this is part of the Kansas test security plan.</p> <p>Remediation following test security incidents: The evidence provided documentation of remediation procedures.</p> <p>Investigation of incidents: The evidence provided documentation of procedures for the investigation of incidences.</p>
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence regarding incidence reporting procedures. • Provide additional details regarding data forensics processes and procedures (e.g. criteria for irregular scores or score patterns) and monitoring of social media. 		

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

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p>1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual a. Chapter II.5 Test Security (pp. 37–40)</p> <p>14 – Test Security Folder (10 & 11) data sharing agreement including Kansas Student Data Privacy law.</p>	<p><i>Policies and procedures to protect integrity of test-related data during test administration, scoring, storage, and use of results:</i> The data sharing agreement (#14.10) provided evidence of general procedures that must be followed when handling data; however there was not a full description of procedures. Additionally, the evidence submitted (#14.10) appears to be a draft since there are tracked changes in the document, and it was not clear whether the document had been finalized. It is also was not clear regarding which assessment(s) these guidelines apply to.</p> <p><i>Student-level data:</i> The draft data-sharing agreement described procedures for handling and sharing student-level data.</p> <p><i>N-size:</i> Sample size of 10 is required for reporting.</p>
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide the finalized version of the data-sharing agreement for KELPA. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Kansas ELP Assessment

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><i>The State’s ELP assessments</i> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s ELP standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s ELP assessment and the ELP standards the assessment is designed to measure in terms of language knowledge and skills, the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards, across all proficiency levels, domains, and modalities identified therein; • Documentation of alignment (as defined) between the State’s ELP standards and the language demands implied by, or explicitly stated in, the State’s academic content standards; • If the State administers an AELPA aligned with alternate ELP achievement standards, the assessment shows adequate linkage to the State’s ELP standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and that the breadth of content and linguistic complexity 	<p>1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter III.1 Validity Evidence Based on Test Content (p. 41–42) Chapter II.1.1 Test Blueprints (p. 12) Chapter II.2.2.1 Item-Writing Training (p. 27) Chapter II.2.3.2 External Review (p. 28–29) Chapter II.2.3.4 Data Review (p. 30) <p>5 - Alignment Study Final Report</p> <p>6 - Alignment Study Response Memo</p> <p>7 – Alignment Study Response from NCIEA</p>	<p>Documentation of adequate alignment: The alignment study (#5) indicates that there seems to be some misalignment between the blueprint and score points by domain and grade, particularly in grades 2-3 and 4-5; though the responses to the alignment study (#6, #7) assert that this may be appropriate in this case. The peers are concerned that the alignment study indicated that there were a lack of low level of linguistic difficulty (LDL) items, and that this might reduce access to content for lower performing students, which has ramifications for measuring the entire range of ability.</p> <p>Documentation of alignment: The state provided evidence beyond item indicators that included an evaluation of performance, in total, which is an important aspect with respect to the validity of claims based on scores. The state noted: “Additionally, when panelists were asked about their overall judgment that students with language skills at Level 4 (Proficient) on the English Learners Performance Level rubric can acquire and demonstrate achievement of the knowledge and skills in the academic content standards, panelists tended to agree that students with language skills at the Proficient level would be able to demonstrate their achievement on the academic content standards...” which is a critical piece because it indicates that the items form a meaningful construct.</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.

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

Section 3.1 Summary Statement

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Provide evidence that there is a sufficient range of item difficulty to measure the performance of the full range of students.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Kansas ELP Assessment

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>1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter III.2 Validity Evidence Based on Response Process (p. 42–43) b. Chapter II.3 Test Administration and Scoring (p. 33–36) c. Chapter V Inclusion of All Students (p. 87–91) <p>2 - KELPA 2021 Technical Manual</p> <p>Chapter III.3 Validity Evidence Based on Consequences of Testing (p. 16)</p>	<p>Technical manual (#1) indicated that external reviews examined items and linguistic processes. It was not entirely clear to the peers that the external reviewers had received training on what linguistic processes are and how to analyze the items to determine this.</p> <p>Have cognitive labs/think alouds been conducted with students, and if not, is there a plan to do so? Cognitive labs/think alouds could provide valuable evidence regarding how the assessment taps the intended language processes.</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence is needed regarding the training that external reviewers received on what linguistic processes are and how to analyze the items to determine this. • Additional evidence is needed regarding how the assessment taps into intended language processes (e.g., cognitive labs/think alouds). 		

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

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>1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual Chapter III.3 Validity Evidence Based on Internal Structure (p. 43–48)</p>	<p>The technical manual documents appropriate procedures for establishing dimensionality (unidimensional models by grade and domain) and evaluating threats to model stability (local independence, invariance). However, given the heterogeneous theta values across domains and grades there this a concern that the proficiency claim changes across grades (i.e. different domains become more difficult relative to others). Peers are interested in the state’s interpretation of the non-uniform changing difficulty across grades and domains, and its impact on overall claims about proficiency.</p> <p>DIF analysis was extremely limited. Only data for gender and Hispanic/non-Hispanic was provided. The peers were looking for data for additional races/ethnicities, special education status, etc. Peers would like more information on the models used to detect DIF including whether non-uniform DIF was examined.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional detail is needed regarding state’s interpretation of the non-uniform changing difficulty across grades and domains, and its impact on overall claims about proficiency. • A more complete analysis of DIF is needed that includes additional subgroups and details about the models used. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Kansas ELP Assessment

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 style="text-align: center;">Relationship With Other Variables</p> <p>2 - KELPA 2021 Technical Manual Chapter III.4 Validity Evidence Based on Relations to Other Variables (p. 14–16)</p>	<p>Correlations between domain scores and ELA, Math and Science were provided and these all appear appropriate. The only correlations presented were among KELPA domains, and across KAP and KELPA. Additional disaggregations by ELP level across the KAP and KELPA would provide more insight beyond relationships that focus on criterion-related performance.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional disaggregations by ELP levels across the KAP and KELPA that provide more insight beyond relationships that focus on criterion-related performance are needed. 		

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

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population (<i>for ELP assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable</i>); • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of <i>an EL’s English proficiency</i>. 	<p><u>Test Reliability</u> 1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual a. Chapter II.2.3.4 Data Review (p. 30–31) b. Chapter IV.1.1 Test Reliability (p. 50–52)</p> <p><u>Standard Error of Measurement</u> 1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual a. Chapter IV.1.2 Test Information Function i. Figures IV-1 to IV-4 (p. 54–57) b. Appendix C: Conditional Standard Error of Measurement i. Figure C-1 (p. 117) ii. Figure C-2 (p. 118) iii. Figure C-3 (p. 119) iv. Figure C-4 (p. 120)</p> <p><u>Classification Consistency and Accuracy</u> 1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual a. Chapter IV.1.3 Classification Consistency and Accuracy (p. 58–59)</p>	<p><i>Test reliability:</i> State presented various reliabilities and these generally appeared sufficiently strong. Internal consistency reliabilities by grade and domain were mostly strong, as were results by student group.</p> <p><i>Standard error of measurement:</i> The standard errors of measurement by grade, domain, and student group should also be reported.</p> <p><i>Consistency and accuracy of estimates:</i> Consistency and accuracy is sufficient, though the values were difficult to interpret because CSEM were all reported in the theta scale. These values would be easier to interpret and evaluate if the values had been the reported/scale score metric. Cut scores should also be converted to reported/scale scores.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Kansas ELP Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The standard errors of measurement by grade, domain, and student group in scale score is needed. 		

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

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 definition³).</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 style="text-align: center;"><u>Accessibility</u></p> <p>1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter II.2.1.1 Passage Writing (p. 24) b. Chapter II.2.3.3 Accessibility Review (p. 29) c. Chapter IV.2.1 Fairness (p. 60–61) d. Chapter IV.2.2 Accessibility (p. 61–62) <p>2 - KELPA 2021 Technical Manual</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Appendix B: Summary Results of Teachers’ Responses to Survey Questions (p. 57–63) <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Fairness</u></p> <p>1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter II.2.1.3 Passage Review (p. 25) b. Chapter II.2.2.2 Item-Writing Training (p. 26–28) c. Chapter II.2.3 Item Review (p. 28–30) d. Chapter IV.2.1 Fairness (p. 60–61) <p>Chapter IV.2.2 Accessibility (p. 61–62)</p>	<p><i>Developed using principles of UDL.</i> Passage and item writers were trained in UDL. (#1, p. 60)</p> <p><i>Accessibility-</i> Technical manual described how accommodations provide access (#1)</p> <p>State indicates that “...numerous checks were conducted to ensure the items were accessible and fair...” The KELPA manual (#1) referenced content and bias checks but it was not clear what these are (p.23). More details for item writing (not post-hoc checks) are needed.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide documentation of procedures (e.g. examples of training materials) 		

³ 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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Kansas ELP Assessment

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>Full Performance Continuum 1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual a. Chapter IV.1.2 Test Information Function (p. 52–57) Chapter IV.1.3 Classification Consistency and Accuracy (p. 58–60)</p>	<p>There is a need for a reference point for determining that reliability and error levels are acceptable across the full scale. State notes that TIF indicates that more precise information exists at lower performance levels (across all domains), which seems somewhat surprising given the emphasis on writing items that maximize information around the proficient cut. It would seem that the most precise information would be near the proficiency cuts since the State claims this is its intent. The peers would like additional elaboration and explanation of the results regarding the mismatch between intent and operation.</p> <p>The overall composite score consists of only 3 levels in which approximately 80% of students currently fall. If the state intends to monitor progress using domain scores in some way then there may be additional concern that the proficiency level cuts are quite variable which make interpretation of growth difficult.</p> <p>Additional information regarding what constitutes an acceptable level of error or reliability would be helpful in determining whether the estimates of student performance are adequately precise.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanation of the mismatch between item writing intent and outcome (e.g. information not maximized at the proficiency cut) is needed. • Additional information regarding what constitutes an acceptable level of error or reliability is needed. This would be helpful in determining whether the estimates of student performance are adequately precise. 		

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

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.⁴</p>	<p>Scoring</p> <p>1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual a. Chapter IV.3 Scoring and Scaling (p. 62–78)</p> <p>2 - KELPA 2021 Technical Manual a. Chapter IV.1.3 Interrater Agreement Study (p. 21–26)</p> <p>Domain Exemption</p> <p>2 - KELPA 2021 Technical Manual b. Chapter IV.3.3 Domain-Score Exemption (p. 44)</p>	<p><i>Established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols.</i> Standard procedures were used for scoring, however, the performance level cuts generally fell below theta =0 and varied quite substantially across grades. Given these scores are to support valid interpretations, it is not clear how these patterns support monitoring progress and assigning meaning to performance levels across grades.</p> <p><i>Description of how ELs with disabilities who are unable to participate in all domains are assessed in remaining domains:</i> The technical manual (#1, p. 91) indicated that districts can contact the state to request exemptions for specific domains for students unable to participate in all domains. It also stated that exempted domains will not be taken into consideration when determining overall proficiency. However, the peers were unable to find information about how the exempted domain(s) will be taken into consideration in algorithms in making determinations about overall performance levels.</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide additional information about how patterns of proficiency cuts (theta) support monitoring progress and assigning meaning to performance levels across grades. • Provide details about how exempted domain(s) will be taken into consideration in algorithms in making determinations about overall performance levels. 		

⁴ 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)

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Kansas ELP Assessment

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>NA</p>	<p>The peers understand that this is the first year of the assessment, but they anticipated that they would find an equating plan.</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a plan for equating for subsequent test administrations. 		

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

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>NA</p>	<p>Peers noted the absence of Braille version of the assessment. See 5.3 for further commentary.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NA 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Kansas ELP Assessment

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website. 	<p>Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter II.2 Content Development (p. 23–33) b. Chapter II.3 Test Administration and Scoring (p. 33–36) c. Chapter II.4 Monitoring Test Administration (p. 36–37) d. Chapter IV.3.1.2 Educator Scoring (p. 62–64) e. Chapter IV.3.4 Operational Test Results (p. 65–77) f. Chapter IV.3.5 Quality-Control Checks (p. 78) g. Chapter IV.4 Full Performance Continuum (p. 78–85) h. Chapter IV.5 Continuous Program Improvement (p. 85–86) <p>2. KELPA 2021 <i>Technical Manual</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter II.2.2 Development of Rater-Training Materials (p. 5–6) <p>11 – TAC Documents Folder</p>	<p>System for monitoring, maintaining and improving the quality of the assessment system: Ongoing maintenance seemed appropriate, though given this is a new assessment and much of the technical results are based on scores that are based on interrupted opportunities to learn due to the pandemic, the state should continue to monitor item and test functioning closely. For example, it seems reasonable to continue to evaluate impact data to ensure it aligns with proficiency cuts, the TIFs remain consistent with what has been presented and the performance level cuts remain meaningful. This is particularly noteworthy with respect to the assessment appearing somewhat easy – which raises the question of easiness once students have full opportunities to learn. If the assessment is too easy, it could lead to students exiting EL services too soon.</p> <p>Information on State website: It is not evident where the technical quality of the assessment is reported on the State’s website.</p>
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide documentation of where evidence of technical quality is made publicly available (e.g., state website). Provide documentation that the State has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses (e.g., continued monitoring of item and test functioning). 		

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

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 students⁵ with disabilities in the State’s assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For ELP assessments, policies that require the inclusion of an EL with a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) such that there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected component (the State must assess the student’s English language proficiency based on the remaining components in which it is possible to assess the student). 	<p>Inclusion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter V.1 Inclusion of All English Learners in KELPA (p. 87) c. Chapter V.4 Accommodations (p. 88–90) d. Chapter V.4.1 Selection of Accommodations (p. 90–91) 2. KELPA 2021 <i>Technical Manual</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter IV.3.3 Domain-Score Exemption (p. 44) 1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter 3 Accommodations (p. 14–15) 	<p>Procedures to ensure students with disabilities are included: The peers were unable to find participation guidelines. Information for IEP teams on how to make appropriate assessment decisions was also not found. The peers did not find any evidence that the State had an alternate ELP assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities.</p> <p>Inclusion of EIs with disabilities whose disability preclude from taking one or more domains: The technical manual (#1, p. 91) indicated that districts can contact the state to request exemptions for specific domains for students unable to participate in all domains.</p>
<p>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p>		

⁵ For ELP peer review, this refers to ELs with disabilities.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Kansas ELP Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide the participation guidelines for making decisions about how Els with disabilities are included in the State’s ELP assessment. • Provide documentation that the state is in the process of developing an alternate ELP assessment. 		

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Kansas ELP Assessment

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs; • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. • Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment. 	<p>Accommodations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter V.1 Inclusion of All English Learners in KELPA (p. 87) b. Chapter V.3 Accessibility Supports for KELPA (p. 87–88) c. Chapter V.4 Accommodations (p. 88–90) d. Chapter V.4.1 Selection of Accommodations (p. 90–91) e. Chapter V.4.2 Frequency of Accommodations (p. 91) 2. KELPA 2021 <i>Technical Manual</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter II.3.1 KELPA Teacher Survey (p.7) 8 2019–2020 KELPA Examiner’s Manual Section 3: Prohibited Practices (p. 15) 	<p>Ensure availability of appropriate accommodations: State’s rationale around accessibility and accommodations was provided in technical manual (#1. pp. 60-62). The peers noted that there is no braille version of the assessment, and that some ELs with disabilities may need a braille accommodation.</p> <p>Determined accommodation are appropriate, etc.: Did not find evidence that the provided accommodations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student's need(s) to participate in the assessments. o Do not alter the construct being assessed. o Allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations. <p>Analyses on the impact of accommodations on score interpretation could help ensure that accommodations are, in fact, not changing the assessed construct.</p> <p>Request process for accommodations beyond those routinely allowed: According to the Examiner’s Manual (#8, p. 14)), district test coordinators are to send requests to the Kansas Dept. of Education.</p> <p>Ensures accommodations do not deny opportunity to participate: Did not find evidence that IEP team members understand how to make accessibility and accommodations decisions. Also evidence was not found that research studies have been conducted on the appropriateness and effectiveness of allowable accommodations, and how they allow student participation in the assessment.</p>

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide documentation that accommodations available on the assessment are: (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; • Provide documentation the accommodations available do not deny Els with disabilities the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Kansas ELP Assessment

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures; • Monitored for administrations of all required ELP assessments, and AELPA. 	<p>1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual a. Chapter II.4 Monitoring Test Administration (p. 36–37)</p> <p>14 – Test Security Folder (5 & 6) visits include observations of special populations with accommodations.</p>	<p>Monitoring that accommodations provision consistent with state policies. Evidence was not found that monitoring of accommodations provision was consistent with state policies. Since this assessment is new, it will be important for the state to monitor that the accommodations are working as intended and not changing the construct being assessed.</p> <p>Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability: Evidence was not found that accommodations provided were appropriate for addressing student needs. For example, no information was found about the findings of research studies.</p> <p>Consistent with accommodations provided during instruction: Test Examiners’ Manual (#8, p.14) states, “Accommodations should be used on the state assessments only if they have been a regular part of instruction.”</p> <p>Consistent with assessment accommodations identified in IEP. Test examiners’ manual (#8, p. 14) indicates that only accommodations documented on IEP or 504 plan may be used.</p> <p>Administered with fidelity: #14.6 provides a fairly detailed list of questions to check on the administration of the test but very few address the provision of accommodations. This protocol would benefit from additional questions that specifically address whether the accommodations on the IEP and PNP were provided and used by the student.</p> <p>Monitored for administration: The monitoring checklist (#14.6) indicates that the district/building coordinator is to monitor that accommodations are entered in the Personal Needs Profile (PNP), but peers were unable to find</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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		evidence that monitoring is conducted regarding whether students actually receive the accommodations. No information is provided about how the State monitors the provision of accommodations for non-visited sites.
Section 5.4 Summary Statement		
<p data-bbox="191 480 1965 513">___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p data-bbox="191 537 1965 570">___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul data-bbox="191 602 1965 797" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="191 602 1965 634">• Provide additional evidence that monitoring of accommodations provision is consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; <li data-bbox="191 634 1965 699">• Provide additional evidence that monitoring of accommodations provision is appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; <li data-bbox="191 699 1965 732">• Provide evidence that accommodations are administered with fidelity to test administration procedures; <li data-bbox="191 732 1965 764">• Provide evidence that the state monitored for administrations of accommodations on KELPA. <li data-bbox="191 764 1965 797">• Provide evidence regarding how accommodations are monitored for sites that are not visited by the monitoring team. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Kansas ELP Assessment

SECTION 6: ELP ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For ELP standards:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State adopted ELP achievement standards that address the different proficiency levels of ELs; • If the State has developed alternate ELP achievement standards, it has adopted them only for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who cannot participate in the regular ELP assessment even with appropriate accommodations. 	<p><u>Adoption of ELP standards</u></p> <p>1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter I.1 Standards Committee (p. 8–9) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter V1.1 State Adoption of Performance Standards for All English Learners (p. 93) <p>KSDE did not adopt alternate EL achievement standards.</p>	<p><i>Adoption of ELP achievement standards:</i> State board adopted standards that address the different proficiency levels of ELs.</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

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"> • ELP achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate ELP achievement standards, such that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cut scores are developed for every grade/grade band, content domain/language domain, and/or composite for which proficiency-level scores are reported. 	<p>1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter I.2 Test Purposes and Uses (p. 10–11) b. Chapter VI.1 State Adoption of Performance Standards for All English Learners (p. 93) c. Chapter VI.2.1 Overview of the Bookmark Method (p. 94) d. Chapter VI.2.2 Ordered Item Booklet (p. 94) e. Chapter VI.2.3 Panelist Recruitment (p. 95–98) f. Chapter VI.2.5.1 Panelist Advance Training and Assignments (p. 98–100) g. Chapter VI.2.5.2 Virtual Standard-Setting Meeting (p. 100–107) h. Chapter VI.2.6 Vertical-Articulation Procedure (p. 107) i. Chapter VI.2.7 Standard-Setting Results (p. 107–108) j. Chapter VI. Academic Achievement Standards and Reporting (p. 93) <p>17 – Standard Setting Folder State Board Presentation and Approval Observation report from the Center for Assessment</p> <p>11 – TAC Folder</p>	<p>Technically sound method used: Standard procedures were followed for standard setting, with the exception of conducting meetings remotely online. Other than indicating that it was challenging to do this standards setting due to the pandemic, no information was provided about how the challenges may have affected the results. The peers were unable to find the number of participants in standard setting for each grade/grade band or the participants’ demographic information. (Kansas submission notes indicate that there were a total of 41 educators who participated in standards setting. Most were EL specialists.) #17.2 (slide 27) indicates that the Kansas TAC expressed concern about relative lack of diversity of the panel in terms of gender and race. It was also not clear whether educators who participated in the standard setting were knowledgeable of ELs with disabilities Also, it was not clear the extent to which impact data was impacted due to the pandemic and whether the state intends to conduct any post-pandemic follow up studies (perhaps with the 2023 administration). The peers believe that the State may want to hold a follow up study due to the challenges.</p> <p>Development of cut scores: Cut scores were developed for every grade/grade band and domain.</p>
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a plan for ensuring that unique elements of the standards setting (e.g., online standards setting, potential for impact data not being representative of performance under normal circumstances) did not result in inconsistent and imprecise cut scores. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Kansas ELP Assessment

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>For ELP achievement standards: 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>1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter VI.1 State Adoption of Performance Standards for All English Learners (p. 93) b. Chapter VI.2.4 Performance Level Descriptors (p. 98) <p>5 KELPA Alignment Study Final Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter 4: Discussion (Standards Correspondence Summary, p. 60) 	<p><i>Assessment results expressed in terms aligned with ELP standards and performance level descriptors:</i> ELP levels by domain and overall are clearly defined and aligned.</p>
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on <i>English language proficiency for all ELs including the number and percentage of ELs attaining ELP.</i></p> <p>For the <i>ELP assessment</i>, the State provides coherent and timely information about each student’s attainment of the State’s ELP standards to parents that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports the <i>ELs’ English proficiency</i> in terms of the State’s grade level/grade-band ELP standards (including performance-level descriptors); • Are provided in an understandable and uniform format; • Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian; • Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are 	<p><u>Reporting</u></p> <p>1 - KELPA 2020 Technical Manual</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter VI.5 Reporting (p. 111–112) b. Appendix D: Sample KELPA Student Score Report (p.121) c. Chapter IV.3.4.2 Test Results for All Students (p. 71–73) <p>2. KELPA 2021 <i>Technical Manual</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter VI.1.2 Interpretive Guides (p. 47) <p>Chapter IV.2.1.2 Test Results for All Students (p. 32–34)</p> <p>15 – Score Reporting Folder Student Score Reports Parent Guides</p>	<p><i>Timely and coherent reports on ELs’ English proficiency:</i> Evidence was provided that the turnaround was timely – test window closed in late March and reports were out before the end of the school year. The peers found the parents’ student KELPA report (#15.1, 15.2) to be somewhat vague in presenting progress, and that it was not as coherent as it should be. The report should contain sufficient information for the parent to understand how their child is progressing. However neither progress expectations nor how the student met or did not meet progress is defined. It just says “progress not demonstrated.”</p> <p><i>Provided in an understandable and uniform format.</i> 4th and 6th grade parent reports provided as evidence (#15.1, #15.2) looked very similar. Technical manual states that, “The KELPA provides separate score reports to students, schools, and districts in understandable and uniform format” (p. 111).</p> <p><i>To extent feasible written in a language parents/guardians can understand:</i> A Spanish translation of the KELPA Parent Guide is available (#2, p. 47). It is unclear whether the student report is available in any languages other than English or if there is a process for orally translating the student reports.</p> <p><i>Alternate formats for parents with disabilities.</i> No information was located which indicated whether 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.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Kansas ELP Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.		
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide additional evidence that progress is defined and presented in a coherent manner on the Parents' report. • Provide evidence that parent reports 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; • Provide evidence that 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. 		

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.