

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Final Technical Review Summary for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) Fiscal Year 2019

Application "B" Applicant Name Georgia:

Score Summary: Averages Across Four Reviewers

	possible	Application B State of Georgia	
criteria	pts		
a1	5	4.25	
a2	25	11.25	
a3	10	4.5	
a. Narrative	40	20	
b1	5	3.75	
b2	5	3.75	
b3	10	3.25	
b. Prior Experience	20	10.75	
c1	5	2.5	
c2	10	3	
c. Timeline, budget	15	5.5	
d1	5	4.25	
d2	5	4.25	
d3	5	4.5	
d4	10	2.75	
d. Supports	25	15.75	
e1	12	10	
e2	8	7	
e. Evaluation	20	17	
Overall Total	120	69	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Instructions:

- The Panel Monitor will provide deadlines for submitting preliminary scores and comments.
- Review and score each application independently.
- Enter preliminary scores and comments into the Preliminary TRF.
- Send completed TRF to the Panel Monitor.
- The Panel Monitor will review scores and comments and ask you to clarify or elaborate if needed, so that comments clearly reflect and justify your scores.
- All scores and comments must be completed before panel discussions can be held.
- After discussion, revise your Preliminary TRF to reflect any changes you want to make.

Writing strengths and weaknesses:

- Make clear, evaluative statements about the substance of the criterion being discussed.
- Substantiate all evaluative statements using evidence from the application narrative, evidence tables, performance measures, appendices, and/or budgets.
- You may comment on information that is missing or inconsistent with other parts of the application.
- Write for a broad audience. Avoid expressions and jargon that might not be commonly understood.

Scoring:

- You may choose to break comments down by subcriteria, which will make them easier to read and review. This is preferred but optional.
- When awarding points, you should NOT break down scores by sub-criteria. Each criterion receives one total score as directed in the TRF (for example, (a)(1)(i-ii) receives one score).
- A few criteria may not be applicable to every application. If so, follow the instructions in the TRF.

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>(a) Consultation. Evidence that the SEA or consortium has developed an innovative assessment system in collaboration with--</p> <p>(1) Experts in the planning, development, implementation, and evaluation of innovative assessment systems, which may include external partners; and</p> <p>(2) Affected stakeholders in the State, or in each State in the consortium, including--</p> <p>(i) Those representing the interests of children with disabilities, English learners, and other subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act;</p> <p>(ii) Teachers, principals, and other school leaders;</p> <p>(iii) Local educational agencies (LEAs);</p> <p>(iv) Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State;</p> <p>(v) Students and parents, including parents of children described in paragraph (a)(2)(i) of this section; and</p> <p>(vi) Civil rights organizations.</p>	<p>(a)</p> <p>___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u> X </u>Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>The state and all three assessment options have consulted with experts of various types in the planning, development, and implementation of their innovative assessment systems. However, although the Cobb County District describes sending communications and resources to parents, there is no evidence provided that they included parents directly in activities related to the planning, development, implementation, or evaluation of the innovative assessment system, and they have not yet gathered input from civil rights organizations. Similarly, the Putnam Consortium has not yet worked with parents in the planning, development, implementation or evaluation of their evaluation system, and they have not yet gathered input from civil rights organizations.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p><u>(b)Innovative assessment system.</u> A demonstration that the innovative assessment system does or will-- (1) Meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(2)(B) of the Act, except that an innovative assessment-- (i) Need not be the same assessment administered to all public elementary and secondary school students in the State during the demonstration authority period described in 34 CFR 200.104(b)(2) or extension period described in 34 CFR 200.108 and prior to statewide use consistent with 34 CFR 200.107, if the innovative assessment system will be administered initially to all students in participating schools within a participating LEA, provided that the statewide academic assessments under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act are administered to all students in any non-participating LEA or any non-participating school within a participating LEA; and (ii) Need not be administered annually in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in grades 9-12 in the case of reading/language arts and mathematics assessments, and at least once in grades 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12 in</p>	<p>(b)(1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>_X_Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <input type="checkbox"/>___Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> <input type="checkbox"/>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>the case of science assessments, so long as the statewide academic assessments under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act are administered in any required grade and subject under 34 CFR 200.5(a)(1) in which the SEA does not choose to implement an innovative assessment.</p>		
<p>(2)(i) Align with the challenging State academic content standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act, including the depth and breadth of such standards, for the grade in which a student is enrolled; and (ii) May measure a student’s academic proficiency and growth using items above or below the student’s grade level so long as, for purposes of meeting the requirements for reporting and school accountability under sections 1111(c) and 1111(h) of the Act and paragraphs (b)(3) and (b)(7)-(9) of this section, the State measures each student’s academic proficiency based on the challenging State academic standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled;</p>	<p>(b)(2) <input type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the</p>	<p>During Years 1, 2 and 3 of the IADA period, students in the GMAP districts will be taking NWEA “off-the-shelf” assessments that are not aligned to GA standards.</p> <p>The application states that the GMAP assessment option currently includes items that are at Depth of Knowledge (DOK) levels 1, 2, and 3. Since it is most likely that Georgia standards also include student expectations that are at DOK level 4 (i.e., extended thinking), it is unclear if the continued item development proposed by the GMAP option will create items to fit the DOK level 4 of thinking. In other words, in its current form, the GMAP system does not align with the full depth and breadth of the state academic content standards. While the plan describes development work during the IADA period to address deficits, it is not clear if the DOK deficit will be able to be addressed.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i>	
(3) Express student results or competencies consistent with the challenging State academic achievement standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act and identify which students are not making sufficient progress toward, and attaining, grade-level proficiency on such standards;	<p>(b)(3)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the</i></p>	<p>It is not clear how the Cobb County assessment will be scaled to the Georgia Milestones in terms of how student results will be expressed in line with the level of proficiency on the state standards.</p> <p>The GMAP assessment option includes a growth scale that is norm-referenced, and one way that students' results will be reported is grouping students by percentiles based on NWEA national norms. Using a norm-referenced approach to express student results or competencies in a standards-based system is not appropriate or useful for helping teachers, parents, or students understand their progress towards meeting grade-level proficiency on the state standards. The national norms used by NWEA are derived from states and districts from across the country and do not represent Georgia's standards. In addition, ranking students by percentile is only useful if there is a reason for students to be ranked against each other (such as for placement in a special program) but certainly this practice is not only not useful or appropriate in a standards-based system, but it can be harmful to students' self-perceptions of themselves as learners and is in no way useful for informing instruction.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<i>application).</i>	
<p>(4)(i) Generate results, including annual summative determinations as defined in paragraph (b)(7) of this section, that are valid, reliable, and comparable for all students and for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, to the results generated by the State academic assessments described in 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act for such students.</p> <p>Consistent with the SEA’s or consortium’s evaluation plan under 34 CFR 200.106(e), the SEA must plan to annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period in one of the following ways:</p> <p>(A) Administering full assessments from both the innovative and statewide assessment systems to all students enrolled in participating schools, such that at least once in any grade span (i.e., 3-5, 6-8, or 9-12) and subject for which there is an innovative assessment, a statewide assessment in the same subject would</p>	<p>(b)(4) ___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u> X </u>Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>For the Cobb County option, the following aspects are unclear:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is unclear the size of the sample that will be included in the concurrent testing of both the innovative and the state summative assessments. • It appears that teachers can choose to give the test either paper-based or online, and can either include constructed-response items or not include them. It is unclear if comparability will be determined with each of these variations compared to the state summative assessment. • Since teachers can choose their own items for each assessment that they give, it is unclear if the Cobb County assessment plan includes a study of internal comparability across all the form variations of their innovative assessment. • It appears that a comparability study for this assessment option is planned only for Year 2 of the demonstration authority period, but the requirement is for an annual determination of comparability for each year of the authority period. <p>For the GMAP option, the following aspects are not clear:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It appears that a comparability study for this assessment option is planned only for Year 3 of the demonstration authority period for ELA and math, and for Year 4 for science, but the requirement is for an annual determination of comparability for each year of the authority period. • It appears that item development will be continuing during and after the comparability study, so it is unclear how much variability in comparability might exist from year to year. • It is unclear if GMAP will be creating performance tasks to include in the innovative assessment, since in one spot of the application it states that “this is likely” while this development is included as an activity in the timeline. If performance tasks are planned for development, it is unclear

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>also be administered to all such students. As part of this determination, the innovative assessment and statewide assessment need not be administered to an individual student in the same school year.</p> <p>(B) Administering full assessments from both the innovative and statewide assessment systems to a demographically representative sample of all students and subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, from among those students enrolled in participating schools, such that at least once in any grade span (i.e., 3-5, 6-8, or 9-12) and subject for which there is an innovative assessment, a statewide assessment in the same subject would also be administered in the same school year to all students included in the sample.</p> <p>(C) Including, as a significant portion of the innovative assessment system in each required grade and subject in which both an innovative and statewide assessment are administered, items or performance tasks from the statewide assessment system that, at a minimum, have been previously pilot tested or field tested for use in the statewide assessment</p>		<p>if comparability with the state summative assessment will be determined both for innovative GMAP assessments that contain performance tasks and for those that do not.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>system.</p> <p>(D) Including, as a significant portion of the statewide assessment system in each required grade and subject in which both an innovative and statewide assessment are administered, items or performance tasks from the innovative assessment system that, at a minimum, have been previously pilot tested or field tested for use in the innovative assessment system.</p> <p>(E) An alternative method for demonstrating comparability that an SEA can demonstrate will provide for an equally rigorous and statistically valid comparison between student performance on the innovative assessment and the statewide assessment, including for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act;</p> <p>(ii) Generate results, including annual summative determinations as defined in paragraph (b)(7) of this section, that are valid, reliable, and comparable, for all students and for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, among</p>		

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>participating schools and LEAs in the innovative assessment demonstration authority. Consistent with the SEA’s or consortium’s evaluation plan under 34 CFR 200.106(e), the SEA must plan to annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period;</p>		
<p>(5)(i) Provide for the participation of all students, including children with disabilities and English learners; (ii) Be accessible to all students by incorporating the principles of universal design for learning, to the extent practicable, consistent with 34 CFR 200.2(b)(2)(ii); and (iii) Provide appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act;</p>	<p>(b)(5) ___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. _X_Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p>	<p>One of the key principles of Universal Design for Learning is to provide learners alternatives for demonstrating what they know. The proposed Navvy assessment (by the Putnam Consortium) is entirely multiple choice, which does not give learners alternative methods (such as essays or short answer items) to demonstrate what they know, especially in the area of English Language Arts. The current GMAP system by NWEA also suffers from this feature, and it is unclear in the proposal whether it is definite that performance tasks will be developed and included in the final GMAP innovative assessment.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(6) For purposes of the State accountability system consistent with section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the Act, annually measure in each participating school progress on the Academic Achievement indicator under section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the Act of at least 95 percent of all students, and 95 percent of students in each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, who are required to take such assessments consistent with paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section;</p>	<p>(b)(6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>7) Generate an annual summative determination of achievement, using the annual data from the innovative assessment, for each student in a participating school in the demonstration authority that describes--</p> <p>(i) The student’s mastery of the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act for the grade in which the student is enrolled; or</p> <p>(ii) In the case of a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed with an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Act, the student’s mastery of those standards;</p>	<p>(b)(7)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>For Cobb County and NWEA systems, it is unclear how they will be aggregating the data across the year into one summative determination. When a standard is measured in each assessment given throughout the year, it is not clear how the data will be used to interpret whether the student met that standard. For example, if a student showed meeting standard earlier in the year, but not later, it is unclear how that would be interpreted in comparison to a student showing that they met standard later in the year but not earlier.</p>
<p>(8) Provide disaggregated results by each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and</p>	<p>(b)(8)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, including timely data for teachers, principals and other school leaders, students, and parents consistent with 34 CFR 200.8 and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(x) and (xii) and section 1111(h) of the Act, and provide results to parents in a manner consistent with paragraph (b)(4)(i) of this section and part 200.2(e);</p>	<p>to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(9) Provide an unbiased, rational, and consistent determination of progress toward the State’s long-term goals for academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(A) of the Act for all students and each subgroup of students described in section</p>	<p>(b)(9)</p> <p>____Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p>	<p>If any schools are not giving the Georgia Milestones every year in the Cobb County or NWEA pilots, then it is not clear how the SEA will identify participating schools in a consistent manner for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement. The application does describe that the Navvy assessment (Putnam Consortium) has been designed to be comparable to the statewide system of assessments for the express purpose of use within the new</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>1111(c)(2) of the Act and a comparable measure of student performance on the Academic Achievement indicator under section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the Act for participating schools relative to non-participating schools so that the SEA may validly and reliably aggregate data from the system for purposes of meeting requirements for--</p> <p>(i) Accountability under sections 1003 and 1111(c) and (d) of the Act, including how the SEA will identify participating and non-participating schools in a consistent manner for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement under section 1111(c)(4)(D) of the Act; and</p> <p>(ii) Reporting on State and LEA report cards under section 1111(h) of the Act.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>state accountability system, including school identification for targeted or comprehensive support and improvement.</p> <p>The NWEA GMAP system proposes to use RIT data for reporting student growth, but the RIT scale is a normative scale based on national norms that do not reflect the GA standards, and therefore this approach seems inconsistent with how progress is determined in the state’s standards-based system of accountability.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>(d) <u>Assurances.</u> This application contains assurances that the lead SEA and each SEA applying as a consortium will: (1) Continue use of the statewide academic assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science required under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act-- (i) In all non-participating schools; and (ii) In all participating schools for which such assessments will be used in addition to innovative assessments for accountability purposes under section 1111(c) of the Act consistent with paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section or for evaluation purposes consistent with 34 CFR 200.106(e) during the demonstration authority period;</p>	<p>(d)(1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>_X_Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <input type="checkbox"/>___Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> <input type="checkbox"/>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(2) Ensure that all students and each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act in participating schools are held to the</p>	<p>(d)(2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>_X_Application demonstrates a plan to meet this</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>same challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act as all other students, except that students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may be assessed with alternate assessments aligned with alternate academic achievement standards consistent with 34 CFR 200.6 and section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D) of the Act, and receive the instructional support needed to meet such standards;</p>	<p>requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(3) Report the following annually to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may reasonably require:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) An update on implementation of the innovative assessment demonstration authority,</p>	<p>(d)(3)</p> <p><u> X </u>Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>including-- (A) The SEA's progress against its timeline under 34 CFR 200.106(c) and any outcomes or results from its evaluation and continuous improvement process under 34 CFR 200.106(e); and (B) If the innovative assessment system is not yet implemented statewide consistent with 34 CFR 200.104(a)(2), a description of the SEA's progress in scaling up the system to additional LEAs or schools consistent with its strategies under 34 CFR 200.106(a)(3)(i), including updated assurances from participating LEAs consistent with paragraph (e)(2) of this section. (ii) The performance of students in participating schools at the State, LEA, and school level, for all students and disaggregated for each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, on the innovative assessment, including academic</p>	<p>___Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>achievement and participation data required to be reported consistent with section 1111(h) of the Act, except that such data may not reveal any personally identifiable information. 18 (iii) If the innovative assessment system is not yet implemented statewide, school demographic information, including enrollment and student achievement information, for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, among participating schools and LEAs and for any schools or LEAs that will participate for the first time in the following year, and a description of how the participation of any additional schools or LEAs in that year contributed to progress toward achieving high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse LEAs in the State consistent with the SEA’s benchmarks described in 34 CFR 200.106(a)(3)(iii).</p>		

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>(iv) Feedback from teachers, principals and other school leaders, and other stakeholders consulted under paragraph (a)(2) of this section, including parents and students, from participating schools and LEAs about their satisfaction with the innovative assessment system;</p>		
<p>(4) Ensure that each participating LEA informs parents of all students in participating schools about the innovative assessment, including the grades and subjects in which the innovative assessment will be administered, and, consistent with section 1112(e)(2)(B) of the Act, at the beginning of each school year during which an innovative assessment will be implemented. Such information must be--</p> <p>(i) In an understandable and uniform format;</p> <p>(ii) To the extent practicable, written in a language that parents can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent with limited English</p>	<p>(d)(4)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>proficiency, be orally translated for such parent; and (iii) Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act, provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent; and</p>	<p>a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(5) Coordinate with and provide information to, as applicable, the Institute of Education Sciences for purposes of the progress report described in section 1204(c) of the Act and ongoing dissemination of information under section 1204(m) of the Act.</p>	<p>(d)(5) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i>	
<p>(e)Initial implementation in a subset of LEAs or schools. If the innovative assessment system will initially be administered in a subset of LEAs or schools in a State--</p> <p>(1) A description of each LEA, and each of its participating schools, that will initially participate, including demographic information and its most recent LEA report card under section 1111(h)(2) of the Act; and</p> <p>(2) An assurance from each participating LEA, for each year that the LEA is participating, that the LEA will comply with all requirements of this section.</p>	<p>(e)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific</i></p>	<p>There are at least three schools that are listed in both the GMAP list of participating schools and the Putnam Consortium list of participating schools, all in Floyd County – Cave Springs Elementary, Pepperell Middle School, and Armuchee Elementary.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p><i>parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i> OR This requirement is not applicable to this application</p>	
<p>(f)Application from a consortium of SEAs. If an application for the innovative assessment demonstration authority is submitted by a consortium of SEAs-- (1) A description of the governance structure of the consortium, including-- (i) The roles and responsibilities of each member SEA, which may include a description of affiliate members, if applicable, and must include a description of financial responsibilities of member SEAs; (ii) How the member SEAs will manage and, at their discretion, share intellectual property developed by the consortium as a group; and (iii) How the member SEAs will consider requests from SEAs to join or leave the consortium and ensure that changes in membership do not affect the consortium’s ability to implement the innovative assessment demonstration authority consistent with the requirements and selection</p>	<p>(f) ____Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. ____Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ____Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement</i></p>	<p>NA</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>criteria in this section and 34 CFR 200.106.</p> <p>(2) While the terms of the association with affiliate members are defined by each consortium, consistent with 34 CFR 200.104(b)(1) and paragraph (f)(1)(i) of this section, for an affiliate member to become a full member of the consortium and to use the consortium's innovative assessment system under the demonstration authority, the consortium must submit a revised application to the Secretary for approval, consistent with the requirements of this section and 34 CFR 200.106 and subject to the limitation under 34 CFR 200.104(d).</p>	<p><i>were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This requirement is not applicable to this application</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>(a) Project narrative. The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s plan for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the plan, the Secretary considers--</p> <p>(a)(1) ; (5 points if factor (3) is applicable; 10 points if factor (3) is inapplicable) The rationale for developing or selecting the particular innovative assessment system to be implemented under the demonstration authority, including-</p> <p>-</p> <p>(i) The distinct purpose of each assessment that is part of the innovative</p>	<p>(a)(1):</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>All three assessment options have generally the same purpose – to provide assessment data to teachers on a timely basis throughout the year in order to inform their instruction and to positively affect student learning.</p> <p>Both Cobb County and Putnam Consortium express that their assessments are designed to sync accountability and student learning.</p> <p>The three different approaches in this application to developing through-year assessments could provide useful information in the long run for</p>	<p>One description of the purpose of the GMAP assessment option is to provide “normative” growth information. Giving norm-referenced information in a standards-based system is neither innovative nor informative, and given that the NWEA national norms are not based on Georgia’s standards and that teachers are given percentile scores that rank students, this part of the system’s rationale is poorly conceptualized in the context of the goals of the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority. This approach would not only not advance the design and delivery of large-scale statewide</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>assessment system and how the system will advance the design and delivery of large-scale, statewide academic assessments in innovative ways; and (ii) The extent to which the innovative assessment system as a whole will promote high-quality instruction, mastery of challenging State academic standards, and improved student outcomes, including for each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act; (5 points if factor (3) is applicable; 10 points if factor (3) is inapplicable)</p>			<p>advancing the design and delivery of large-scale, statewide academic assessments in innovative ways.</p>	<p>academic assessments in innovative ways, such a model for others would set back much of the progress that has been made toward the development of standards-based assessments designed to promote high-quality instruction.</p> <p>The stated purpose of the GMAP system plays down the accountability side of this assessment, and while it is laudable to focus on students' everyday learning, the accountability piece is also very much a key factor in the development of an innovative assessment that can replace the statewide summative assessment.</p> <p>The fact that the Navvy assessment of the Putnam Consortium is comprised solely of multiple-choice items, and the GMAP initially has only multiple-choice items (and perhaps will stay that way), is not innovative and will not advance this aspect of the design of large-scale statewide academic assessments. In fact, the use of only multiple-choice items limits the types of student outcomes that can be demonstrated on the assessment and will not mirror the depth and breadth of instructional outcomes sought throughout instruction (e.g.,</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
				demonstrating thinking and reasoning through short-answer and essay type responses). Since the stated purpose is to help teachers improve instructional outcomes for students, the limited type of items used on these assessments will in fact limit the extent to which the data can be useful for teachers, or may restrict the instructional approaches used in classrooms.
<p>(a)(2) (25 points if factor (3) is applicable; 30 points if factor (3) is inapplicable) The plan the SEA or consortium, in consultation with any external partners, if applicable, has to--</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">(i) Develop and use standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, methods, or other strategies for scoring innovative assessments throughout the demonstration authority period, consistent with</p>	<p>(a)(2):</p>	<p>12</p>	<p>Since both the Navvy assessment and the GMAP assessment (until such time as performance tasks might be developed for GMAP) will be online and consist of only multiple-choice items, there is no need for developing and using rubrics or other scoring methods that apply to open-ended student responses for these options in their current status. Similarly, there is no need to compute inter-rater reliability or training of scorers for these assessments in their current</p>	<p>The application states that for the Cobb County option, there will be a paper-and-pencil mode available for teachers to choose to use, but it is unclear how accuracy of scoring will be assured for the paper-based assessments.</p> <p>The Cobb County option, which includes constructed response items, supports both online and rubric-based manual scoring for the constructed response items. The training provided</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>relevant nationally recognized professional and technical standards, to ensure inter-rater reliability and comparability of innovative assessment results consistent with 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4)(ii), which may include evidence of inter-rater reliability; and</p> <p>(ii) Train evaluators to use such strategies, if applicable; (25 points if factor (3) is applicable; 30 points if factor (3) is inapplicable) and</p>			<p>status.</p> <p>The final independent evaluation of technical quality that the SEA plans to have conducted is designed to include an examination of inter-rater reliability and protocols for scoring constructed-response items from each of the assessment options. This evaluation would be expected to use relevant nationally recognized professional and technical standards and therefore bring a consistent view of these concepts across the three options.</p>	<p>for this important aspect, described as teachers learning how to write quality constructed response items tied to standards and how to collaboratively score constructed response prompts, is listed as a 45-minute session. To even begin to adequately train teachers to both write quality constructed response items AND to score them would take at least a full week for each of these topics.</p> <p>For the performance tasks that NWEA may be including in their final GMAP assessment, through-year assessment model, the application states that NWEA intends to collect sample responses to the performance tasks, guide teachers in matching student work to Georgia Achievement Level Descriptors, and build training guides and next-step guides. However, in the absence of more detailed explanations of this work, it is unclear if the development and use of the scoring tools will be consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical standards.</p> <p>Similarly, while the application states that NWEA intends to collect inter-rater reliability of performance tasks, it is unclear how they plan to</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
				<p>determine this set of data.</p> <p>Because the final independent technical evaluation initiated at the SEA level will not occur until the end of the demonstration authority period, there is no assurance that the development and use of the scoring tools and strategies used in all the innovative assessments will be of adequate quality throughout the demonstration authority period.</p>
<p>(a)(3) (10 points, if applicable) If the system will initially be administered in a subset of schools or LEAs in a State--</p> <p>(i) The strategies the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, will use to scale the innovative assessment to all schools statewide, with a rationale for selecting those strategies;</p> <p>(ii) The strength of the SEA's or consortium's criteria that will be used to determine LEAs and schools that will initially participate and when to approve additional LEAs and schools, if applicable, to participate during the requested demonstration authority period; and</p> <p>(iii) The SEA's plan, including</p>	<p>(a)(3):</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>The SEA included in the criteria they used to select assessment options to pilot as part of IADA whether their inclusion reflected the capacity and ability for high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse districts and schools and would contribute to progress toward achieving such implementation across demographically diverse districts and schools, including diversity based on enrollment of subgroups of students. Having this assurance from each assessment option is basic to this criterion.</p> <p>It appears that for all three innovative</p>	<p>With regard to scaling the innovative assessment statewide, it is not clear in the application how the SEA plans to choose just one of these innovative assessment options for final statewide implementation at the end of the IADA period. The SEA indicates that they will collect and use stakeholder feedback along with results of the technical evaluation to ultimately select one assessment system. However, it is not clear what criteria the state will use, how they will weight different aspects of the three options, or what role the final evaluation will have in the decision. The SEA needs to have a definitive plan and process in place at the start of</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>each SEA in a consortium, for how it will ensure that, during the demonstration authority period, the inclusion of additional LEAs and schools continues to reflect high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse LEAs and schools, or contributes to progress toward achieving such implementation across demographically diverse LEAs and schools, including diversity based on enrollment of subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act and student achievement. The plan must also include annual benchmarks toward achieving high-quality and consistent implementation across participating schools that are, as a group, demographically similar to the State as a whole during the demonstration authority period, using the demographics of initially participating schools as a baseline. (10 points, if applicable)</p>			<p>assessment options, the selection of schools to initially participate was based on schools and/or LEAs volunteering to do so, and in each case, seems to include schools and/or LEAs that were already involved with using that particular assessment system. This situation helps build buy-in for using that particular assessment system and hopefully increases the likelihood of effective and consistent implementation.</p> <p>Additional schools and districts not initially part of a consortium will have an opportunity to join a consortium during the IADA period. The selection criteria that were used by the SEA to identify which assessment options would be a part of the IADA application will be applied to the selection and inclusion of additional LEAs and schools within the existing approved pilots. This approach will hopefully assure that new districts that join a consortium will work toward quality and consistent implementation.</p>	<p>the IADA period for the decision-making that must occur at the end of the IADA period regarding the statewide assessment.</p> <p>A phenomenon that typically occurs in an adoption of curricular materials is that the participants piloting each option fall in love with the option they are piloting and are resistant to considering the adoption of an unfamiliar one. The SEA needs to address the likelihood of this happening during the IADA period, which would skew stakeholder feedback to whatever option each set of stakeholders is familiar with and make it more difficult for the state to make a decision at the end of the IADA period. One strategy that can help mitigate this risk is to ensure that all stakeholders receive comprehensive information about all three options, and if at all possible, some stakeholders actually pilot at least portions of more than one assessment, and/or have opportunities to observe and share assessment experiences across the three pilots over the course of the IADA period.</p> <p>The application does not include</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
				<p>benchmarks toward achieving implementation across participating schools that are, as a group, demographically similar to the State as a whole during the demonstration authority period, using the demographics of initially participating schools as a baseline.</p> <p>The application does not address what strategies the SEA will use to handle situations in which a consortium is not demographically similar to the state as a whole and is not showing adequate progress toward that end. Since the inclusion of schools and/or LEAs throughout the IADA period appears to continue to rely on volunteerism, this approach could be a detriment to achieving all pilots being demographically similar to the state population.</p> <p>Because the inclusion of additional schools is based on volunteerism (coupled with meeting SEA selection criteria), it is unclear how the SEA will address ensuring quality and consistent implementation of the final selected statewide system for non-participating schools and/or LEAs who have not piloted any innovative</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
				<p>assessment and might be resistant to any changes in the assessments they currently use. Additionally, once the SEA chooses one assessment system at the end of the IADA period, it is not clear what strategies the state will use to help schools/LEAs who have piloted a different system to transition to the selected assessment system.</p> <p>One risk that should be addressed at the SEA level is the likelihood that any of these assessment options (two of whom are commercial vendors) might use material incentives to encourage LEAs and/or schools to volunteer to participate in their pilot. This situation is similar to that of a textbook adoption in a district or state in which the companies with the vested interests try to entice teachers and school administrators to use their materials, since those who use materials in a pilot tend to want to continue to use what they have become familiar with.</p>
Total (out of 40) Criteria (a) (auto-total):	<u>17</u>			
(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support. (Up to 20 points total) (b)(1) (5 points) The extent and	(b)(1):	4	In general, all three innovative assessment options appear to have adequate prior experience in	The prior experience of the Cobb County staff working on the innovative assessment option seems to

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>depth of prior experience that the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, and its LEAs have in developing and implementing the components of the innovative assessment system. An SEA may also describe the prior experience of any external partners that will be participating in or supporting its demonstration authority in implementing those components. In evaluating the extent and depth of prior experience, the Secretary considers—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The success and track record of efforts to implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items aligned to the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act in LEAs planning to participate; and (ii) The SEA’s or LEA’s development or use of-- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (A) Effective supports and appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR part 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the 			<p>developing and implementing most of the components of their particular innovative assessment system. The most important part of their prior experience is in the work they have already done in the state of Georgia working in the schools and LEAs that have previously adopted each system as a local assessment system.</p> <p>All three assessment options have experience with the development and use of effective accommodations to provide support for students with disabilities as well as English learners.</p> <p>The Navy assessment (Putnam Consortium) in particular has strong external partners -- the Center for Assessment and the Institute for Performance Improvement -- in terms of their work with innovative assessment systems. The Center for Assessment has been working with the two states already approved for IADA implementation, and the Institute has been providing professional development for the GaDOE to state and regional education center staff assigned to support district and school</p>	<p>be limited to their work on this assessment system in Georgia pilot districts. They list an organization called Education Insights as having provided support to the Cobb County initiative, but no details are provided to explain this relationship. Additionally, the application states that Cobb County will be hiring a third-party contractor to provide support and training on assessment development, and a psychometrician to help with reliability and validity analyses, but again, no details are provided to determine the prior experience of these external partners.</p> <p>While NWEA has a great deal of experience in assessment design and implementation in other states, their experience in developing the GMAP system for Georgia standards is less extensive than is true for staff of the other two assessments. In addition, NWEA item development experience is geared toward trying to find the best alignment to state standards for previously-developed assessment items in a post hoc approach, rather than in developing items from scratch designed especially to measure a set of state standards. Additionally it is</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>Act for administering innovative assessments to all students, including English learners and children with disabilities, which must include professional development for school staff on providing such accommodations;</p> <p>(B) Effective and high-quality supports for school staff to implement innovative assessments and innovative assessment items, including professional development; and</p> <p>(C) Standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, methods, or other strategies for scoring innovative assessments, with documented evidence of the validity, reliability, and comparability of annual summative determinations of achievement, consistent with 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4) and (7). (5 points)</p>			<p>improvement. The description of the Institute’s LAUNCH! Training that addresses teachers’ need to teach effectively to the standards at the appropriate depth of rigor and administrators’ need to better conduct classroom observations and provide effective feedback are two critical areas of improvement needed in education today.</p> <p>All three assessment options have experience with the development and use of accommodations for all students, English learners, and those with disabilities, and all have experience providing training to teachers on the use of such accommodations.</p>	<p>unclear if NWEA has prior experience in developing performance tasks.</p> <p>The professional development support provided by the Cobb County option appears to be limited in expertise, an observation based on the fact that it appears that all the training modules are scheduled to be accomplished in a 45-minute slot. While this design is to help avoid the use of substitute teachers during professional development time, educators with expertise in professional development, especially with regard to developing and scoring innovative items and using assessment data to properly inform instruction, know that to be effective, this type of professional development requires far more extensive depth and time for application than is possible in such a short time frame.</p>
<p>(b)(2) (5 points) The extent and depth of SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, and LEA capacity to implement the innovative assessment system considering the availability of technological</p>	<p>(b)(2):</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>During the 2018-2019 school year, 100% of Georgia Milestones assessments will be administered online, thereby demonstrating that the technological infrastructure is in</p>	<p>The Cobb County assessment pilot has been in place for 8 years, but no data are provided to indicate the extent to which the stated purpose of improving student learning has been met. This</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>infrastructure; State and local laws; dedicated and sufficient staff, expertise, and resources; and other relevant factors. An SEA or consortium may also describe how it plans to enhance its capacity by collaborating with external partners that will be participating in or supporting its demonstration authority. In evaluating the extent and depth of capacity, the Secretary considers--</p> <p>(i) The SEA’s analysis of how capacity influenced the success of prior efforts to develop and implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items; and</p> <p>(ii) The strategies the SEA is using, or will use, to mitigate risks, including those identified in its analysis, and support successful implementation of the innovative assessment. (5 points)</p>			<p>place for online testing throughout the state. Additionally, since the three proposed assessment options occur throughout the year rather than at the same time as the Georgia Milestones, there should not be issues with the availability of computers for multiple tests occurring in the same time frame.</p> <p>The GaDOE plans to hire five new staff members –three in the Office of Assessment and Accountability and two in the Office of Information Technology. Since these positions are explicitly designed to support the IADA work, there should be enough dedicated and sufficient state-level staff to support the project.</p> <p>The GaDOE plans to hire an external technical assistance partner to provide independent technical assistance to the IADA pilot districts and consortia as well as helping to monitor the progress being made. The additional technical expertise of this partner should help provide important oversight to the technical analyses being derived by each of the three pilot assessments.</p>	<p>brings into question whether implementation of this option will yield the results that would define success.</p> <p>In terms of mitigating risks, NWEA intends to analyze the pacing guides of schools in GMAP districts to understand how much variability there will likely be at the planned testing events in order to address the possibility of different content being covered at different points in time (since these tests are given at three specific times during the year). While this is an important concern in the context of that assessment and possible impacts on the results, NWEA staff really should additionally find out from teachers the extent to which the pacing guides are actually followed.</p> <p>The application describes that the NWEA program team will identify potential risks and employ strategies and processes to mitigate these impacts before they become issues, and that these risks will be managed/mitigated internally and shared with stakeholders during regular team meetings.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>Georgia law has established the state's innovative assessment pilot and includes the necessary requirements that will enable the state to implement the innovative assessment pilot and scale it statewide.</p>	<p>However, it is not clear what strategies or processes they have used in other situations to mitigate these types of issues; it would be far more informative if some examples were provided to support their experience and success in doing this.</p> <p>Cobb County, Navvy (Putnam Consortium) and the SEA do not provide specific strategies they will use to mitigate risks, other than to generally indicate that they will use information gathered to mitigate risks.</p> <p>Since two of the assessment options (GMAP and Navvy) are contingent on commercial vendors who will continue to own the assessment items and other supporting features of their assessments, one potential concern when considering adoption of one of these systems as the statewide assessment is the lack of SEA control if (a) the test company should go out of business or make a decision to no longer provide support for that assessment, or such, or (b) staff of the test company changes and is no longer providing the level or quality of technical support needed for successful statewide implementation.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
				After having put the necessary amount of time, effort, and resources into the implementation of a new statewide assessment, the SEA needs protections against such circumstances.
<p>(b)(3) (10 points)The extent and depth of State and local support for the application for demonstration authority in each SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, as demonstrated by signatures from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Superintendents (or equivalent) of LEAs, including participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority period. (ii) Presidents of local school boards (or equivalent, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority. (iii) Local teacher organizations (including labor organizations, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority. 	(b)(3):	4	<p>There are letters of support as follows:</p> <p>GMAP :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letters signed by the Superintendent and Board Chair for nine districts expressing support and willingness to participate • Letter from Georgia Center for Assessment expressing willingness to provide services to engage GA educators in the development process to “reflect their voice” and to help NWEA better understand the GA standards <p>Putnam Consortium:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One letter from a district superintendent • One letter from the Executive Director of a district • One letter from the University of GA expressing support and willingness to host meetings and provide speakers and facilitators 	<p>There are no letters of support for the Cobb County initiative.</p> <p>There are no letters of support for any of the three innovative assessment options from organizations representing teachers, parents, civil rights advocates, or businesses.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
(iv) Other affected stakeholders, such as parent organizations, civil rights organizations, and business organizations. (10 points)				
Total (out of 20) Criteria (b) (auto-total):	<u>12</u>			
<p>(c) Timeline and budget. (Up to 15 points) The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s timeline and budget for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the timeline and budget, the Secretary considers--</p> <p>(c)(1) (5 points). The extent to which the timeline reasonably demonstrates that each SEA will implement the system statewide by the end of the requested demonstration authority period, including a description of--</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">(i) The activities to occur in each year of the requested demonstration authority period;</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">(ii) The parties responsible for each activity; and</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">(iii) If applicable, how a consortium’s member SEAs will implement</p>	(c)(1):	2	<p>The application provides general information about what the SEA staff will be doing each year of the IADA period, demonstrating reasonable support for the three assessment pilots that will be underway.</p> <p>The application includes detailed descriptions of what will be occurring in the GMAP pilot across the five years of the IADA period and the parties responsible, demonstrating a reasonable picture of attaining their development and field-testing objectives.</p>	<p>At the SEA level, it is unclear what the external technical assistance provider will be doing each year of the IADA period.</p> <p>With regard to the Cobb County timeline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The timeline does not include who the parties are who will be doing each activity. • It is unclear what the difference is between the “field tests” and “districtwide implementation at all the grade levels” that are both listed in Year 2 of the timeline. It is also not clear what grade levels/groups of students will be in the field tests each year. • The timeline does not indicate when training of teachers will occur prior to districtwide implementation.

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>activities at different paces and how the consortium will implement interdependent activities, so long as each non-affiliate member SEA begins using the innovative assessment in the same school year consistent with 34 CFR part 200.104(b)(2); (5 points) and</p>				<p>In the GMAP timeline, it is not clear who exactly will be doing item development. If teachers will be involved in item development, the timeline does not indicate when that training will occur and who would be providing the training.</p> <p>For the GMAP assessment, the timeline shows that the development of performance tasks begins in Year 3, but this is also the year the comparability study will be conducted for ELA and math. It is unclear how the comparability study will be able to include the performance tasks with such a timeline.</p> <p>The application includes a timeline for the Putnam Consortium, but the only activities included are those at the project management level. It is not clear what teachers and students will be doing each year, or when training for teachers will be provided in relation to the progression of activities each year.</p>
(c)(2) (10 points) .The adequacy of the project budget for the duration	(c)(2):	3	The application includes the	Even though budget figures are

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>of the requested demonstration authority period, including Federal, State, local, and non-public sources of funds to support and sustain, as applicable, the activities in the timeline under paragraph (c)(1) of this section, including--</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) How the budget will be sufficient to meet the expected costs at each phase of the SEA’s planned expansion of its innovative assessment system; and</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(ii) The degree to which funding in the project budget is contingent upon future appropriations at the State or local level or additional commitments from non-public sources of funds. (10 points)</p>			<p>estimated costs of the budget for the SEA level of work during the IADA which appear reasonable for the work that is being proposed at that level.</p> <p>While the SEA must seek funds for this budget during the 2019 legislative session for the additional staff to be hired, and in the 2022 legislative session for the external evaluator, the State Board of Education has approved a resolution in support of these funds.</p> <p>An estimated annual budget is provided in the application for the Cobb County pilot which appears reasonable for the proposed work.</p>	<p>provided for SEA level work and the Cobb County pilot, it is not clear if these estimates include the costs for teacher (or substitute) time for activities in which teachers are included.</p> <p>No estimated costs are provided for the work proposed to be conducted for the GMAP assessment. The application states that a price will be dependent on the deliverables expected by GMAP districts and the SEA, but at a minimum, costs for a menu of possible deliverables should be made available as part of the proposal.</p> <p>While the application states that the Putnam Consortium and Navy Education, LLC are responsible for the development and implementation of its innovative assessment system during the IADA period, no details are provided with regard to the expected costs or how the cost sharing between the consortium and the vendor will be determined.</p> <p>The three innovative assessment consortia are responsible for bearing some or all of the costs of developing</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
				<p>each of their innovative assessment solutions. This means that the development budgets are contingent on LEA money, but the application does not include any assurances from the LEAs or the consortia regarding either the existence of the necessary funds or sources from which these funds will be generated.</p> <p>Because all content developed during the program for two of the innovative assessment options (GMAP and Navvy) will be owned by the commercial vendors for those assessments, the state needs to have safeguards in place to protect themselves in terms of long-term budgetary needs and commitments if one of these options is chosen for the statewide assessment after the IADA period. In other words, if the state enters into any contractual agreement with a commercial vendor for replacing the current statewide assessment, limits on cost increases need to be made and if possible, state ownership of items that were developed to be aligned to the GA state standards (perhaps after a certain number of years of state use).</p>
Total (out of 15) Criteria (c):	<u>5</u>			

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents. (Up to 25 points) The quality of the SEA or consortium’s plan to provide supports that can be delivered consistently at scale to educators, students, and parents to enable successful implementation of the innovative assessment system and improve instruction and student outcomes. In determining the quality of supports, the Secretary considers--</p> <p>(d)(1) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 9 points if factor (4) is inapplicable). The extent to which the SEA or consortium has developed, provided, and will continue to provide training to LEA and school staff, including teachers, principals, and other school leaders, that will familiarize them with the innovative assessment system and develop teacher capacity to implement instruction that is informed by the innovative assessment system and its results;</p>	<p>(d)(1):</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Cobb County has a menu of 18 45-minute training modules, three of which are explicitly designed to familiarize teachers and staff with an overview of the system and its purpose.</p> <p>The Putnam Consortium and Navvy Education plan to work with a communications vendor to develop and produce a series of short informational videos designed to introduce the Navy assessment system to interested LEAs. This could be an effective means of familiarizing LEA staff with the assessment as long as its availability is publicized and LEAs make time to view them.</p> <p>The Putnam Consortium has a strong external training program designed to support teachers in implementing the assessment program with fidelity that includes how to use assessment results to inform instruction and support personalized learning for students. Their goal is for participants to commit to the mindset of using on-going assessments to inform their teaching practices, which if</p>	<p>Of the 18 topics listed in the Training Menu for the Cobb County assessment option, none sound as if they are explicitly designed to help teachers learn how to use assessment results to inform instruction.</p> <p>NWEA offers a list of about 17 recommended professional learning opportunities, two of which are designed to familiarize teachers with MAP Growth and several designed to help teachers interpret reports for application to their classrooms. However, the majority of these trainings address the use of MAP Growth data, which is normative and not aligned to GA state standards. In addition, the training materials are described as narrated PowerPoint web presentations with screenshots, interactive online courses, with PDF documents available online or in print. Trainings provided via this type of delivery system are not likely to be as effective as face-to-face or job-embedded training. It is also unclear the length of the NWEA trainings and who is delivering them. The application states that NWEA will work with GMAP and</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>accomplished would develop teacher capacity to implement instruction that is informed by the innovative assessment and its results.</p>	<p>State stakeholders to add through-year assessment-focused professional learning to the current 17 offerings described above, but these do not yet exist and are not included in the description of activities to be accomplished in the timeline.</p>
<p>(d)(2) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 8 points if factor (4) is inapplicable) The strategies the SEA or consortium has developed and will use to familiarize students and parents with the innovative assessment system;</p>	<p>(d)(2):</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Cobb County has developed some resources and communication mechanisms for parents, especially parents of English learners and those with disabilities, about the innovative assessment system. These populations are important groups with whom to communicate about assessment.</p> <p>NWEA provides practice tests to help familiarize students with the online assessment system, allowing them to see sample items and try some accessibility features. Giving students practice tests is an excellent way to help them become familiar with a new assessment.</p> <p>NWEA has a variety of parent resources to help familiarize parents with their assessment system, including a Parent’s Guide to MAP</p>	<p>The application indicates that Cobb County will develop additional supports and documents to familiarize students and parents with the innovative assessment system in collaboration with the CCSD communications Department, but it is unclear what types of supports and documents will be developed or what the content of these resources will be.</p> <p>It is unclear whether the Cobb County assessment option has practice tests for students. This would be an important feature to be developed as a way to familiarize students with the assessment.</p> <p>It is unclear in the Navvy assessment system how students become familiar with the student dashboard and learn how to use this feature, and what resources are provided to teachers for</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>Growth and a sample letter. The application indicates NWEA’s intention to modify these resources for the GMAP version of the assessment.</p> <p>The Navvy assessment system includes a student dashboard for them to keep track of which standards they are in progress learning and which ones they have demonstrated competence. The dashboard includes definitions of the standards broken down by constituent parts and practice questions aligned to the standards. This set of features can help students take charge of their own learning.</p> <p>The Putnam Consortium and Navvy staff will develop materials for communicating with parents, including short instructional videos to introduce parents to the purpose and uses of the Navvy assessment system.</p>	<p>helping to facilitate students in this process. Also, it would be helpful for teachers to be able to monitor students’ use of the dashboard because even though this feature has enormous potential for students, it will only be effective to the extent that it is being used by students in meaningful ways.</p>
<p>(d)(3) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 8 points if factor (4) is inapplicable) The strategies the SEA will use to ensure that all</p>	<p>(d)(3):</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Both the Cobb County and Putnam Consortium state that their assessments use the same accommodations as are used on the</p>	<p>While all three assessment options provide accommodations supports for all students as well as relevant sub-groups, the GMAP option is described</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>students and each subgroup of students under section 1111(c)(2) of the Act in participating schools receive the support, including appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR part 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act, needed to meet the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act; and</p>			<p>current statewide assessment.</p>	<p>as using a set of accommodations used in other NWEA applications and do not necessarily match the set of accommodations used in the current statewide assessment. It is important for the accommodations used in the innovative assessment to match those used in the statewide system, not only for statistical comparability purposes but also for consistency needed for both teachers and students to fully understand the accommodations that are available and to be used in daily instruction every day.</p>
<p>(d)(4) (10 points if applicable). If the system includes assessment items that are locally developed or locally scored, the strategies and safeguards (e.g., test blueprints, item and task specifications, rubrics, scoring tools, documentation of quality control procedures, inter-rater reliability checks, audit plans) the SEA or consortium has developed, or plans to develop, to validly and reliably score such items, including how the strategies engage and support teachers and other staff in designing, developing, implementing, and validly and</p>	<p>(d)(4):</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>The SEA will include in its technical evaluation a study of protocols for scoring constructed response items and inter-rater reliability statistics for the assessment options. This work should help catch issues that may exist in the scoring of items that are locally scored.</p>	<p>Items for the Cobb County assessment are developed by LEA teacher leaders at each grade level and content area who are provided training on how to write “quality rigorous” items by unnamed external partners. However, since no details are provided about the training, such as length of training, content covered, strategies for ensuring that teachers have developed the necessary item-writing skills at an acceptable level, and such, it is unclear the level of quality that is ensured in the item-writing process. And even though assessment experts work alongside the teacher teams during the</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>reliably scoring high-quality assessments; how the safeguards are sufficient to ensure unbiased, objective scoring of assessment items; and how the SEA will use effective professional development to aid in these efforts (10 points if applicable)</p>				<p>development process, it is not clear what strategies these assessment experts will use to guide teachers who might be struggling in item development. Furthermore, it is unclear what approaches are used by the assessment leaders to vet the items for quality and bias. Additionally, it is unclear who reviews and revises the items to meet alignment with state standards.</p> <p>The Cobb County assessment allows teachers to select how an assessment is scored, giving full credit, partial credit, and rubric-based scoring. The application allows evidence-based selected response and multi-part items to be scored with partial credit, and rubric-based manual scoring is currently used for scoring written constructed response items. Also, users may alter the weighting of items on a test by adjusting the number of possible points. With all of these scoring options, it is unclear what safeguards are in place to ensure that the scoring is valid and reliable.</p> <p>NWEA will involve teachers in the development of performance tasks, and will collect sample responses to</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
				<p>the performance tasks, guide teachers in matching student work to Georgia Achievement Level Descriptors, and build training guides. However, it is not clear how teachers will actually be scoring these tasks, how the scores will be integrated into the system with the selected-response items, and how NWEA will ensure consistent, unbiased, and objective scoring across large numbers of teachers scoring these tasks. For example, it is not clear if they will develop anchor sets, training papers, do back reading of papers to ensure consistent scoring and retrain as necessary, nor is it clear if NWEA plans to develop new performance tasks for each year, and if not, how they propose to protect the security of the tasks.</p> <p>NWEA will be collecting inter-rater reliability statistics for scoring of the performance tasks, but it is not clear what processes they will be using for this analysis or what criteria would be used for acceptable levels of inter-rater reliability.</p>
Total (out of 25) Criteria (d):	13			
(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement. (Up to 20 points)	(e)(1):	9	The SEA plans to have an external	The SEA plans to hire an external

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s plan to annually evaluate its implementation of innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers—</p> <p>(e)(1) (12 points) The strength of the proposed evaluation of the innovative assessment system included in the application, including whether the evaluation will be conducted by an independent, experienced third party, and the likelihood that the evaluation will sufficiently determine the system’s validity, reliability, and comparability to the statewide assessment system consistent with the requirements of 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4) and (9); and</p>			<p>technical assistance provider collect and analyze data from the three assessment pilots each year and to obtain advice and feedback on this information from a Technical Advisory Committee regarding reliability, validity, and comparability evidence for the innovative assessment pilots. If this information will be used in an evaluative manner and be wrapped into the information examined by the external evaluator in Year 5, this annual work could be a valuable supplement to the final evaluation in Year 5.</p> <p>Cobb County will use the services of an external evaluator to address continuous alignment of assessments with state standards for the duration of the IADA period. This is one aspect needed for the validity of the system and comparability to the state assessment.</p> <p>NWEA plans to iteratively improve the reliability, validity, and comparability of the through-year assessment system by annually evaluating and prioritizing revisions. Although NWEA is not an independent evaluator, if the data</p>	<p>independent evaluator to determine the validity, reliability, and comparability of each of the three innovative assessment options to the statewide assessment system. However, this evaluation is planned for just Year 5 of the IADA period rather than on an annual basis.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>collected through these various mechanisms are used effectively during the IADA period to make changes as needed to the system, this could improve the quality of the GMAP system for Georgia.</p> <p>Navvy Education will guide the evaluation of technical properties of the Navvy assessment and produce annual technical documentation. Although Navvy is not an independent evaluator, if the data collected are used effectively during the IADA period to make changes as needed to the system, this could improve the quality of the Navvy system for Georgia.</p>	
<p>(e)(2) (8 points) The SEA's or consortium's plan for continuous improvement of the innovative assessment system, including its process for--</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Using data, feedback, evaluation results, and other information from participating LEAs and schools to make changes to improve the quality of the innovative assessment; and (ii) Evaluating and 	<p>(e)(2):</p>	<p>6</p>	<p>One role of the Program Manager to be hired by the SEA will be to develop and monitor an implementation plan for each participating consortium. Additionally, the Program Manager will develop and carry out a plan to ensure all stakeholders are kept up-to-date on the innovative assessment pilot program and have multiple opportunities to provide feedback. As long as this individual</p>	<p>It is not clear how Cobb County and NWEA will be monitoring the implementation of their specific systems during the IADA period</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>monitoring implementation of the innovative assessment system in participating LEAs and schools annually.</p>			<p>collects ongoing feedback from LEA teachers and staff as well as from staff of the three testing consortia, and ensures that this feedback is used to address changes as needed, then this work can be an important vehicle for promoting continuous improvement.</p> <p>The Putnam Consortium will evaluate unintended consequences of the Navy system through feedback gathered during monthly meetings attended by leadership teams from participating LEAs and through multi-year, independent formative evaluation conducted to support continuous improvement. Since Navy has teams of participating and affiliated LEAs who meet regularly to give feedback, and participation in these meetings is required as part of commitment to the pilot, the likelihood is high that these mechanisms will contribute to continuous improvement of the Navy system.</p>	
<p>Total (out of 20) Criteria (e): (auto-total)</p>	<p><u>15</u></p>			

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
Total (a+b+c+d+e) (auto-total)	<u>17 + 12 + 5 + 13 + 15 = 62</u>		

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Instructions:

- The Panel Monitor will provide deadlines for submitting preliminary scores and comments.
- Review and score each application independently.
- Enter preliminary scores and comments into the Preliminary TRF.
- Send completed TRF to the Panel Monitor.
- The Panel Monitor will review scores and comments and ask you to clarify or elaborate if needed, so that comments clearly reflect and justify your scores.
- All scores and comments must be completed before panel discussions can be held.
- After discussion, revise your Preliminary TRF to reflect any changes you want to make.

Writing strengths and weaknesses:

- Make clear, evaluative statements about the substance of the criterion being discussed.
- Substantiate all evaluative statements using evidence from the application narrative, evidence tables, performance measures, appendices, and/or budgets.
- You may comment on information that is missing or inconsistent with other parts of the application.
- Write for a broad audience. Avoid expressions and jargon that might not be commonly understood.

Scoring:

- You may choose to break comments down by subcriteria, which will make them easier to read and review. This is preferred but optional.
- When awarding points, you should NOT break down scores by sub-criteria. Each criterion receives one total score as directed in the TRF (for example, (a)(1)(i-ii) receives one score).
- A few criteria may not be applicable to every application. If so, follow the instructions in the TRF.

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>(a) Consultation. Evidence that the SEA or consortium has developed an innovative assessment system in collaboration with--</p> <p>(1) Experts in the planning, development, implementation, and evaluation of innovative assessment systems, which may include external partners; and</p> <p>(2) Affected stakeholders in the State, or in each State in the consortium, including--</p> <p>(i) Those representing the interests of children with disabilities, English learners, and other subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act;</p> <p>(ii) Teachers, principals, and other school leaders;</p> <p>(iii) Local educational agencies (LEAs);</p> <p>(iv) Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State;</p> <p>(v) Students and parents, including parents of children described in paragraph (a)(2)(i) of this section; and</p> <p>(vi) Civil rights organizations.</p>	<p>(a)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>The evidence submitted pertains to the state's process to solicit stakeholder feedback to inform the ESSA plan, which resulted in common themes about assessment.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>(b) Innovative assessment system. A demonstration that the innovative assessment system does or will--</p> <p>(1) Meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(2)(B) of the Act, except that an innovative assessment--</p> <p>(i) Need not be the same assessment administered to all public elementary and secondary school students in the State during the demonstration authority period described in 34 CFR 200.104(b)(2) or extension period described in 34 CFR 200.108 and prior to statewide use consistent with 34 CFR 200.107, if the innovative assessment system will be administered initially to all students in participating schools within a participating LEA, provided that the statewide academic assessments under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act are administered to all students in any non-participating LEA or any non-participating school within a participating LEA; and</p> <p>(ii) Need not be administered annually in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in grades 9-12 in the case of reading/language arts and mathematics assessments, and at least once in grades 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12 in</p>	<p>(b)(1)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>Clarification is needed about if (1) the NWEA alignment and depth and breadth of knowledge studies occur prior to score reporting, and (2) if growth will continue to be reported in the NWEA assessment.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>the case of science assessments, so long as the statewide academic assessments under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act are administered in any required grade and subject under 34 CFR 200.5(a)(1) in which the SEA does not choose to implement an innovative assessment.</p>		
<p>(2)(i) Align with the challenging State academic content standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act, including the depth and breadth of such standards, for the grade in which a student is enrolled; and (ii) May measure a student’s academic proficiency and growth using items above or below the student’s grade level so long as, for purposes of meeting the requirements for reporting and school accountability under sections 1111(c) and 1111(h) of the Act and paragraphs (b)(3) and (b)(7)-(9) of this section, the State measures each student’s academic proficiency based on the challenging State academic standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled;</p>	<p>(b)(2) ___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. ___X___Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the</p>	<p>The documentation does not verify that the alignment to the State’s academic content standards includes alignment to the depth and breadth of the students.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i>	
(3) Express student results or competencies consistent with the challenging State academic achievement standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act and identify which students are not making sufficient progress toward, and attaining, grade-level proficiency on such standards;	<p>(b)(3) ___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>___X___Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the</i></p>	It is not clear if CCSD scaling and standard setting are aligned to the Georgia Milestone scale.

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<i>application).</i>	
<p>(4)(i) Generate results, including annual summative determinations as defined in paragraph (b)(7) of this section, that are valid, reliable, and comparable for all students and for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, to the results generated by the State academic assessments described in 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act for such students.</p> <p>Consistent with the SEA’s or consortium’s evaluation plan under 34 CFR 200.106(e), the SEA must plan to annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period in one of the following ways:</p> <p>(A) Administering full assessments from both the innovative and statewide assessment systems to all students enrolled in participating schools, such that at least once in any grade span (i.e., 3-5, 6-8, or 9-12) and subject for which there is an innovative assessment, a statewide assessment in the same subject would</p>	<p>(b)(4)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>CCSD does not demonstrate that all tests developed are comparable; tests are being developed locally. It appears that teachers may write and select the items to construct a test.</p> <p>It is not stated if the to-be developed NWEA performance tasks will be included in comparability studies.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>also be administered to all such students. As part of this determination, the innovative assessment and statewide assessment need not be administered to an individual student in the same school year.</p> <p>(B) Administering full assessments from both the innovative and statewide assessment systems to a demographically representative sample of all students and subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, from among those students enrolled in participating schools, such that at least once in any grade span (i.e., 3-5, 6-8, or 9-12) and subject for which there is an innovative assessment, a statewide assessment in the same subject would also be administered in the same school year to all students included in the sample.</p> <p>(C) Including, as a significant portion of the innovative assessment system in each required grade and subject in which both an innovative and statewide assessment are administered, items or performance tasks from the statewide assessment system that, at a minimum, have been previously pilot tested or field tested for use in the statewide assessment</p>		

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>system.</p> <p>(D) Including, as a significant portion of the statewide assessment system in each required grade and subject in which both an innovative and statewide assessment are administered, items or performance tasks from the innovative assessment system that, at a minimum, have been previously pilot tested or field tested for use in the innovative assessment system.</p> <p>(E) An alternative method for demonstrating comparability that an SEA can demonstrate will provide for an equally rigorous and statistically valid comparison between student performance on the innovative assessment and the statewide assessment, including for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act;</p> <p>(ii) Generate results, including annual summative determinations as defined in paragraph (b)(7) of this section, that are valid, reliable, and comparable, for all students and for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, among</p>		

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>participating schools and LEAs in the innovative assessment demonstration authority. Consistent with the SEA’s or consortium’s evaluation plan under 34 CFR 200.106(e), the SEA must plan to annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period;</p>		
<p>(5)(i) Provide for the participation of all students, including children with disabilities and English learners; (ii) Be accessible to all students by incorporating the principles of universal design for learning, to the extent practicable, consistent with 34 CFR 200.2(b)(2)(ii); and (iii) Provide appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act;</p>	<p>(b)(5) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(6) For purposes of the State accountability system consistent with section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the Act, annually measure in each participating school progress on the Academic Achievement indicator under section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the Act of at least 95 percent of all students, and 95 percent of students in each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, who are required to take such assessments consistent with paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section;</p>	<p>(b)(6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>7) Generate an annual summative determination of achievement, using the annual data from the innovative assessment, for each student in a participating school in the demonstration authority that describes--</p> <p>(i) The student’s mastery of the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act for the grade in which the student is enrolled; or</p> <p>(ii) In the case of a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed with an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Act, the student’s mastery of those standards;</p>	<p>(b)(7)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>It is not described how an annual summative determination of achievement can be accurately determined by aggregating scores of assessments administered at different points of time for students, after students have been able to retake assessments multiple times, and in CCSD, how the assessments, which are teacher-made, are valid.</p>
<p>(8) Provide disaggregated results by each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and</p>	<p>(b)(8)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan</p>	<p>It is not evident in the application that disaggregated results by each subgroup of students</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, including timely data for teachers, principals and other school leaders, students, and parents consistent with 34 CFR 200.8 and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(x) and (xii) and section 1111(h) of the Act, and provide results to parents in a manner consistent with paragraph (b)(4)(i) of this section and part 200.2(e);</p>	<p>to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(9) Provide an unbiased, rational, and consistent determination of progress toward the State’s long-term goals for academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(A) of the Act for all students and each subgroup of students described in section</p>	<p>(b)(9)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p>	<p>It is unclear if both tests, an innovative assessment or the GA milestone are administered every year for each consortia.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>1111(c)(2) of the Act and a comparable measure of student performance on the Academic Achievement indicator under section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the Act for participating schools relative to non-participating schools so that the SEA may validly and reliably aggregate data from the system for purposes of meeting requirements for--</p> <p>(i) Accountability under sections 1003 and 1111(c) and (d) of the Act, including how the SEA will identify participating and non-participating schools in a consistent manner for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement under section 1111(c)(4)(D) of the Act; and</p> <p>(ii) Reporting on State and LEA report cards under section 1111(h) of the Act.</p>	<p>____Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>(d) <u>Assurances.</u> This application contains assurances that the lead SEA and each SEA applying as a consortium will: (1) Continue use of the statewide academic assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science required under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act-- (i) In all non-participating schools; and (ii) In all participating schools for which such assessments will be used in addition to innovative assessments for accountability purposes under section 1111(c) of the Act consistent with paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section or for evaluation purposes consistent with 34 CFR 200.106(e) during the demonstration authority period;</p>	<p>(d)(1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(2) Ensure that all students and each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act in participating schools are held to the</p>	<p>(d)(2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>same challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act as all other students, except that students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may be assessed with alternate assessments aligned with alternate academic achievement standards consistent with 34 CFR 200.6 and section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D) of the Act, and receive the instructional support needed to meet such standards;</p>	<p>requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(3) Report the following annually to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may reasonably require:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) An update on implementation of the innovative assessment demonstration authority,</p>	<p>(d)(3)</p> <p><u> X </u>Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>including-- (A) The SEA’s progress against its timeline under 34 CFR 200.106(c) and any outcomes or results from its evaluation and continuous improvement process under 34 CFR 200.106(e); and (B) If the innovative assessment system is not yet implemented statewide consistent with 34 CFR 200.104(a)(2), a description of the SEA’s progress in scaling up the system to additional LEAs or schools consistent with its strategies under 34 CFR 200.106(a)(3)(i), including updated assurances from participating LEAs consistent with paragraph (e)(2) of this section. (ii) The performance of students in participating schools at the State, LEA, and school level, for all students and disaggregated for each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, on the innovative assessment, including academic</p>	<p>___Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>achievement and participation data required to be reported consistent with section 1111(h) of the Act, except that such data may not reveal any personally identifiable information. 18 (iii) If the innovative assessment system is not yet implemented statewide, school demographic information, including enrollment and student achievement information, for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, among participating schools and LEAs and for any schools or LEAs that will participate for the first time in the following year, and a description of how the participation of any additional schools or LEAs in that year contributed to progress toward achieving high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse LEAs in the State consistent with the SEA’s benchmarks described in 34 CFR 200.106(a)(3)(iii).</p>		

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>(iv) Feedback from teachers, principals and other school leaders, and other stakeholders consulted under paragraph (a)(2) of this section, including parents and students, from participating schools and LEAs about their satisfaction with the innovative assessment system;</p>		
<p>(4) Ensure that each participating LEA informs parents of all students in participating schools about the innovative assessment, including the grades and subjects in which the innovative assessment will be administered, and, consistent with section 1112(e)(2)(B) of the Act, at the beginning of each school year during which an innovative assessment will be implemented. Such information must be--</p> <p>(i) In an understandable and uniform format;</p> <p>(ii) To the extent practicable, written in a language that parents can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent with limited English</p>	<p>(d)(4)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>proficiency, be orally translated for such parent; and</p> <p>(iii) Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act, provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent; and</p>	<p>a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(5) Coordinate with and provide information to, as applicable, the Institute of Education Sciences for purposes of the progress report described in section 1204(c) of the Act and ongoing dissemination of information under section 1204(m) of the Act.</p>	<p>(d)(5)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i>	
<p><u>(e)Initial implementation in a subset of LEAs or schools. If the innovative assessment system will initially be administered in a subset of LEAs or schools in a State--</u></p> <p>(1) A description of each LEA, and each of its participating schools, that will initially participate, including demographic information and its most recent LEA report card under section 1111(h)(2) of the Act; and</p> <p>(2) An assurance from each participating LEA, for each year that the LEA is participating, that the LEA will comply with all requirements of this section.</p>	<p>(e)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific</i></p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p><i>parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i> OR This requirement is not applicable to this application</p>	
<p>(f)Application from a consortium of SEAs. If an application for the innovative assessment demonstration authority is submitted by a consortium of SEAs-- (1) A description of the governance structure of the consortium, including-- (i) The roles and responsibilities of each member SEA, which may include a description of affiliate members, if applicable, and must include a description of financial responsibilities of member SEAs; (ii) How the member SEAs will manage and, at their discretion, share intellectual property developed by the consortium as a group; and (iii) How the member SEAs will consider requests from SEAs to join or leave the consortium and ensure that changes in membership do not affect the consortium’s ability to implement the innovative assessment demonstration authority consistent with the requirements and selection</p>	<p>(f) ____Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. ____Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ____Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement</i></p>	<p>This requirement is not applicable to this application.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>criteria in this section and 34 CFR 200.106.</p> <p>(2) While the terms of the association with affiliate members are defined by each consortium, consistent with 34 CFR 200.104(b)(1) and paragraph (f)(1)(i) of this section, for an affiliate member to become a full member of the consortium and to use the consortium's innovative assessment system under the demonstration authority, the consortium must submit a revised application to the Secretary for approval, consistent with the requirements of this section and 34 CFR 200.106 and subject to the limitation under 34 CFR 200.104(d).</p>	<p><i>were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><u> X </u> This requirement is not applicable to this application</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>(a) Project narrative. The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s plan for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the plan, the Secretary considers--</p> <p>(a)(1) (5 points if factor (3) is applicable; 10 points if factor (3) is inapplicable) The rationale for developing or selecting the particular innovative assessment system to be implemented under the demonstration authority, including-</p> <p>-</p> <p>(i) The distinct purpose of each assessment that is part of the innovative assessment system and</p>	<p>(a)(1):</p>	<p>4</p>	<p><u>Cobb</u></p> <p>(i) CCSD provides a clear purpose for CTLS-Assess, including the intention to “sync accountability with supporting student learning”, using district-developed formative assessments throughout the school year.</p> <p>(ii) CTLS-Assess provides student data throughout the school year that is related to mastery of state standards which can immediately inform instruction by “increasing the quality of instructionally-relevant feedback . . . while simultaneously increasing the quality of data collected for monitoring the learning</p>	<p><u>Cobb</u></p> <p>(ii) Having current student data pertaining to attainment of state standards is important, it must be combined with professional development and instructional resources to ensure the data are used to inform instruction. No details are provided related to the statement that, “CCSD will provide schools instructional resources to fully implement a formative assessment process.” There is a 45 minute professional development module pertaining to analyzing student data, but no information about successful implementation of the practices provided in the module.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>how the system will advance the design and delivery of large-scale, statewide academic assessments in innovative ways; and</p> <p>(ii) The extent to which the innovative assessment system as a whole will promote high-quality instruction, mastery of challenging State academic standards, and improved student outcomes, including for each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act; (5 points if factor (3) is applicable; 10 points if factor (3) is inapplicable)</p>			<p>opportunities provided by schools in the state. We expect both improved feedback and accountability to improve student outcomes.” CCSD will provide schools “instructional resources to fully implement a formative assessment process.”</p> <p><u>GMAP</u></p> <p>(i) This through-year assessment is innovative in that the rationale is to provide immediate, actionable data throughout the school year so teachers can adjust instruction to focus on students’ learning needs, and to maximize test efficiency by not retesting standards students have achieved.</p> <p>(ii) GMAP will include instructionally relevant reports on student grade level performance, individual learning level, cross-grade level growth, and recommendations for classroom-based performance tasks tailored to students’ needs. Additionally, The online, on-demand training includes training related to using data to support student learning. This Professional Learning Online tracks completion of courses and provides certification by</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>individual. Such professional development has the potential to guide teachers to use data to inform instruction.</p> <p><u>Putnam Consortium</u></p> <p>(i) The clearly stated purpose of Navy assessment system is to flexibly administer each student's competency of each standard, and provide instructionally relevant feedback for teaching, learning, and accountability purposes.</p> <p>(ii) This consortium states the importance of teachers having the supports needed to be able to interpret and appropriately use results from Navy. Putnam clearly describes the continuum of professional development provided to LEAs, including quarterly innovative assessment summits and partnering with professional development experts. One example of training pertains to the weakness of teachers to teach the standards at the needed depth of rigor. This professional development focused on LEAs and teachers has the potential to inform instructional practice.</p>	
(a)(2) (25 points if factor (3) is	(a)(2):	10	<u>Cobb</u>	<u>Cobb</u>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>applicable; 30 points if factor (3) is inapplicable) The plan the SEA or consortium, in consultation with any external partners, if applicable, has to--</p> <p>(i) Develop and use standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, methods, or other strategies for scoring innovative assessments throughout the demonstration authority period, consistent with relevant nationally recognized professional and technical standards, to ensure inter-rater reliability and comparability of innovative assessment results consistent with 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4)(ii), which may include evidence of inter-rater reliability; and</p> <p>(ii) Train evaluators to use such strategies, if applicable; (25 points if factor (3) is applicable; 30 points if factor (3) is inapplicable) and</p>			<p>(i) CTLS-Assess permits the teacher to develop items and to determine how the assessment will be scored, which may support the instructional intent of the assessment.</p> <p><u>GMAP</u></p> <p>(i) GMAP will develop performance tasks to confirm higher-order thinking and writing skills are included in the assessment system. This development of the performance tasks and scoring protocols will begin in year 3.</p> <p><u>Putnam Consortium</u></p> <p>(i) Students responses are machine scored as correct/incorrect.</p> <p>(ii) not applicable</p>	<p>(i) It is not apparent that CTLS-Assess uses standardized and calibrated scoring tools, rubrics, or methods since CTLS-Assess permits the teacher to determine how the assessment will be scored, permitting partial credit and changing the weighting of items by changing the number of assigned points. No description is provided related to ensuring inter-rater reliability for manually scored items and comparability of assessment results.</p> <p>(ii) Information about training evaluators to use scoring procedures for manually scored items is limited; there is one training session that includes a topic about how to collaboratively score constructed response prompts in the list of Assessment and Personalized Learning Menu of CTLS Assess Trainings.</p> <p><u>GMAP</u></p> <p>(i) The scoring of the performance tasks is not described.</p> <p>(ii) Information about training evaluators to use the scoring procedures for the performance tasks is not provided.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>(a)(3) (10 points, if applicable) If the system will initially be administered in a subset of schools or LEAs in a State--</p> <p>(i) The strategies the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, will use to scale the innovative assessment to all schools statewide, with a rationale for selecting those strategies;</p> <p>(ii) The strength of the SEA's or consortium's criteria that will be used to determine LEAs and schools that will initially participate and when to approve additional LEAs and schools, if applicable, to participate during the requested demonstration authority period; and</p> <p>(iii) The SEA's plan, including each SEA in a consortium, for how it will ensure that, during the demonstration authority period, the inclusion of additional LEAs and schools continues to reflect high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse LEAs and schools, or contributes to progress toward achieving such implementation across</p>	<p>(a)(3):</p>	<p>7</p>	<p><u>This response is based on the SEAs response to this critical element, not individual consortia.</u></p> <p><u>Georgia</u></p> <p>(i) There is not an intention to scale up any of the selected assessments to all schools statewide during the demonstration period. The intention of Georgia's plan is to select one system for statewide implementation after the five-year demonstration period, based on annual reports and the evaluation of the technical quality of each of the innovative assessment systems.</p> <p>(ii) In summer 2018, three districts/consortia, were selected by Georgia SBOE to participate in the five-year demonstration period of IADA. Their selection was based on a competition held to select the innovative assessments that would be considered to become Georgia's assessment model, or the state's current assessment system, after the demonstration period. The criteria each district/consortia of districts had to meet reflect IADA regulatory requirements, assurances, and</p>	<p><u>Georgia</u></p> <p>The strategies that Georgia DOE will use to scale the selected innovated assessment to all schools statewide are not described.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>demographically diverse LEAs and schools, including diversity based on enrollment of subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act and student achievement. The plan must also include annual benchmarks toward achieving high-quality and consistent implementation across participating schools that are, as a group, demographically similar to the State as a whole during the demonstration authority period, using the demographics of initially participating schools as a baseline. (10 points, if applicable)</p>			<p>application selection criteria.</p> <p>(iii) “Districts that choose to join one of the approved innovative assessments would be required to seek amendment of their state performance contracts with the SBOE, which currently require them to use only Georgia Milestones.”</p> <p>Additional districts and schools that wish to join one of the three districts/consortia, must meet the same requirements that the selected districts/consortia were required to meet.</p> <p>Each district/consortia will work with external technical experts to design and implement its assessments and Georgia will also contract with an external technical assistance provider to provide independent technical assistance to each district/consortia and an annual report of activities, needs, and next steps.</p> <p>“All participating districts/consortia are required to provide an annual report to the State that addresses annual benchmarks toward achieving high-quality and consistent</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>implementation across participating schools that are, as a group, demographically similar to the State as a whole during the demonstration authority period, using the demographics of initially participating schools as a baseline.</p> <p>Georgia clearly consistently expects that each of the consortia, in every aspect of this demonstration authority – selection and implementation - will meet the requirements of this demonstration authority.</p>	
Total (out of 40) Criteria (a) (auto-total):	21			
<p>(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support. (Up to 20 points total) (b)(1) (5 points) The extent and depth of prior experience that the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, and its LEAs have in developing and implementing the components of the innovative assessment system. An SEA may also describe the prior experience</p>	(b)(1):	4	<p><u>Georgia</u> (i) The SEA demonstrates the prior experience needed to work with these districts/consortia to develop and implement an innovative assessment system. The implementation of Georgia Milestones requires an online administration, except for some students with disabilities and has met all federal requirements, as does each of the three innovative</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>of any external partners that will be participating in or supporting its demonstration authority in implementing those components. In evaluating the extent and depth of prior experience, the Secretary considers—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The success and track record of efforts to implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items aligned to the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act in LEAs planning to participate; and (ii) The SEA’s or LEA’s development or use of-- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (A) Effective supports and appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR part 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act for administering innovative assessments to all students, including English learners and children with disabilities, which must include professional development 			<p>assessment systems. Additionally, the SEA recently developed a game-based formative assessment for grades 1 and 2 of English language arts and mathematics content standards. Extensive input was received from Georgia educators, external assessment experts, and gaming experts to design test development and result in real-time data to inform instruction. This assessment is now integrated into Georgia’s Statewide Longitudinal Data System.</p> <p><u>Cobb</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) CCSD has been developing and improving the CTLS-Assess for eight years; the CTLS-Assess is used in all 112 CCSD schools at scale for several years. (ii)(A) CCSD will ensure that students have appropriate access to supports and accommodations and will use the same accommodation guidelines as Georgia Milestones when implementing CTLS-Assess. (ii)(B) Individual student summative reports will inform teachers and 	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>for school staff on providing such accommodations;</p> <p>(B) Effective and high-quality supports for school staff to implement innovative assessments and innovative assessment items, including professional development; and</p> <p>(C) Standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, methods, or other strategies for scoring innovative assessments, with documented evidence of the validity, reliability, and comparability of annual summative determinations of achievement, consistent with 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4) and (7). (5 points)</p>			<p>parents about the current learning needs of students.</p> <p>CTLs-Assess training pertaining to navigating the dashboard, sound assessment practices, data analysis for teachers and administrative teams, building items and assessments will be provided by CCSD to leaders, teachers, and support staff in 30-45 minute sessions in face-to-face and digital formats.</p> <p>(ii)(C) Teachers can select how an assessment is scored; the platform permits full and partial credit and rubric-based scoring. Digitally scored items are scored right/wrong. Rubric-based manual scoring is supported and is used for scoring written constructed response items. Teachers may alter the weighting of items on a test.</p> <p><u>GMAP</u></p> <p>(i) NWEA provides a thorough description of the assessment development and implementation work completed over decades; this work includes computer adaptive assessment offerings. Chicago’s use of NWEA assessments is</p>	<p>(ii) (C) Information about how these teacher-selected practices – deciding how an item is scored, changing the weighting of items, and rubric-based manual scoring – are implemented in a standardized manner with calibrated tools to result in valid, reliable, and comparable results, is lacking.</p> <p><u>GMAP</u></p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>documented.</p> <p>Additionally, many of the districts have partnered with NWEA for several years, since 2013, and understand how Growth MAP works and how to ensure a successful implementation.</p> <p>(ii)(A) (pp. 67, 139) Universal design and accessibility standards are considered at the beginning of NWEA product development to support student accessibility to test items.</p> <p>Permitted accommodations for students with disabilities and English learners are documented. Test administration guideline documents and training materials for MAP Growth, including for administration with accommodations are available. A Bias, Sensitivity, and Fairness panel reviews NWEA English language passages; such guidelines are used for each content area. NWEA created a computer adaptive assessment that is accessible to students with visual impairments.</p> <p>(ii)(B) Professional development plans and recommendations for online and onsite professional</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>development, encompassing both instructional practices and considerations, assessment administration, and use of data are provided in detail.</p> <p>(ii)(C) NWEA describes a general plan to building training and next step guides for teachers to administer tasks and a framework for analyzing student work with learning progressions.</p> <p><u>Putnam</u> (i) The Putnam Consortium, in collaboration with Navy Education, has implemented an innovative online assessment in twelve school districts in 2018-19 SY, and fewer districts in the previous SY.</p> <p>(ii)(A) The Putnam Consortium provides supports and appropriate accommodations to students with disabilities and English learners including: (1) adopting the same policies and set of accommodations as the state in its first two years of administration, stating these will be consistent with the statewide system in the future; and (2) employs technology-enabled accessibility</p>	<p>(ii)(C) Details to make this process standardized are not provided.</p> <p><u>Putnam</u> (i) Specific information about this implementation is not provided.</p> <p>(ii)(A) An explicit statement that training on accommodation implementation will be provided to school staff is not included.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>features.</p> <p>(ii)(B) Teachers and administrators will be provided a continuum of high-quality training about: (1) how to interpret and appropriately use Navvy results, (2) implementation from an administrative perspective, (3) hands-on training to use the online technology, and (4) introduction to the assessment design and development from a content perspective. Additional professional development supports include (1) quarterly innovative assessment summits-in-person training sessions for LEAs at various participation levels, (2) partnering with Institute for Performance Improvement to train educational leaders to support implementing Navvy with fidelity and success, and (3) creating web-based training modules to facilitate full-scale implementation for all participating teachers and administrators.</p> <p>(ii)(C) Student responses to Navvy assessment items are machine-scored as correct/not correct. The response data informs student competency profiles by standard, via the</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>“diagnostic psychometric algorithm”. The annual determinations of the profiles are comparable to the statewide assessment annual determinations.</p>	
<p>(b)(2) (5 points) The extent and depth of SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, and LEA capacity to implement the innovative assessment system considering the availability of technological infrastructure; State and local laws; dedicated and sufficient staff, expertise, and resources; and other relevant factors. An SEA or consortium may also describe how it plans to enhance its capacity by collaborating with external partners that will be participating in or supporting its demonstration authority. In evaluating the extent and depth of capacity, the Secretary considers--</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The SEA’s analysis of how capacity influenced the success of prior efforts to develop and implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items; and (ii) The strategies the SEA 	<p>(b)(2):</p>	<p>3</p>	<p><u>Georgia</u> (b)(2)(i) Georgia law established the state’s innovative assessment pilot and includes the requirement to scale statewide. GA BOE will request to support internet bandwidth in 2020-21. Georgia will request funds to hire five state-level positions to support this pilot. Georgia has an RFP for external experts to assist the state and pilot districts in planning, developing, implementing, evaluating and scaling the innovative assessment program.</p> <p><u>Cobb</u> (b)(2)(i) CCSD has been developing and enhancing the CTLS for eight years and it has been implemented in all 112 CCSD schools at scale for several years. CTLS uses an online platform to deliver these assessments.</p> <p>(b)(2)(ii) not addressed</p> <p><u>GMAP</u> (b)(2)(i) GMAP will partner with</p>	<p><u>Cobb</u> (b)(2)(ii) A description of strategies that will be implemented to reduce</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>is using, or will use, to mitigate risks, including those identified in its analysis, and support successful implementation of the innovative assessment. (5 points)</p>			<p>NWEA to create an innovative assessment system. NWEA has implemented large-scale online statewide testing in three states, the BIA, and in several of the largest school districts in the country. Key NWEA staff and teams are engaged in design and development of this assessment and have extensive state assessment consortia experience.</p> <p>(b)(2)(ii) A team at NWEA will identify potential risks and employ strategies and processes to mitigate impacts before issues arise. System requirements are provided and discussed in detail, and state that the NWEA testing platform supports over sixty million test events/year and a million test events in a day and is capable of scaling up to partners' needs.</p> <p><u>Putnam</u> (b)(2)(i) The current statewide assessments are administered 100% online so Putnam Consortium participants have the technology infrastructure, both devices and internet connectivity to deliver Navvy. Since Navvy is a non-concurrent assessment, burden is</p>	<p>risk is not provided.</p> <p>(b)(2)(ii) A description of the strategies that NWEA will employ to mitigate risks and thus support successful implementation is not provided.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>reduced for the number of devices required during a concurrent assessment.</p> <p>Capacity is evident by the human resources involved: Dr. Bradshaw provided technical expertise to design a diagnostic assessment system for PARCC and external partners collaborating with the Putnam Consortium include the Center for Assessment, which will provide technical expertise and policy assistance.</p> <p>The Putnam Consortium provides four tiered levels of participation to ensure successful implementation in each LEA: Full Participant, Partial Participant, Full Affiliate, Partial Affiliate; each level has various levels of assessment participation and different participation in the statewide assessment system for accountability. The intent of these tiers of participation is to help districts more easily engage in the pilot, which facilitates successful scaling to all districts. Also, participating or affiliate LEAs provide two commitments, with expectations clearly defined, indicated by a signed memo:</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>implementation with fidelity and collaborative leadership.</p> <p>(b)(2)(ii) The above practices and organizations involved mitigate risks and support successful implementation of the Putnam Consortium innovative assessment.</p>	
<p>(b)(3) (10 points)The extent and depth of State and local support for the application for demonstration authority in each SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, as demonstrated by signatures from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Superintendents (or equivalent) of LEAs, including participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority period. (ii) Presidents of local school boards (or equivalent, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority. (iii) Local teacher organizations (including 	<p>(b)(3):</p>	<p>3</p>	<p><u>Georgia</u> Two GA BOE Resolutions ensure support for the IADA application and support to increase the DOE budge to implement these programs.</p> <p><u>Cobb</u> (i – iv) not addressed</p> <p><u>GMAP</u> (i) Letters of support were submitted by all 9 participating LEA superintendents.</p> <p><u>Putnam</u> (i) MOUs were submitted by the one participating LEA superintendent and all 9 affiliate LEA superintendents. Putnam also submitted two letters of</p>	<p><u>Cobb</u> (i – iv) CCSD did not provide letters of support from any of the LEA officials, teachers, or stakeholders.</p> <p><u>GMAP</u> (ii-iv) GMAP did not provide letters of support from any of the local BOEs, teachers, or stakeholders.</p> <p><u>Putnam</u> (i) On page 152 it states that Putnam Consortium has implemented the innovative assessment system in 12</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
labor organizations, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority. (iv) Other affected stakeholders, such as parent organizations, civil rights organizations, and business organizations. (10 points)			support: (1) the First District Regional Educational Service Agency (RESA), and (2) The University of Georgia, Dean of the College of Education.	school districts. However letters of support were submitted for ten school districts. (ii-iv) Putnam consortia members did not provide letters of support from any of the local BOEs, teachers, or indicated stakeholders.
Total (out of 20) Criteria (b) (auto-total):	<u>10</u>			
(c) Timeline and budget. (Up to 15 points) The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s timeline and budget for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the timeline and budget, the Secretary considers-- (c)(1) (5 points). The extent to which the timeline reasonably demonstrates that each SEA will implement the system statewide by the end of the requested demonstration authority period, including a description of-- (i) The activities to occur in each year of the requested demonstration authority period;	(c)(1):	2	<u>Cobb</u> (c)(1)(i) CCSD provided a high-level list of activities to complete in years 0-4; district-wide implementation at all grade levels is planned for year 2. (c)(1)(ii) Not addressed (c)(1)(iii) Not applicable to this application <u>GMAP</u> (c)(1)(i) GMAP Pilot Timeline and subsequent narratives for each year provide detailed descriptions of each activity throughout the demonstration period. (c)(1)(ii) The parties responsible for each activity are delineated in the Pilot Timeline.	<u>Cobb</u> (c)(1)(i) Year five of the demonstration period is not represented in the timeline. (c)(1)(ii) The parties responsible for each activity are not indicated.

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>(ii) The parties responsible for each activity; and (iii) If applicable, how a consortium’s member SEAs will implement activities at different paces and how the consortium will implement interdependent activities, so long as each non-affiliate member SEA begins using the innovative assessment in the same school year consistent with 34 CFR part 200.104(b)(2); (5 points) and</p>			<p>(c)(1)(iii) Not applicable to this application.</p> <p><u>Putnam</u> (c)(1)(i) A high-level general timeline presents an overview of typical activities that occur during a school year of the Navvy innovative assessment system.</p> <p>(c)(1)(ii) Responsible parties are indicated next to each high level activity.</p> <p>(c)(1)(iii) Not applicable to this application.</p>	<p><u>Putnam</u> (c)(1)(i) The activities listed in this timeline are so general that it is difficult to ascertain if this innovative assessment would be ready for statewide implementation in year five.</p>
<p>(c)(2) (10 points).The adequacy of the project budget for the duration of the requested demonstration authority period, including Federal, State, local, and non-public sources of funds to support and sustain, as applicable, the activities in the timeline under paragraph (c)(1) of this section, including-- (i) How the budget will be sufficient to meet the expected costs at each phase of the SEA’s planned</p>	<p>(c)(2):</p>	<p>2</p>	<p><u>Georgia</u> The state of Georgia will seek funds from the General Assembly for several annual activities associated with technical assistance and an external, independent evaluation.</p> <p><u>Cobb</u> (c)(2)(i) Budgets for activities for year one start-up costs and activities in years 2-5 recurring costs are presented in the application.</p>	<p><u>Cobb</u> (c)(2)(ii) There is no mention of the degree to which project budget funding is contingent upon future</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>expansion of its innovative assessment system; and (ii) The degree to which funding in the project budget is contingent upon future appropriations at the State or local level or additional commitments from non-public sources of funds. (10 points)</p>			<p>(c)(2)(ii) Not addressed.</p> <p><u>GMAP</u> (c)(2)(i) Not provided.</p> <p>(c)(2)(ii) Not addressed.</p> <p><u>Putnam</u> (c)(2)(i) Not provided.</p> <p>(c)(2)(ii) Not addressed.</p>	<p>appropriations at the State or local level or additional commitments from non-public sources of funds.</p> <p><u>GMAP</u> (c)(2)(i) A budget is not included. The narrative states, “a price will be dependent on the deliverables expected by GMAP districts and the GDOE.”</p> <p>(c)(2)(ii) There is no mention of the degree to which project budget funding is contingent upon future appropriations at the State or local level or additional commitments from non-public sources of funds.</p> <p><u>Putnam</u> (c)(2)(i) A budget is not included.</p> <p>(c)(2)(ii) There is no mention of the degree to which project budget funding is contingent upon future appropriations at the State or local level or additional commitments from non-public sources of funds.</p>
Total (out of 15) Criteria (c):	4			
(d) Supports for educators,	(d)(1):	4	<u>Cobb</u>	<u>Cobb</u>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>students, and parents. (Up to 25 points) The quality of the SEA or consortium’s plan to provide supports that can be delivered consistently at scale to educators, students, and parents to enable successful implementation of the innovative assessment system and improve instruction and student outcomes. In determining the quality of supports, the Secretary considers-- (d)(1) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 9 points if factor (4) is inapplicable). The extent to which the SEA or consortium has developed, provided, and will continue to provide training to LEA and school staff, including teachers, principals, and other school leaders, that will familiarize them with the innovative assessment system and develop teacher capacity to implement instruction that is informed by the innovative assessment system and its results;</p>			<p>(d)(1) CTLTS-Assess Training Menu, lists 18 training topics for administrators, assessment teams, or teachers. Each training session is 30 – 45 minutes in length. The focus for teachers is test development, item development, and scoring: how to write selected response and constructive response items, how to collaboratively score constructed response items, how to incorporate effective feedback on assessments, learn about the dashboard and new enhancements to the assessment, how to use blueprints, test bank items, and other resources to develop teacher created assessments, how to input selected response items and constructed response prompts into the item bank, create an assessment using constructed response item with a defined rubric, input constructed response scores and feedback.</p> <p><u>GMAP</u> (d)(1) Recommended Professional Learning, presents a continuum of professional development topics, both face-to-face and online, for teachers, teacher leaders, administrators, state and district leaders, school technical teams, and proctors. Topics include</p>	<p>(d)(1) Although the training is focused on test development, item development, and scoring, there is no mention of oversight and feedback that are provided to ensure quality, aligned items, and an assessment that adheres to a blueprint and that will be comparable to the current state assessment. There is only one training topic related to instruction – Data Analysis for Teachers: Teachers will explore the Results widget in PLCs and look at how to disaggregate the data, and use the results to drive classroom instruction (45 minutes).</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>purpose and value of MAP Growth, Administering the assessment, Accessing and Interpreting status reports, Applying Growth Reports, Clarifying Learning and Activating Learners, Learning Progressions. This continuum reflects a professional development focus on teaching, learning, assessment administration, and interpreting data and using reports. The breadth and depth of this professional development plan encompasses critical components necessary for successful implementation of the innovative assessment.</p> <p><u>Putnam</u> (d)(1) All new joining members received face-to-face professional development on administrative implementation of the assessment system, components of the Navy assessment system, hands-on training to use the online technology, overview of the assessment content design and development. Supports to provide on-going professional development throughout the development authority include (1) quarterly innovative assessment</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			summits, (2) partnering with professional development experts – The Institute for Performance Improvement – to provide leaders with training to effectively support implementation, and (3) creating accessible, web-based training content to facilitate full-scale implementation by administrators and teachers. The breadth and depth of this professional development plan encompasses critical components necessary for successful implementation of the innovative assessment.	
<p>(d)(2) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 8 points if factor (4) is inapplicable) The strategies the SEA or consortium has developed and will use to familiarize students and parents with the innovative assessment system;</p>	<p>(d)(2):</p>	<p>4</p>	<p><u>Cobb</u> (d)(2) CCSD indicates it will develop supports and documents to familiarize students and parents with the innovative assessment system, initially developing descriptions of the subject/course proficiency to the Milestones.</p> <p><u>GMAP</u> (d)(2) NWEA provides a range of supports to familiarize parents and students with GMAP assessment</p>	<p><u>Cobb</u> (d)(2) CCSD does not describe how it will disseminate these to-be developed supports and documents to parents and students. CCSD does not mention any existing practices used to familiarize students and parents with CTSL-Assess; if such practices have been used for previous school years, it is not clear if these will be updated and disseminated for parent and student use.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>including (1) reports with growth and proficiency data to describe what a student knows and likely next steps, (2) students take online practice tests to familiarize them with item types and accessibility features, (3) the Parent’s Guide to MAP Growth, provided in eight languages, and (4) a letter in English and Spanish that teachers may send home explaining the assessment prior to the assessment administration and a letter, also in English and Spanish that explains test results (pp. 168-9). These activities and documents will likely support parents’ and students’ understanding of the MAP Growth assessment.</p> <p><u>Putnam</u> (d)(2) The Navy platform dashboard engages students in monitoring their learning and assessment process by tracking the standards they are learning- the definitions of the standards, components of the standards, and practice tests, and standards they have/have not learned.</p> <p>One-page reports summarize students’ results and were created for use at parent-teacher conferences.</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>Further development of materials for communicating with parents include short videos explaining the purpose and uses of Navvy assessment system; other supportive practices will be identified by participating LEAs.</p> <p>These practices to engage students and support parent understanding will foster their familiarization of Navvy.</p>	
<p>(d)(3) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 8 points if factor (4) is inapplicable) The strategies the SEA will use to ensure that all students and each subgroup of students under section 1111(c)(2) of the Act in participating schools receive the support, including appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR part 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act, needed to meet the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act; and</p>	<p>(d)(3):</p>	<p>4</p>	<p><u>Cobb</u> (d)(3) CTLS-Assess provides accommodations to students with disabilities and English learners as specified on an IEP, IAP, or EL-TPC.</p> <p><u>GMAP</u> (d)(3) NWEA assessments are designed to support student access to items by reducing language demands, universal features, and accommodations for students with disabilities and English learners. The new through-year assessments will encompass existing features and accommodations. These features and accommodations appear to be typical practice.</p>	<p><u>Cobb, GMAP, Putnam</u> (d)(3) There is no description of an audit or monitoring process to ensure accommodations are provided appropriately to ensure valid assessment results and students who were to receive the accommodations actually received them.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p><u>Putnam</u> (d)(3) Accommodations and supports will be provided to students with disabilities and English learners. Navy will also conduct analyses to ensure items do not function differently such that a subgroup of students may be disadvantaged and will also monitor proficiency rates among students with disabilities to ensure the Navy assessment system provides equitable opportunities to learn.</p>	
<p>(d)(4) (10 points if applicable). If the system includes assessment items that are locally developed or locally scored, the strategies and safeguards (e.g., test blueprints, item and task specifications, rubrics, scoring tools, documentation of quality control procedures, inter-rater reliability checks, audit plans) the SEA or consortium has developed, or plans to develop, to validly and reliably score such items, including how the strategies engage and support teachers and other staff in designing, developing, implementing, and validly and</p>	<p>(d)(4):</p>	<p>2</p>	<p><u>Cobb</u> (d)(4) CCSD teacher leaders develop CTLTS-Assess assessment items after participating in item writing training provided by external partners. The items are reviewed for quality and bias by assessment and content leaders.</p> <p><u>GMAP</u> (d)(4) GMAP does not currently use</p>	<p><u>Cobb</u> (d)(4) Discrepant information is provided in the application about the item development and assessment development process. Some descriptions in the application state that individual teachers must write selected response and constructed response items and construct their own assessments for their students.</p> <p>Although the training for teachers is focused on test development, item development, and scoring, there is no mention of oversight and feedback that are provided to ensure quality, aligned items, and that a teacher</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
reliably scoring high-quality assessments; how the safeguards are sufficient to ensure unbiased, objective scoring of assessment items; and how the SEA will use effective professional development to aid in these efforts (10 points if applicable)			locally developed or scored assessment items. However, there is a plan to develop performance tasks in year 3. <u>Putnam</u> (d)(4) Navy does not develop or score items locally.	constructed assessment adheres to a blueprint that will be comparable to the current state assessment. <u>GMAP</u> (d)(4) No description is provided about strategies, safeguards, quality control procedures, inter-rater reliability checks, audit plans, professional development that will be developed to validly and reliably design, develop, implement, and score performance tasks.
Total (out of 25) Criteria (d):	<u>14</u>			
(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement. (Up to 20 points) The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s plan to annually evaluate its implementation of innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers— (e)(1) (12 points) The strength of the proposed evaluation of the innovative assessment system included in the application, including whether the evaluation will be conducted by an independent, experienced third party, and the likelihood that the	(e)(1):	11	<u>Georgia DOE</u> (e)(1) An independent contractor, selected through an RFP process, will conduct the final evaluation. This final evaluation will include comparability studies with Georgia Milestones and an analyses of test blueprints and item specifications, and an evaluation of reliability and validity evidence consistent with nationally recognized standards, score comparability studies, analyses of subgroups of students and performance differentiation by schools; comparability of administratioprocedures including availability of accommodations, of	Details about the types of analyses that will be conducted based on the data collected and how the annual reports will inform the evaluation are needed.

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>evaluation will sufficiently determine the system’s validity, reliability, and comparability to the statewide assessment system consistent with the requirements of 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4) and (9); and</p>			<p>scoring specifications, and inter-rater reliability statistics.</p>	
<p>(e)(2) (8 points) The SEA’s or consortium’s plan for continuous improvement of the innovative assessment system, including its process for--</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Using data, feedback, evaluation results, and other information from participating LEAs and schools to make changes to improve the quality of the innovative assessment; and (ii) Evaluating and monitoring implementation of the innovative assessment system in participating LEAs and schools annually. 	<p>(e)(2):</p>	<p>7</p>	<p>This response is based on the information provided by GA DOE, not individual consortia.</p> <p><u>Georgia DOE</u> (e)(2)(i) A separate contract will be awarded to an independent third party to (1) provide a set number of hours to provide technical assistance to each assessment pilot to assist in the development and implementation of their assessment systems, and (2) to organize and lead a series of TAC meetings, two times each year during the development authority, to support pilot program participants and provide input and feedback regarding reliability and validity evidence for the innovative assessments.</p> <p>These ongoing practices support the use of data and feedback to inform the implementation of each assessment system.</p>	<p>A description of the data analyses that will be conducted for the annual reports is needed.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p><u>Georgia DOE</u> (e)(2)(ii) The Program Manager for GA DOE will develop and monitor an implementation plan for the state and each pilot to ensure requirements are met and collect data and information, to be used by an independent external expert identified through an RFP process, to develop annual reports related to pilot implementation. The annual reports will include summaries of the technical assistance needs addressed at TAC meetings and through technical assistance provided to each pilot, lessons learned, and recommendations for future pilot program activities.</p>	
<p>Total (out of 20) Criteria (e): (auto-total)</p>	<p><u>18</u></p>			
<p>Total (a+b+c+d+e) (auto-total)</p>	<p><u>67</u></p>			

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Instructions:

- The Panel Monitor will provide deadlines for submitting preliminary scores and comments.
- Review and score each application independently.
- Enter preliminary scores and comments into the Preliminary TRF.
- Send completed TRF to the Panel Monitor.
- The Panel Monitor will review scores and comments and ask you to clarify or elaborate if needed, so that comments clearly reflect and justify your scores.
- All scores and comments must be completed before panel discussions can be held.
- After discussion, revise your Preliminary TRF to reflect any changes you want to make.

Writing strengths and weaknesses:

- Make clear, evaluative statements about the substance of the criterion being discussed.
- Substantiate all evaluative statements using evidence from the application narrative, evidence tables, performance measures, appendices, and/or budgets.
- You may comment on information that is missing or inconsistent with other parts of the application.
- Write for a broad audience. Avoid expressions and jargon that might not be commonly understood.

Scoring:

- You may choose to break comments down by subcriteria, which will make them easier to read and review. This is preferred but optional.
- When awarding points, you should NOT break down scores by sub-criteria. Each criterion receives one total score as directed in the TRF (for example, (a)(1)(i-ii) receives one score).
- A few criteria may not be applicable to every application. If so, follow the instructions in the TRF.

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>(a) Consultation. Evidence that the SEA or consortium has developed an innovative assessment system in collaboration with--</p> <p>(1) Experts in the planning, development, implementation, and evaluation of innovative assessment systems, which may include external partners; and</p> <p>(2) Affected stakeholders in the State, or in each State in the consortium, including--</p> <p>(i) Those representing the interests of children with disabilities, English learners, and other subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act;</p> <p>(ii) Teachers, principals, and other school leaders;</p> <p>(iii) Local educational agencies (LEAs);</p> <p>(iv) Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State;</p> <p>(v) Students and parents, including parents of children described in paragraph (a)(2)(i) of this section; and</p> <p>(vi) Civil rights organizations.</p>	<p>(a)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p><u>(b)Innovative assessment system.</u> A demonstration that the innovative assessment system does or will-- (1) Meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(2)(B) of the Act, except that an innovative assessment-- (i) Need not be the same assessment administered to all public elementary and secondary school students in the State during the demonstration authority period described in 34 CFR 200.104(b)(2) or extension period described in 34 CFR 200.108 and prior to statewide use consistent with 34 CFR 200.107, if the innovative assessment system will be administered initially to all students in participating schools within a participating LEA, provided that the statewide academic assessments under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act are administered to all students in any non-participating LEA or any non-participating school within a participating LEA; and (ii) Need not be administered annually in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in grades 9-12 in the case of reading/language arts and mathematics assessments, and at least once in grades 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12 in</p>	<p>(b)(1) ___x___ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. ___Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>the case of science assessments, so long as the statewide academic assessments under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act are administered in any required grade and subject under 34 CFR 200.5(a)(1) in which the SEA does not choose to implement an innovative assessment.</p>		
<p>(2)(i) Align with the challenging State academic content standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act, including the depth and breadth of such standards, for the grade in which a student is enrolled; and (ii) May measure a student’s academic proficiency and growth using items above or below the student’s grade level so long as, for purposes of meeting the requirements for reporting and school accountability under sections 1111(c) and 1111(h) of the Act and paragraphs (b)(3) and (b)(7)-(9) of this section, the State measures each student’s academic proficiency based on the challenging State academic standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled;</p>	<p>(b)(2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i>	
(3) Express student results or competencies consistent with the challenging State academic achievement standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act and identify which students are not making sufficient progress toward, and attaining, grade-level proficiency on such standards;	<p>(b)(3)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the</i></p>	No plan is presented for how the CTLS-Assess innovative assessment will be able to express student results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards (that is, its performance levels). Without such a plan, which would address psychometric linking designs/decisions and provide justifications for these, the innovative assessment cannot meet (b)(3).

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<i>application).</i>	
<p>(4)(i) Generate results, including annual summative determinations as defined in paragraph (b)(7) of this section, that are valid, reliable, and comparable for all students and for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, to the results generated by the State academic assessments described in 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act for such students.</p> <p>Consistent with the SEA’s or consortium’s evaluation plan under 34 CFR 200.106(e), the SEA must plan to annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period in one of the following ways:</p> <p>(A) Administering full assessments from both the innovative and statewide assessment systems to all students enrolled in participating schools, such that at least once in any grade span (i.e., 3-5, 6-8, or 9-12) and subject for which there is an innovative assessment, a statewide assessment in the same subject would</p>	<p>(b)(4)</p> <p>___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>__x__Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>CTLS-Assess: The application identifies option (B) as the chosen route for determining comparability, but since the innovative assessments are locally developed and not necessarily the same across participating schools and districts, it is not guaranteed that the program will collect the data needed to assess / establish comparability.</p> <p>GMAP: Several linking studies are proposed and linking issues are discussed in depth in the application. However, it is unclear what is the plan for combining the information from different studies to arrive at a determination such that (4)(i) can be met. Moreover, the application does not identify any of the (A)-(E) options as the design by which the program will determine annual comparability.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>also be administered to all such students. As part of this determination, the innovative assessment and statewide assessment need not be administered to an individual student in the same school year.</p> <p>(B) Administering full assessments from both the innovative and statewide assessment systems to a demographically representative sample of all students and subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, from among those students enrolled in participating schools, such that at least once in any grade span (i.e., 3-5, 6-8, or 9-12) and subject for which there is an innovative assessment, a statewide assessment in the same subject would also be administered in the same school year to all students included in the sample.</p> <p>(C) Including, as a significant portion of the innovative assessment system in each required grade and subject in which both an innovative and statewide assessment are administered, items or performance tasks from the statewide assessment system that, at a minimum, have been previously pilot tested or field tested for use in the statewide assessment</p>		

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>system.</p> <p>(D) Including, as a significant portion of the statewide assessment system in each required grade and subject in which both an innovative and statewide assessment are administered, items or performance tasks from the innovative assessment system that, at a minimum, have been previously pilot tested or field tested for use in the innovative assessment system.</p> <p>(E) An alternative method for demonstrating comparability that an SEA can demonstrate will provide for an equally rigorous and statistically valid comparison between student performance on the innovative assessment and the statewide assessment, including for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act;</p> <p>(ii) Generate results, including annual summative determinations as defined in paragraph (b)(7) of this section, that are valid, reliable, and comparable, for all students and for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, among</p>		

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>participating schools and LEAs in the innovative assessment demonstration authority. Consistent with the SEA’s or consortium’s evaluation plan under 34 CFR 200.106(e), the SEA must plan to annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period;</p>		
<p>(5)(i) Provide for the participation of all students, including children with disabilities and English learners; (ii) Be accessible to all students by incorporating the principles of universal design for learning, to the extent practicable, consistent with 34 CFR 200.2(b)(2)(ii); and (iii) Provide appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act;</p>	<p>(b)(5) ___x___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. ___Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(6) For purposes of the State accountability system consistent with section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the Act, annually measure in each participating school progress on the Academic Achievement indicator under section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the Act of at least 95 percent of all students, and 95 percent of students in each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, who are required to take such assessments consistent with paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section;</p>	<p>(b)(6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>7) Generate an annual summative determination of achievement, using the annual data from the innovative assessment, for each student in a participating school in the demonstration authority that describes--</p> <p>(i) The student’s mastery of the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act for the grade in which the student is enrolled; or</p> <p>(ii) In the case of a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed with an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Act, the student’s mastery of those standards;</p>	<p>(b)(7) ___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>__x__Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>CTLS-Assess: No plan is provided for meeting (b)(7).</p> <p>GMAP: The application provides no plan for aggregating data from the interim assessments to form one summative determination; it only indicates that such aggregation will occur. However, the issues involves in aggregating data from different point in time assessments, especially when students could/should have been developing interim, merit more in-depth treatment to provide greater assurance that (b)(7) can be met.</p>
<p>(8) Provide disaggregated results by each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and</p>	<p>(b)(8) ___Application demonstrates a plan</p>	<p>CTLS-Assess: No specific plan is provided for meeting (b)(8). In addition, the proposal to report at the “standard element” level calls for greater elaboration and</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, including timely data for teachers, principals and other school leaders, students, and parents consistent with 34 CFR 200.8 and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(x) and (xii) and section 1111(h) of the Act, and provide results to parents in a manner consistent with paragraph (b)(4)(i) of this section and part 200.2(e);</p>	<p>to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u> x </u> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><u> </u> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>justification.</p> <p>GMAP: The plan should discuss the time required for anticipated analyses (such as linking activities) between operational testing and reporting (or an indication that no such special analyses will be required).</p>
<p>(9) Provide an unbiased, rational, and consistent determination of progress toward the State’s long-term goals for academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(A) of the Act for all students and each subgroup of students described in section</p>	<p>(b)(9)</p> <p><u> </u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p>	<p>CTLS-Assess: No specific plan is provided for meeting (b)(9).</p> <p>Note this reviewer’s interpretation of this requirement: If all students are taking the statewide test during the demonstration period, then (b)(9) can be met during this period with the statewide test.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>1111(c)(2) of the Act and a comparable measure of student performance on the Academic Achievement indicator under section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the Act for participating schools relative to non-participating schools so that the SEA may validly and reliably aggregate data from the system for purposes of meeting requirements for--</p> <p>(i) Accountability under sections 1003 and 1111(c) and (d) of the Act, including how the SEA will identify participating and non-participating schools in a consistent manner for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement under section 1111(c)(4)(D) of the Act; and</p> <p>(ii) Reporting on State and LEA report cards under section 1111(h) of the Act.</p>	<p><u> x </u>Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><u> </u>Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>Whenever the statewide test is not given or the intention is to use the innovative assessment to meet (b)(9), then a plan is needed for ensuring the innovative assessment is able to do so.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>(d) <u>Assurances.</u> This application contains assurances that the lead SEA and each SEA applying as a consortium will: (1) Continue use of the statewide academic assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science required under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act-- (i) In all non-participating schools; and (ii) In all participating schools for which such assessments will be used in addition to innovative assessments for accountability purposes under section 1111(c) of the Act consistent with paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section or for evaluation purposes consistent with 34 CFR 200.106(e) during the demonstration authority period;</p>	<p>(d)(1) ___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. ___Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>---</p>
<p>(2) Ensure that all students and each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act in participating schools are held to the</p>	<p>(d)(2) ___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this</p>	<p>---</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>same challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act as all other students, except that students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may be assessed with alternate assessments aligned with alternate academic achievement standards consistent with 34 CFR 200.6 and section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D) of the Act, and receive the instructional support needed to meet such standards;</p>	<p>requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(3) Report the following annually to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may reasonably require:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) An update on implementation of the innovative assessment demonstration authority,</p>	<p>(d)(3)</p> <p>____Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p>	<p>---</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>including--</p> <p>(A) The SEA’s progress against its timeline under 34 CFR 200.106(c) and any outcomes or results from its evaluation and continuous improvement process under 34 CFR 200.106(e); and</p> <p>(B) If the innovative assessment system is not yet implemented statewide consistent with 34 CFR 200.104(a)(2), a description of the SEA’s progress in scaling up the system to additional LEAs or schools consistent with its strategies under 34 CFR 200.106(a)(3)(i), including updated assurances from participating LEAs consistent with paragraph (e)(2) of this section.</p> <p>(ii) The performance of students in participating schools at the State, LEA, and school level, for all students and disaggregated for each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, on the innovative assessment, including academic</p>	<p>___Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>achievement and participation data required to be reported consistent with section 1111(h) of the Act, except that such data may not reveal any personally identifiable information. 18 (iii) If the innovative assessment system is not yet implemented statewide, school demographic information, including enrollment and student achievement information, for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, among participating schools and LEAs and for any schools or LEAs that will participate for the first time in the following year, and a description of how the participation of any additional schools or LEAs in that year contributed to progress toward achieving high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse LEAs in the State consistent with the SEA’s benchmarks described in 34 CFR 200.106(a)(3)(iii).</p>		

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>(iv) Feedback from teachers, principals and other school leaders, and other stakeholders consulted under paragraph (a)(2) of this section, including parents and students, from participating schools and LEAs about their satisfaction with the innovative assessment system;</p>		
<p>(4) Ensure that each participating LEA informs parents of all students in participating schools about the innovative assessment, including the grades and subjects in which the innovative assessment will be administered, and, consistent with section 1112(e)(2)(B) of the Act, at the beginning of each school year during which an innovative assessment will be implemented. Such information must be--</p> <p>(i) In an understandable and uniform format;</p> <p>(ii) To the extent practicable, written in a language that parents can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent with limited English</p>	<p>(d)(4)</p> <p>___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>___Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>___Application does not demonstrate</p>	<p>---</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>proficiency, be orally translated for such parent; and</p> <p>(iii) Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act, provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent; and</p>	<p>a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(5) Coordinate with and provide information to, as applicable, the Institute of Education Sciences for purposes of the progress report described in section 1204(c) of the Act and ongoing dissemination of information under section 1204(m) of the Act.</p>	<p>(d)(5)</p> <p>___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>___Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this</p>	<p>---</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i>	
<p><u>(e)Initial implementation in a subset of LEAs or schools. If the innovative assessment system will initially be administered in a subset of LEAs or schools in a State--</u></p> <p>(1) A description of each LEA, and each of its participating schools, that will initially participate, including demographic information and its most recent LEA report card under section 1111(h)(2) of the Act; and</p> <p>(2) An assurance from each participating LEA, for each year that the LEA is participating, that the LEA will comply with all requirements of this section.</p>	<p>(e)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific</i></p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p><i>parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i> OR This requirement is not applicable to this application</p>	
<p>(f)Application from a consortium of SEAs. If an application for the innovative assessment demonstration authority is submitted by a consortium of SEAs-- (1) A description of the governance structure of the consortium, including-- (i) The roles and responsibilities of each member SEA, which may include a description of affiliate members, if applicable, and must include a description of financial responsibilities of member SEAs; (ii) How the member SEAs will manage and, at their discretion, share intellectual property developed by the consortium as a group; and (iii) How the member SEAs will consider requests from SEAs to join or leave the consortium and ensure that changes in membership do not affect the consortium’s ability to implement the innovative assessment demonstration authority consistent with the requirements and selection</p>	<p>(f) ____Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. ____Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ____Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement</i></p>	<p>---</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>criteria in this section and 34 CFR 200.106.</p> <p>(2) While the terms of the association with affiliate members are defined by each consortium, consistent with 34 CFR 200.104(b)(1) and paragraph (f)(1)(i) of this section, for an affiliate member to become a full member of the consortium and to use the consortium's innovative assessment system under the demonstration authority, the consortium must submit a revised application to the Secretary for approval, consistent with the requirements of this section and 34 CFR 200.106 and subject to the limitation under 34 CFR 200.104(d).</p>	<p><i>were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>This requirement is not applicable to this application</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>(a) Project narrative. The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s plan for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the plan, the Secretary considers--</p> <p>(a)(1) ; (5 points if factor (3) is applicable; 10 points if factor (3) is inapplicable) The rationale for developing or selecting the particular innovative assessment system to be implemented under the demonstration authority, including-</p> <p>-</p> <p>(i) The distinct purpose of each assessment that is part of the innovative assessment system and</p>	<p>(a)(1):</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>(factor 3 is applicable to all three innovative assessment programs)</p> <p>The application describes the distinct purpose of each component of all three innovative assessment programs.</p> <p>Because they all include through-course assessments with immediate standards-aligned feedback for teachers and students, all three innovative assessment programs have great potential in meeting (a)(1)(ii).</p> <p>This reviewer notes that an interim assessment system featuring only selected response items does not have</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>how the system will advance the design and delivery of large-scale, statewide academic assessments in innovative ways; and</p> <p>(ii) The extent to which the innovative assessment system as a whole will promote high-quality instruction, mastery of challenging State academic standards, and improved student outcomes, including for each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act; (5 points if factor (3) is applicable; 10 points if factor (3) is inapplicable)</p>			<p>the merits of one with a mixture of item formats, including constructed response items, other things being equal.</p>	
<p>(a)(2) (25 points if factor (3) is applicable; 30 points if factor (3) is inapplicable) The plan the SEA or consortium, in consultation with any external partners, if applicable, has to--</p> <p>(i) Develop and use standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, methods, or other strategies for scoring innovative assessments throughout the demonstration authority period, consistent with</p>	<p>(a)(2):</p>	<p>8</p>	<p>(factor 3 is applicable to all three innovative assessment programs)</p> <p>Putnam: The test development processes described for the Putnam Consortium to develop its assessments are entirely consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical standards for scoring.</p> <p><u>However, Putnam Consortium is trivially meeting this requirement.</u></p>	<p>CTLS-Assess: To meet professional standards for test development, the CTLS-Assess plan for the use of teacher-developed tests requires several standardization measures, as indicated in (a)(2)(i), that are not addressed in the application.</p> <p>NWEA: The plan for using Georgia educators to development performance assessments requires a more explicit description of the process to meet (a)(2)(i). Clause (a)(2)(ii) is relevant.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>relevant nationally recognized professional and technical standards, to ensure inter-rater reliability and comparability of innovative assessment results consistent with 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4)(ii), which may include evidence of inter-rater reliability; and</p> <p>(ii) Train evaluators to use such strategies, if applicable; (25 points if factor (3) is applicable; 30 points if factor (3) is inapplicable) and</p>			<p><u>since this requirement does not directly address tests composed solely of selected response items.</u></p>	
<p>(a)(3) (10 points, if applicable) If the system will initially be administered in a subset of schools or LEAs in a State--</p> <p>(i) The strategies the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, will use to scale the innovative assessment to all schools statewide, with a rationale for selecting those strategies;</p> <p>(ii) The strength of the SEA's or consortium's criteria that will be used to determine LEAs and schools that will initially participate</p>	<p>(a)(3):</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Putnam: The Putnam Consortium has devised a tiered participation program, with degrees of specific commitments from participating LEAs for each tier.</p> <p>Putnam is tracking specific demographic indicators, including CCRPI scores, to ensure that diversity and quality goals are maintained during scale-up.</p> <p><u>Note this reviewer's interpretation of this requirement: For this</u></p>	<p>Neither CTLS-Assess nor GMAP presented a scaling plan to ascertain whether it met (a)(3)</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>and when to approve additional LEAs and schools, if applicable, to participate during the requested demonstration authority period; and (iii) The SEA’s plan, including each SEA in a consortium, for how it will ensure that, during the demonstration authority period, the inclusion of additional LEAs and schools continues to reflect high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse LEAs and schools, or contributes to progress toward achieving such implementation across demographically diverse LEAs and schools, including diversity based on enrollment of subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act and student achievement. The plan must also include annual benchmarks toward achieving high-quality and consistent implementation across participating schools that are, as a group, demographically similar to the State as a whole during the demonstration authority period, using the demographics of initially participating schools as a baseline. (10 points, if applicable)</p>			<p><u>requirement, each system would need to show, if it was to expand statewide, how it would do so.</u></p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
Total (out of 40) Criteria (a) (auto-total):	<u>5+8+3=16</u>			
<p>(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support. (Up to 20 points total) (b)(1) (5 points) The extent and depth of prior experience that the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, and its LEAs have in developing and implementing the components of the innovative assessment system. An SEA may also describe the prior experience of any external partners that will be participating in or supporting its demonstration authority in implementing those components. In evaluating the extent and depth of prior experience, the Secretary considers—</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) The success and track record of efforts to implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items aligned to the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act in LEAs planning to participate; and</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(ii) The SEA’s or LEA’s</p>	(b)(1):	3	<p>GMAP: The experience of NWEA, as described in this section of the application, supports (b)(1) for GMAP.</p> <p>Putnam: The experience of Navy Education and the Center for Assessment, as described in this section, supports (b)(1) for the Putnam Consortium.</p>	<p>CTLS-Assess: Aside from the SEA’s prior experience, which can count positively toward each of the innovative assessment teams, the CTLS-Assess section cited only trainings that it has produced to support claims about prior experience. However, this does not cover the requirements under (b)(1).</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>development or use of--</p> <p>(A) Effective supports and appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR part 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act for administering innovative assessments to all students, including English learners and children with disabilities, which must include professional development for school staff on providing such accommodations;</p> <p>(B) Effective and high-quality supports for school staff to implement innovative assessments and innovative assessment items, including professional development; and</p> <p>(C) Standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, methods, or other strategies for scoring innovative assessments, with documented evidence of the validity, reliability, and comparability of annual summative determinations of achievement, consistent with 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4) and (7). (5</p>				

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria points)	Reviewers score for this part	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>(b)(2) (5 points) The extent and depth of SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, and LEA capacity to implement the innovative assessment system considering the availability of technological infrastructure; State and local laws; dedicated and sufficient staff, expertise, and resources; and other relevant factors. An SEA or consortium may also describe how it plans to enhance its capacity by collaborating with external partners that will be participating in or supporting its demonstration authority. In evaluating the extent and depth of capacity, the Secretary considers--</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The SEA’s analysis of how capacity influenced the success of prior efforts to develop and implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items; and (ii) The strategies the SEA is using, or will use, to mitigate risks, including those identified in its analysis, and support successful implementation 	<p>(b)(2): 4</p>	<p>Cobb County, NWEA, and Naavy have submitted evidence of having the technological infrastructure to administer a high volume of assessments online.</p>	<p>No consortium cited risks. In addition, CTLS-Assess did not discuss risk mitigate strategies.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
of the innovative assessment. (5 points)				
<p>(b)(3) (10 points)The extent and depth of State and local support for the application for demonstration authority in each SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, as demonstrated by signatures from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Superintendents (or equivalent) of LEAs, including participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority period. (ii) Presidents of local school boards (or equivalent, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority. (iii) Local teacher organizations (including labor organizations, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority. (iv) Other affected stakeholders, such as parent organizations, civil rights 	(b)(3):	3	Letters of support for (i) and (ii) provided for GMAP and Putnam.	<p>X: No letter of support specific to CTLS-Assess could be located.</p> <p>No letters of support of type (iii) or (iv) could be located for GMAP or Putnam.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
organizations, and business organizations. (10 points)				
Total (out of 20) Criteria (b) (auto-total):	3+4+3=10			
<p>(c) Timeline and budget. (Up to 15 points) The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s timeline and budget for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the timeline and budget, the Secretary considers--</p> <p>(c)(1) (5 points). The extent to which the timeline reasonably demonstrates that each SEA will implement the system statewide by the end of the requested demonstration authority period, including a description of--</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The activities to occur in each year of the requested demonstration authority period; (ii) The parties responsible for each activity; and (iii) If applicable, how a consortium’s member SEAs will implement activities at different paces and how the consortium will implement 	(c)(1):	3	<p>CTLS-Assess: A year-by-year timeline of activities is provided.</p> <p>GMAP: A detailed timeline is provided with applicable years for each activity and activity ownership information.</p> <p>Putnam: A recurring timeline is provided with activity ownership information.</p>	<p>CTLS-Assess: The timeline lacks important elements, such as item and test development activities, and parties responsible for each activity are not specified.</p> <p>Putnam: The timeline does not cover assessment design, development, and analysis activities; the timeline does not include activities or milestones that might differ depending on year of implementation.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
interdependent activities, so long as each non-affiliate member SEA begins using the innovative assessment in the same school year consistent with 34 CFR part 200.104(b)(2); (5 points) and				
(c)(2) (10 points) . The adequacy of the project budget for the duration of the requested demonstration authority period, including Federal, State, local, and non-public sources of funds to support and sustain, as applicable, the activities in the timeline under paragraph (c)(1) of this section, including-- (i) How the budget will be sufficient to meet the expected costs at each phase of the SEA's planned expansion of its innovative assessment system; and (ii) The degree to which funding in the project budget is contingent upon future appropriations at the State or local level or additional commitments from non-public sources of funds. (10 points)	(c)(2):	2	CTLS-Assess: An itemized budget is provided.	CTLS-Assess: (c)(2)(ii) is not addressed. What will be the funding source or sources for CTLS-Assess? GMAP: There is no budget showing itemized costs (including a range wherever necessary). Putnam: No budget is provided.
Total (out of 15) Criteria (c):	3+2=5			

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses	
<p>(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents. (Up to 25 points) The quality of the SEA or consortium’s plan to provide supports that can be delivered consistently at scale to educators, students, and parents to enable successful implementation of the innovative assessment system and improve instruction and student outcomes. In determining the quality of supports, the Secretary considers--</p> <p>(d)(1) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 9 points if factor (4) is inapplicable). The extent to which the SEA or consortium has developed, provided, and will continue to provide training to LEA and school staff, including teachers, principals, and other school leaders, that will familiarize them with the innovative assessment system and develop teacher capacity to implement instruction that is informed by the innovative assessment system and its results;</p>	(d)(1):	5	All three innovative assessment groups have provided training as described under (d)(1) and plan to continue to do so.	
<p>(d)(2) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 8 points if factor (4) is inapplicable) The strategies the SEA or consortium has developed</p>	(d)(2):	4	GMAP: The plan presented addresses both students and parents; it encompasses reporting (results	CTLS-Assess: Plan does not address how to students and parents are to become familiar with aspects of the assessment system, other than how to

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
and will use to familiarize students and parents with the innovative assessment system;			interpretation) and administration (e.g., by providing practice tests) Putnam: The plan presented addresses both students and parents; it encompasses both reporting (results interpretation) and administration	interpret the information it provides.
(d)(3) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 8 points if factor (4) is inapplicable) The strategies the SEA will use to ensure that all students and each subgroup of students under section 1111(c)(2) of the Act in participating schools receive the support, including appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR part 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act, needed to meet the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act; and	(d)(3):	5	All three innovative assessment programs plan to administer assessments in accordance with a student's IEP / IAP.	
(d)(4) (10 points if applicable). If the system includes assessment items that are locally developed or locally scored, the strategies and safeguards (e.g., test blueprints, item and task specifications, rubrics, scoring tools, documentation of quality control procedures, inter-rater reliability	(d)(4):	2	GMAP: NWEA describes a development plan that includes item review for content, DOK, and standards alignment.	CTLS-Assess: The CTLS-Assess plan, as described, fails to include how, specifically, items will be vetted by the Assessment Department. Such vetting usually includes bias and content reviews, field testing, review of statistics, and form or test-event assembly activities. The plan as presented also seems to bundle

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
checks, audit plans) the SEA or consortium has developed, or plans to develop, to validly and reliably score such items, including how the strategies engage and support teachers and other staff in designing, developing, implementing, and validly and reliably scoring high-quality assessments; how the safeguards are sufficient to ensure unbiased, objective scoring of assessment items; and how the SEA will use effective professional development to aid in these efforts (10 points if applicable)				<p>blueprint and assessment development into one activity. An exposition of the strategies and safeguards requires more thorough, step-by-step, treatment to cover (d)(4), than is provided in the application.</p> <p>GMAP: The plan for item review is not detailed enough to explain how NWEA will ensure that the processes it would normally apply to the development of its own assessment items, to ensure their quality, will be implemented in the State.</p> <p>The plan for developing performance assessments does not explain how NWEA will ensure that scoring will be consistent.</p>
Total (out of 25) Criteria (d):	$5 + 4 + 5 + 2 = 16$			
<p>(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement. (Up to 20 points) The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s plan to annually evaluate its implementation of innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers—</p> <p>(e)(1) (12 points) The strength of the proposed evaluation of the</p>	(e)(1):	10	<p>The State has provided an outline of the evaluation process, including some important elements applicable to all three innovative assessment programs.</p> <p>In addition, the State has made provisions for the evaluation to be carried about by external third party.</p> <p>This reviewer assumes that the party ultimately selected will, in fact, be an</p>	<p>Had this been an application for an IADA having only one assessment system, details beyond those provided by the State would have been appropriate.</p> <p>As such either the SEA or each innovative assessment system should have supplemented the general description provided by the State to include at least some elements of a more specific external evaluation plan</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>innovative assessment system included in the application, including whether the evaluation will be conducted by an independent, experienced third party, and the likelihood that the evaluation will sufficiently determine the system’s validity, reliability, and comparability to the statewide assessment system consistent with the requirements of 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4) and (9); and</p>			<p>independent third party.</p>	<p>appropriate to the design innovative assessment system proposed.</p>
<p>(e)(2) (8 points) The SEA’s or consortium’s plan for continuous improvement of the innovative assessment system, including its process for--</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Using data, feedback, evaluation results, and other information from participating LEAs and schools to make changes to improve the quality of the innovative assessment; and (ii) Evaluating and monitoring implementation of the innovative assessment system in participating LEAs and schools annually. 	<p>(e)(2):</p>	<p>7</p>	<p>The major elements of a continuous improvement plan are outlined, which apply to all three assessment systems.</p> <p>Putnam describes their plans further – for example, they will hold monthly continuous improvement meetings to discuss issues such that (e)(2)(i) and (ii) are addressed.</p>	<p>How the general continuous improvement plan will be implemented for CTLS-Assess and GMAP is not discussed.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
Total (out of 20) Criteria (e): (auto-total)	<u>10+7=17</u>		
Total (a+b+c+d+e) (auto-total)	<u>16+10+5+16+17=64</u>		

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Instructions:

- The Panel Monitor will provide deadlines for submitting preliminary scores and comments.
- Review and score each application independently.
- Enter preliminary scores and comments into the Preliminary TRF.
- Send completed TRF to the Panel Monitor.
- The Panel Monitor will review scores and comments and ask you to clarify or elaborate if needed, so that comments clearly reflect and justify your scores.
- All scores and comments must be completed before panel discussions can be held.
- After discussion, revise your Preliminary TRF to reflect any changes you want to make.

Writing strengths and weaknesses:

- Make clear, evaluative statements about the substance of the criterion being discussed.
- Substantiate all evaluative statements using evidence from the application narrative, evidence tables, performance measures, appendices, and/or budgets.
- You may comment on information that is missing or inconsistent with other parts of the application.
- Write for a broad audience. Avoid expressions and jargon that might not be commonly understood.

Scoring:

- You may choose to break comments down by subcriteria, which will make them easier to read and review. This is preferred but optional.
- When awarding points, you should NOT break down scores by sub-criteria. Each criterion receives one total score as directed in the TRF (for example, (a)(1)(i-ii) receives one score).
- A few criteria may not be applicable to every application. If so, follow the instructions in the TRF.

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>(a) Consultation. Evidence that the SEA or consortium has developed an innovative assessment system in collaboration with--</p> <p>(1) Experts in the planning, development, implementation, and evaluation of innovative assessment systems, which may include external partners; and</p> <p>(2) Affected stakeholders in the State, or in each State in the consortium, including--</p> <p>(i) Those representing the interests of children with disabilities, English learners, and other subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act;</p> <p>(ii) Teachers, principals, and other school leaders;</p> <p>(iii) Local educational agencies (LEAs);</p> <p>(iv) Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State;</p> <p>(v) Students and parents, including parents of children described in paragraph (a)(2)(i) of this section; and</p> <p>(vi) Civil rights organizations.</p>	<p>(a)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>(a)(1)</p> <p>In 2018, the Georgia Legislature passed Senate Bill 362, establishing Georgia’s innovative assessment pilot program. The Georgia Department of Education will oversee the pilot program involving three districts/consortia – Cobb County School District, Georgia MAP Assessment Partnership, and Putnam Consortium. Their proposed innovative assessment solutions (CTLS-Assess, MAP Growth for Georgia, Navvy) are aligned with state academic content standards – the Georgia Standards of Excellence. The three districts/consortia have leveraged and will continue to leverage the expertise of experts to develop, implement and evaluate their innovative assessments. The state will also provide additional expert consultations as the innovative assessment pilot progresses through an RFP that is currently in progress. Along with the state’s existing end-of-year summative assessment, the Georgia Milestones, the proposed assessments will provide a variety of different features designed to support student learning. Combined, these three districts/consortia will implement their assessment systems in 22 districts, serving 329 schools and about 287,582 students, beginning in the 2019-2020 school year.</p> <p>The Cobb County School District (CCSD) has implemented the Cobb Teaching and Learning System (CTLS-Assess) since 2011. It was developed in Georgia and provides a suite of standards-based multiple-choice assessments that were created for the specific purpose of measuring the State’s challenging academic content standards throughout the school year for each of the courses and subjects that are required to be tested for state and federal accountability. These assessments are given using a scalable, online platform throughout the year and indicate a student’s academic progress to teachers in real time. CCSD has relied on the expertise of technical and professional experts from the county’s Assessment Department as well as the expertise of outside consultants.</p> <p>The Georgia MAP Assessment Partnership will initially use the MAP Growth assessment created by the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA). It is a through-year norm-referenced multiple-choice assessment based on computer</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
		<p>adaptive interim assessments to provide normative data on students' command of grade-level standards. On the basis of this assessment, NWEA will create the MAP Growth for Georgia innovative assessment, or GMAP.</p> <p>Putnam County has partnered with Navvy Education, representatives from 11 other LEAs, and with educators across the state to develop and implement the Navvy assessment system comprising multiple-choice and constructed-response items to assess competencies at the standards level. The partnership, referred to as the Putnam Consortium, has consulted with a variety of experts and stakeholders in the state in the development of the innovative Navvy assessment system. Navvy Education is a Georgia-based assessment company founded by a University of Georgia professor who is a leading expert in diagnostic psychometrics and assessment.</p> <p>(a)(2i to 2vi) For the five years of the pilot period, the state will utilize its superintendent, parent, and student advisory councils to collect stakeholder feedback on the innovative assessment pilot. Additionally, Georgia will develop an annual stakeholder feedback process to ensure all required stakeholders are kept informed of the innovative assessment pilot's progress and have the opportunity to provide feedback to inform development and implementation efforts. This feedback, along with the results of technical evaluations, will be used by the State to ultimately select one assessment system, approved by the SBOE, for possible statewide expansion. Native Americans represent less than 0.5% of Georgia's population and do not have specific tribal organizations that consult on education issues.</p> <p>CTLS-Assess. Teachers of special education students and English learners have participated in the development of the CTLS-Assess and, along with the county's Special Education Parent Mentors, will continue to be key stakeholders in its ongoing development and scaling. CCSD will work with advocacy groups during the IADA period, soliciting feedback from civil rights advocacy groups such as local chapters of the NAACP as part of the implementation and on-going evaluation and improvement of the innovative assessment system.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
		<p>GMAP. The school districts in the Georgia MAP consortium have involved stakeholders in coming to the decision to partner with NWEA and use MAP Growth and/or to pursue the GMAP pilot, including local BoE members, content teachers and teachers and parents of special education students and English learners, and members from the NAACP and the Coalition of Latino Leaders.</p> <p>The Putnam Consortium's initiative relies on collaboration among the participating districts and various stakeholder groups, including parents and teachers of students with disabilities and English learners. Each school district currently using Navvy assessments is invited to have up to seven representatives on the Putnam Consortium Innovative Assessment Leadership Team: (a) superintendent or assistant superintendent, (b) curriculum director, (c) assessment director, (d) special education director, (e) two principals, and (e) a community member (e.g., board member or other community member). The Consortium has also established a working relationship with such as 100 Black Men of Atlanta, Urban League of Greater Atlanta, ACLU Georgia, and local chapters of the NAACP as part of the implementation and on-going evaluation and improvement of its innovative assessment system.</p>
<p><u>(b) Innovative assessment system.</u> A demonstration that the innovative assessment system does or will-- (1) Meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(2)(B) of the Act, except that an innovative assessment-- (i) Need not be the same assessment administered to all public elementary and secondary school students in the State during the demonstration authority period described in 34 CFR 200.104(b)(2) or extension period</p>	<p>(b)(1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during</p>	<p>(b)(1)</p> <p>The CTLS-Assess in reading and mathematics for grades 3-8 and for identified content areas and courses will be utilized in a subset of Cobb County schools for the period of the demonstration authority, scaling up each year. Participating schools will also administer the statewide end-of-year assessments (i.e., Georgia Milestones) to provide comparability data.</p> <p>GMAP. As the NWEA through-year solution is being refined and validated, partner districts will continue taking the state's end-of-year Georgia Milestones. Districts will transition to GMAP through-year model over the course of the five-year pilot. Thus, all GMAP schools will take the GMAP assessments in English language arts and mathematics in Year 4 at grades 3-8 in lieu of the Georgia</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>described in 34 CFR 200.108 and prior to statewide use consistent with 34 CFR 200.107, if the innovative assessment system will be administered initially to all students in participating schools within a participating LEA, provided that the statewide academic assessments under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act are administered to all students in any non-participating LEA or any non-participating school within a participating LEA; and</p> <p>(ii) Need not be administered annually in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in grades 9-12 in the case of reading/language arts and mathematics assessments, and at least once in grades 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12 in the case of science assessments, so long as the statewide academic assessments under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act are administered in any required grade and subject under 34 CFR 200.5(a)(1) in which the SEA does not choose to implement an innovative assessment.</p>	<p>the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>Milestones, and will take NWEA assessments in English language arts, mathematics, and science in Year 5 at grades 3-8 in lieu of the Georgia Milestones. Students needing alternate assessments will continue to take the State provided assessments in those areas.</p> <p>Putnam Consortium. The Navy assessment system will be administered in a subset of schools and districts for the period of the demonstration authority as it continues to scale each year. Table D-1 shows the grade and subject combinations where, for a representative sample of schools, both the innovative assessment system (Navy) and the statewide academic assessments (Georgia Milestones) will be administered in order to establish comparability. To reduce the burden of double testing, the Putnam Consortium will seek to embed Georgia Milestones assessments into the Navy platform. To preserve the technical quality of Georgia Milestones assessments and items, if this approach is not successful, double testing will occur on the current Georgia Milestones platform at the end of the year.</p>
<p>(2)(i) Align with the challenging State academic content standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act,</p>	<p>(b)(2)</p> <p>____Application demonstrates a plan</p>	<p>(b)(2)(i)</p> <p>CTLS-Assess. Although the Cobb County states that the CTLS-Assess multiple-choice items will be aligned with the challenging State academic standards under</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>including the depth and breadth of such standards, for the grade in which a student is enrolled; and (ii) May measure a student’s academic proficiency and growth using items above or below the student’s grade level so long as, for purposes of meeting the requirements for reporting and school accountability under sections 1111(c) and 1111(h) of the Act and paragraphs (b)(3) and (b)(7)-(9) of this section, the State measures each student’s academic proficiency based on the challenging State academic standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled;</p>	<p>to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u> X </u>Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>_____Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA for the grade in which a student is enrolled as required in section 1111(b)(2)(B)(ii), multiple choice items may not be appropriate to measure the depth and breadth of the state standards. Multiple-choice items constrain students to single appropriate answers, as opposed to constructed-response items such as short answers, which allow students to demonstrate complex, in-depth understanding. NC makes a claim about ensuring the NCPAT will “involve multiple up-to-date measures of student academic achievement, including measures that assess higher order thinking skills and understanding,” but it does not provide any specifics about the type of measures that would accomplish this claim.</p> <p>GMAP. The GMAP use of multiple choice items presents limitations to the extent to which this type of items can directly align with standards that require demonstration of higher-order understanding.</p> <p>Putnam Consortium. It cites several sources of evidence to support the alignment of the Navy innovative assessment system to the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA, including the depth and breadth of such standards, for the grade in which a student is enrolled as required in section 1111(b)(2)(B)(ii), such as the use of both multiple choice and constructed response items, detailed, standard-level assessment blueprint, the experience and expertise of item writing and review teams, and the empirical data available through diagnostic psychometric methods are a few of the sources of evidence cited.</p> <p>(b)(2)(ii) The CTLS-Assess and the Putnam Consortium assessments use items to measure students’ proficiency based on the challenging State academic standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled only. The GMAP through-year assessment model intends to measure student learning against grade-level as well as above and below grade level expectations through the use of vertical scaling of items.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>(3) Express student results or competencies consistent with the challenging State academic achievement standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act and identify which students are not making sufficient progress toward, and attaining, grade-level proficiency on such standards;</p>	<p>(b)(3) <input type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>(b)(3) CTLS-Assess. It will produce proficiency reports containing actionable assessment data at the standard and standard elements level for each assessment to allow parents, teachers, principals, and other school leaders to understand and address the specific academic learning needs of students. The reports will identify which students are not making sufficient progress toward mastery of Georgia standards immediately upon completion of an assessment. There is no explanation of what “standard elements” are, and how the assessment will go about providing reliable scores for the reporting of standard elements.</p> <p>GMAP. While MAP Growth reporting supports determinations about whether students are making progress, NWEA intends to develop additional reports that support decisions regarding grade-level proficiency, relying on the aggregation of data from through-year assessments. Reporting from the first two administrations of the assessment will provide information about projected proficiency, based on grade-level expectations, and following the third assessment, reports will combine information from all three administrations to deliver a summative score relative to grade-level standards as well as information about student growth across the entirety of the academic year. In the absence of providing students with opportunities to retake the first or second administration the GMAP if they don’t pass either assessment, there is no information on how NWEA will handle the generation of projected proficiency reports and its aggregation to the third assessment to provide a summative score.</p> <p>Putnam Consortium. All students attending schools or districts participating in the Navy innovative assessment system will be have their academic proficiency determined based on the challenging State academic standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled. Navy Education will annually evaluate comparability across the Navy and the statewide assessment system during each year of its demonstration authority period using non-parametric clustering methods to map the Navy competency profiles to the nearest Georgia Milestones achievement level in a manner that maximizes classification accuracy. This information will serve as the empirical evidence that will be used in conjunction</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
		<p>with expert judgment to determine relationships between profiles and achievement levels that will be established for annual summative determinations. Based on the final agreed up and approved mapping, achievement level descriptors will be written to summarize the types of profiles that fall into each achievement level.</p>
<p>(4)(i) Generate results, including annual summative determinations as defined in paragraph (b)(7) of this section, that are valid, reliable, and comparable for all students and for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, to the results generated by the State academic assessments described in 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act for such students.</p> <p>Consistent with the SEA’s or consortium’s evaluation plan under 34 CFR 200.106(e), the SEA must plan to annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period in one of the following ways:</p> <p>(A) Administering full assessments from both the innovative and statewide assessment systems to all students enrolled in participating</p>	<p>(b)(4)</p> <p>___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u>X</u>Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or</i></p>	<p>(b)(4)(i and ii)</p> <p>CTLS-Assess. Cobb County School District (CCSD) intends to utilize option (B) to establish comparability between the innovative assessments and the existing state academic assessments for all students and for each subgroup of students. During the initial years of the IADA period, a sample of students will take both the innovative assessments and the state academic assessments. This sample will be selected to ensure demographic similarity to CCSD and the state student populations. Unclear what the size of the sample will be. Also, CCSD will not be collecting data from other counties. In line with this plan, CCSD will utilize the services of a third-party contractor who specializes in assessment item development and assessment development for Georgia standards will train teacher leaders who possess content area expertise in deconstructing standards to identify clear learning targets, blueprint development, and item development using Universal Design Standards. Likewise, CCSD will utilize the services of a psychometrician’s expertise to review item performance and assessment data, and an external evaluator to ensure the CTLS-Assess will meet or exceed the expectations of validity, reliability, and comparability. One aspect of the CTLS-Assess that has the potential to impact the reliability and comparability of scores is that teachers can select items of their choice to generate a test form.</p> <p>GMAP. Without specifying what option it will select, MWEA will utilize the sample of students enrolled in the GMAP pilot schools to establish comparability between the innovative assessments and the existing state academic assessments for all students and for each subgroup of students. NWEA will give additional</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>schools, such that at least once in any grade span (i.e., 3-5, 6-8, or 9-12) and subject for which there is an innovative assessment, a statewide assessment in the same subject would also be administered to all such students. As part of this determination, the innovative assessment and statewide assessment need not be administered to an individual student in the same school year.</p> <p>(B) Administering full assessments from both the innovative and statewide assessment systems to a demographically representative sample of all students and subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, from among those students enrolled in participating schools, such that at least once in any grade span (i.e., 3-5, 6-8, or 9-12) and subject for which there is an innovative assessment, a statewide assessment in the same subject would also be administered in the same school year to all students included in the sample.</p> <p>(C) Including, as a significant portion of the innovative assessment system in each required grade and subject in which both an innovative and statewide assessment are</p>	<p><i>addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>effort and resources to study the validity of the classification decisions derived by the GMAP scales so that the annual summative determinations attain acceptable levels of classification accuracy. This will be done by comparing the classification accuracy of the through-year system to the Georgia Milestones. In addition, NWEA will utilize simulation studies to plan field tests and collect real data to help determine the optimal precision and test lengths needed from the GMAP scores to obtain sufficiently reliable annual summative determinations. To this end, NWEA is forming an internal technical advisory committee to review the technical quality of the through-year assessment and provide guidance on test validation, score reliability, and test scaling. NWEA also plans to iteratively improve the reliability, validity, and comparability of the through-year assessment system by annually evaluating and prioritizing revisions. Figure C-7 displays an iterative test development process that provides a framework for evaluation and continual improvement. Table C-3 presents the types of evidence that will be collected to support claims of validity (content, construct) reliability (inter-rater, classification consistency), and comparability to Milestones for each through-year assessment scale.</p> <p>Putnam Consortium. The Navy assessments were designed to meet or exceed the guidelines established by <i>The Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing</i> (AERA, NCME, & APA, 2014) with respect to the three foundational components of an assessment: validity, reliability, and fairness. On this basis, the Navy innovative assessment and accountability system is designed to provide annual proficiency determinations that are valid, reliable, and comparable for all students and for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of ESEA, to the results generated by the State academic assessments described in 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) for such students. Using Option B, Navy Education will annually evaluate comparability across the Navy and the statewide assessment system during each year of its demonstration authority period using non-parametric clustering methods to map the Navy competency profiles to the nearest Georgia Milestones achievement level in a manner that maximizes classification accuracy. This information will serve as the empirical</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>administered, items or performance tasks from the statewide assessment system that, at a minimum, have been previously pilot tested or field tested for use in the statewide assessment system.</p> <p>(D) Including, as a significant portion of the statewide assessment system in each required grade and subject in which both an innovative and statewide assessment are administered, items or performance tasks from the innovative assessment system that, at a minimum, have been previously pilot tested or field tested for use in the innovative assessment system.</p> <p>(E) An alternative method for demonstrating comparability that an SEA can demonstrate will provide for an equally rigorous and statistically valid comparison between student performance on the innovative assessment and the statewide assessment, including for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act;</p> <p>(ii) Generate results, including annual summative determinations as defined in paragraph (b)(7) of this section, that are valid, reliable, and</p>		<p>evidence that will be used in conjunction with expert judgment to determine relationships between profiles and achievement levels that will be established for annual summative determinations. Based on the final agreed up and approved mapping, achievement level descriptors will be written to summarize the types of profiles that fall into each achievement level.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>comparable, for all students and for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, among participating schools and LEAs in the innovative assessment demonstration authority. Consistent with the SEA’s or consortium’s evaluation plan under 34 CFR 200.106(e), the SEA must plan to annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period;</p>		
<p>(5)(i) Provide for the participation of all students, including children with disabilities and English learners; (ii) Be accessible to all students by incorporating the principles of universal design for learning, to the extent practicable, consistent with 34 CFR 200.2(b)(2)(ii); and (iii) Provide appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act;</p>	<p>(b)(5) ___X___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. ____Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ____Application</p>	<p>(b)(5)(i to iii) CTLS-Assess. Student accommodations will be provided according to their Individual Education Plan (IEP), Individual Accommodation Plan (IAP), or English Learner- Testing Participation Committee (EL-TPC) plan to ensure equitable access to the assessments. The CTLS-Assess provides accessibility for all students through a variety of tools available to all students in the online administration of CTLS-Assess. Some of these include the highlighter tool, scientific and basic function calculators (with the ability to restrict use as needed), and zoom features. In addition, a number of enhancements to CTLS-Assess are in process, such as the ability to enlarge font, use of a place marker/blocking tool, the ability to change the background color of the screen and font color, and the incorporation of text to speech features which will allow ‘read to’ accommodations to be set within the system. Additional accommodations not dependent on CTLS-Assess technology can also be provided. For example, setting accommodations (e.g. small group, preferential setting, test administered by certified educator familiar to student, etc.), presentation accommodations (e.g. repetition of directions, sign English Language Arts passages, Braille, etc.), response accommodations (e.g. scribe, abacus, etc.) and scheduling</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>accommodations (e.g. frequent monitored breaks, extended time, etc.). Students with the most severe cognitive disabilities will continue to participate in the state alternative assessment, currently, the Georgia Alternate Assessment. In contrast to the abundant information provided about available accommodations, no specifics/examples are provided regarding the availability of universal design for learning.</p> <p>NWEA has created an accessibility checklist for item development that follows accessibility standards and protocols provided by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, and WCAG 2.0 Guidelines. Table C-6 provides current NWEA accommodations, universal features, and designated features available to students with disabilities and English learners, where appropriate and in line with documented needs. The new through-year test designs and assessments will be built upon existing supported accommodations and features as outlined in Tables C-6 and C-8.</p> <p>Accommodations that have the potential to interfere with the measurement of core construct are considered non-standard. If documented circumstances (such as an Individualized Education Plan, 504 plan, or English for Speakers of Other Languages program) necessitate non-standard accommodations, those decisions can still be made per State summative assessment guidelines. In contrast to the abundant information provided about available accommodations, no specifics/examples are provided regarding the availability of universal design for learning.</p> <p>Putnam Consortium. Teachers on Navy item authoring and review teams are trained by Navy Education to consider UDL in the development of items to proactively design accessible assessments for the widest range of student needs possible. The Navy innovative assessment system is accessible for students with disabilities and English learners through an assessment delivery platform that features technology-enabled accessibility tools and the availability of appropriate accommodations as specified in a student’s document plan. Among the technology-enabled accessibility tools, the Navy assessments have the options to adjust font size, color and zoom. Navy assessments can be used with regular or</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
		<p>braille keyboards and a touch screen or a mouse. Instructional and assessment accommodations are available for students with disabilities. Navvy assessments support free screen readers (e.g., Google Read and Write) for read aloud accommodations. Additionally, districts are allowed to provide additional accommodations that are not dependent upon the Navvy technology but are detailed in the state’s accommodations manual. For example, districts may provide seating accommodations (e.g., administer the assessments individually to students or in small groups or using adaptive furniture), presentation accommodations (print assessments in Braille, sign assessments and materials, or read assessment aloud), response accommodations (e.g., Braille keyboard, students point to answers), and scheduling accommodations (e.g., frequent breaks, extended time, optimal time of day for testing). In contrast to the abundant information provided about available accommodations, no specifics/examples are provided regarding the availability of universal design for learning.</p>
<p>(6) For purposes of the State accountability system consistent with section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the Act, annually measure in each participating school progress on the Academic Achievement indicator under section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the Act of at least 95 percent of all students, and 95 percent of students in each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, who are required to take such assessments consistent with paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section;</p>	<p>(b)(6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>___ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>(b)(6)</p> <p>CTLS-Assess. CCSD will ensure that at least 95 percent of all students in all schools and 95 percent of students in each subgroup of students will take the CTLS-Assess innovative assessments. Furthermore, the academic achievement indicator for each of these students will be computed from the standards-level competency results.</p> <p>GMAP. The GMAP districts will assess all students in grades 3-8 consistent with how they currently assess the Georgia Milestones Assessment System. This will meet the expectation of assessing at least 95 percent of all students, and 95 percent of students in each subgroup of students.</p> <p>The Putnam Consortium is committed to ensure that at least 95% of all eligible students in participating districts fully participating in the Navvy assessments. Further, the Putnam Consortium will monitor all participating schools and districts to ensure that at least 95% of students in each subgroup of students fully participates in Navvy.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>7) Generate an annual summative determination of achievement, using the annual data from the innovative assessment, for each student in a participating school in the demonstration authority that describes--</p> <p>(i) The student’s mastery of the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act for the grade in which the student is enrolled; or</p> <p>(ii) In the case of a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed with an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Act, the student’s mastery of those standards;</p>	<p>(b)(7)</p> <p>___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>__X__Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during</p>	<p>(b)(7)(i)</p> <p>CTLS-Assess. No plan is provided on how the standards level determination will be combined to form an annual summative score at the end of the year, consistent with the current assessment system, Georgia Milestones, and to form annual summative determinations based on the four Achievement Levels used by the current statewide assessment system that are valid, reliable, and comparable.</p> <p>GMAP. In Year 3, by administering the through-year assessment and Georgia Milestones to the same group of students, NWEA will determine comparability of results from the through-year assessments with the Georgia Milestones. The scores will then be aggregated to produce a summative score that will be used for accountability purposes. In the absence of providing students with opportunities to retake the first or second administration of the GMAP if they don’t pass either assessment, there is no information on how NWEA will handle the aggregation of data from the through-year assessments.</p> <p>Putnam Consortium. The Consortium will establish annual summative determinations for grade levels and subjects where both Navy and Georgia Milestones were administered based upon the empirical data from both assessment systems. Navy does allow for retesting students. Navy Education will annually evaluate comparability across the Navy and the statewide</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>assessment system during each year of its demonstration authority period using non-parametric clustering methods to map the Navvy competency profiles to the nearest Georgia Milestones achievement level, and in a manner that maximizes classification accuracy. Clustering methods will map profiles to achievement levels which will serve as the empirical evidence that will be used in conjunction with expert judgment to determine relationships between profiles and achievement levels that will be established for annual summative determinations. Based on the final agreed up and approved mapping, achievement level descriptors will be written to summarize the types of profiles that fall into each achievement level.</p> <p>(b)(7)(ii) All participating districts in the CTLS-Assess, GMAP and Putnam Consortium pilots will assess students with the most severe cognitive disabilities with the Georgia Alternate Assessment.</p>
<p>(8) Provide disaggregated results by each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, including timely data for teachers, principals and other school leaders, students, and parents consistent with 34 CFR 200.8 and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(x) and (xii) and section 1111(h) of the Act, and provide results to parents in a manner consistent with paragraph (b)(4)(i) of this section and part 200.2(e);</p>	<p>(b)(8) ___X___ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>___ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by</i></p>	<p>(b)(8)</p> <p>CTLS-Assess. The individual student reports available in CTLS-Assess fulfill the requirements specified in section 1111(b)(2)(B)(x). CTLS-Assess assessment reports provide large-scale data overviews of performance on a given assessment, down to individual student level performance on a standard or standard element level. All reports allow district leaders, school leaders, teachers, students, and parents to access real-time data regarding progress toward mastery. There is no explanation of what “standard elements” are, and how the assessment will go about providing reliable scores for the reporting of standard elements.</p> <p>GMAP. For the through-year assessment model, NWEA intends to design and develop reports for teachers, principals, and other school leaders, students, and parents that are consistent with the <i>Standards for Educational Psychological Testing</i> and comply with disaggregation of results by subgroup as per federal accountability and reporting requirements. Currently NWEA provides high-quality and culturally sensitive resources in multiple languages that describe</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p><i>the application).</i> ___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>NWEA assessments and explain test results. Parents can learn more about the vital role assessments play through the Parent’s Guide to MAP Growth, which explains what NWEA assessments measure, how they measure it, and how teachers use the data.</p> <p>The Putnam Consortium Innovative Assessment Executive Team will consult with Navy Education to provide reports through the Navy platform that are disaggregated within the State, as well as each LEA and school, by all subgroups identified in section 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi), except in such cases in which the number of students in a subgroup is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student. The participating LEAs and Navy Education are committed to having the innovative assessment system results disaggregated by all relevant subgroups identified in section 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and reported to USED in the annual progress reports.</p>
<p>(9) Provide an unbiased, rational, and consistent determination of progress toward the State’s long-term goals for academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(A) of the Act for all students and each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act and a comparable measure of student performance on the Academic Achievement indicator under section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the Act for participating schools relative to non-participating schools so that the SEA may validly and reliably aggregate data from the system for purposes of meeting requirements for--</p>	<p>(b)(9) ___X___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. ___Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by</i></p>	<p>(b)(9)</p> <p>CTLS-Assess. Once the comparability of CTLS-Assess and Georgia Milestones results has been empirically established during the initial years of the IADA pilot, CTLS-Assess will provide an unbiased, rational, and consistent determination of the long-term goals of academic achievement set in Georgia’s ESSA Plan.</p> <p>GMAP. To ensure that the results of the assessment being built as part of the GMAP pilot are unbiased, rational and make consistent determinations of progress toward the state’s long-term goals, a phased implementation approach is being used, with the Georgia Milestones assessment being given in Years 1-3 for English language arts and mathematics, and in Years 1-4 for science to establish comparability. This allows for rigorous checks of the system, allowing GMAP districts and the state to verify that the results can be used in the state accountability system and the classroom. Additionally, the through-year assessment system will support the initiatives of Georgia’s long-term goals in a number of ways. For example, the interim assessments will help teachers</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>(i) Accountability under sections 1003 and 1111(c) and (d) of the Act, including how the SEA will identify participating and non-participating schools in a consistent manner for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement under section 1111(c)(4)(D) of the Act; and</p> <p>(ii) Reporting on State and LEA report cards under section 1111(h) of the Act.</p>	<p><i>the application).</i></p> <p>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>understand where students and student subgroups are in terms of their learning, enabling them to challenge students appropriately and to see how student growth is helping to meet the Georgia Accountability goal of annually decreasing the gap between the baseline and 100 percent. When implemented, the data gathered from the innovative assessments can be used in the extant State accountability and Report Card System.</p> <p>Putnam Consortium. The Navy innovative assessment system has been designed to be comparable to the statewide system of assessments for the express purpose of use within the new state accountability system that was approved under the <i>Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)</i>. The Putnam Consortium Innovative Assessment Executive Team in collaboration with Navy Education will ensure individual student summative reports will be provided in an understandable format and, with respect to the annual summative determinations, will be provided in a comparable format consistent with the statewide academic assessment reports. Navy individual student summative reports will be provided in the same languages that Georgia Milestones reports are provided to parents. The Navy system also provides timely and coherent information about student attainment of the challenging State academic standards and whether the student is performing at the student’s grade level as required by section 1111(b)(2)(B)(ii and x) because Navy results detailing standards-competency are provided in real-time. The Putnam Consortium is committed to consulting with Navy Education to ensure Navy reports summative results alongside the statewide academic assessment system results and on the same time schedule when reporting to parents, teachers, and the public.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>(d) <u>Assurances.</u> This application contains assurances that the lead SEA and each SEA applying as a consortium will: (1) Continue use of the statewide academic assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science required under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act-- (i) In all non-participating schools; and (ii) In all participating schools for which such assessments will be used in addition to innovative assessments for accountability purposes under section 1111(c) of the Act consistent with paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section or for evaluation purposes consistent with 34 CFR 200.106(e) during the demonstration authority period;</p>	<p>(d)(1) ___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. ___Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i> ___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(2) Ensure that all students and each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act in participating schools are held to the</p>	<p>(d)(2) ___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>same challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act as all other students, except that students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may be assessed with alternate assessments aligned with alternate academic achievement standards consistent with 34 CFR 200.6 and section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D) of the Act, and receive the instructional support needed to meet such standards;</p>	<p>requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(3) Report the following annually to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may reasonably require:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) An update on implementation of the innovative assessment demonstration authority,</p>	<p>(d)(3)</p> <p>____Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>including--</p> <p>(A) The SEA's progress against its timeline under 34 CFR 200.106(c) and any outcomes or results from its evaluation and continuous improvement process under 34 CFR 200.106(e); and</p> <p>(B) If the innovative assessment system is not yet implemented statewide consistent with 34 CFR 200.104(a)(2), a description of the SEA's progress in scaling up the system to additional LEAs or schools consistent with its strategies under 34 CFR 200.106(a)(3)(i), including updated assurances from participating LEAs consistent with paragraph (e)(2) of this section.</p> <p>(ii) The performance of students in participating schools at the State, LEA, and school level, for all students and disaggregated for each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, on the innovative assessment, including academic</p>	<p>___Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>achievement and participation data required to be reported consistent with section 1111(h) of the Act, except that such data may not reveal any personally identifiable information. 18 (iii) If the innovative assessment system is not yet implemented statewide, school demographic information, including enrollment and student achievement information, for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, among participating schools and LEAs and for any schools or LEAs that will participate for the first time in the following year, and a description of how the participation of any additional schools or LEAs in that year contributed to progress toward achieving high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse LEAs in the State consistent with the SEA’s benchmarks described in 34 CFR 200.106(a)(3)(iii).</p>		

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>(iv) Feedback from teachers, principals and other school leaders, and other stakeholders consulted under paragraph (a)(2) of this section, including parents and students, from participating schools and LEAs about their satisfaction with the innovative assessment system;</p>		
<p>(4) Ensure that each participating LEA informs parents of all students in participating schools about the innovative assessment, including the grades and subjects in which the innovative assessment will be administered, and, consistent with section 1112(e)(2)(B) of the Act, at the beginning of each school year during which an innovative assessment will be implemented. Such information must be--</p> <p>(i) In an understandable and uniform format;</p> <p>(ii) To the extent practicable, written in a language that parents can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent with limited English</p>	<p>(d)(4)</p> <p>___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>___Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>___Application does not demonstrate</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>proficiency, be orally translated for such parent; and</p> <p>(iii) Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act, provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent; and</p>	<p>a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(5) Coordinate with and provide information to, as applicable, the Institute of Education Sciences for purposes of the progress report described in section 1204(c) of the Act and ongoing dissemination of information under section 1204(m) of the Act.</p>	<p>(d)(5)</p> <p>____Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i>	
<p>(e) Initial implementation in a subset of LEAs or schools. If the innovative assessment system will initially be administered in a subset of LEAs or schools in a State--</p> <p>(1) A description of each LEA, and each of its participating schools, that will initially participate, including demographic information and its most recent LEA report card under section 1111(h)(2) of the Act; and</p> <p>(2) An assurance from each participating LEA, for each year that the LEA is participating, that the LEA will comply with all requirements of this section.</p>	<p>(e)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific</i></p>	<p>(e)(1)</p> <p>The Cobb County School District is the second largest district in Georgia with approximately 112,000 students in grades PreK-12 in 113 schools. The system consists of 69 elementary schools, 26 middle schools, and 18 high schools. The district includes students who are English Learners —14%, Economically Disadvantaged—45%, Students with Disabilities—14%. The following races/ethnicities are represented among the student population: Asian—6%, Black—33%, Hispanic—22%, White—36%, and Multi-Racial—4%. Table 2 presents the district’s report card for 2017-2018.</p> <p>Georgia MAP Assessment Partnership. The LEA partners in the GMAP pilot includes 8 collaborating members, who are full members participating immediately in the decision-making, design, and development process; and 1 affiliate partner, who remains informed about the development process and will give the assessments, but is not participating in the decision-making, design, and development process. The 8 collaborating members includes 7 school districts and 1 charter school, comprising more than 100,000 students and representing the diversity of Georgia’s students in terms of geography, ethnicity, and economic status. Both collaborating and affiliate partners will use MAP Growth in 2018-2019 and will also administer Georgia Milestones to students for accountability purposes. The affiliate partners will likely transition to collaborating status beginning the second year. School-by-school demographic information and most recent LEA report card is included.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p><i>parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i> OR This requirement is not applicable to this application</p>	<p>Putnam Consortium. The current set of participating LEAs reflect geographically and demographically diverse LEAs and schools, including diversity described in section 1111(c)(2) of the ESSA, and reflect representative diversity in terms of student achievement. Table D-2 shows the racial and ethnic demographic information for the state of Georgia and for the current set of districts committed to participating in the innovative assessment program during the initial year of the Demonstration Authority. Appendix D-8 provides a detailed description of the demographic characteristics of the districts participating in the Putnam Consortium and their most recent report cards.</p> <p>(e)(2) The necessary assurances, such as letters of support from superintendents of participating districts, institutions of higher learning and partner entities can be found in Appendix B-8 for the Cobb County School District, Appendix C-4 for the Georgia MAP Assessment Partnership, and in Appendix D-11 for the Putnam Consortium.</p>
<p><u>(f)Application from a consortium of SEAs.</u> If an application for the innovative assessment demonstration authority is submitted by a consortium of SEAs-- (1) A description of the governance structure of the consortium, including-- (i) The roles and responsibilities of each member SEA, which may include a description of affiliate members, if applicable, and must include a description of financial responsibilities of member SEAs; (ii) How the member SEAs will manage and, at their discretion, share</p>	<p>(f) ____Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. ____Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement</i></p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>intellectual property developed by the consortium as a group; and (iii) How the member SEAs will consider requests from SEAs to join or leave the consortium and ensure that changes in membership do not affect the consortium’s ability to implement the innovative assessment demonstration authority consistent with the requirements and selection criteria in this section and 34 CFR 200.106.</p> <p>(2) While the terms of the association with affiliate members are defined by each consortium, consistent with 34 CFR 200.104(b)(1) and paragraph (f)(1)(i) of this section, for an affiliate member to become a full member of the consortium and to use the consortium’s innovative assessment system under the demonstration authority, the consortium must submit a revised application to the Secretary for approval, consistent with the requirements of this section and 34 CFR 200.106 and subject to the limitation under 34 CFR 200.104(d).</p>	<p><i>were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>This requirement is not applicable to this application</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>(a) Project narrative. The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s plan for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the plan, the Secretary considers--</p> <p>(a)(1) ; (5 points if factor (3) is applicable; 10 points if factor (3) is inapplicable) The rationale for developing or selecting the particular innovative assessment system to be implemented under the demonstration authority, including-</p> <p>-</p> <p>(i) The distinct purpose of each assessment that is part of the innovative assessment system and</p>	<p>(a)(1):</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>(a)(1)(i)</p> <p>The State of Georgia has established an Innovative Assessment Pilot Program that allows up to 10 school districts or groups of districts to develop alternate assessment and accountability systems aligned with state academic content standards beginning in 2018. Throughout the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) period, the Georgia Department of Education will oversee the innovative assessment pilot program while three approved districts/consortia – Cobb County School District, Georgia MAP Assessment Partnership, and</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>how the system will advance the design and delivery of large-scale, statewide academic assessments in innovative ways; and (ii) The extent to which the innovative assessment system as a whole will promote high-quality instruction, mastery of challenging State academic standards, and improved student outcomes, including for each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act; (5 points if factor (3) is applicable; 10 points if factor (3) is inapplicable)</p>			<p>Putnam Consortium – take the lead in developing and implementing innovative assessment solutions. All three innovative assessments utilize interim assessments administered throughout the year in the grades, content areas, and courses for which they exist, and those results will be used for accountability purposes. The purpose is to provide more immediate, actionable feedback that can be used to guide instruction and improve student performance prior to the end of the school year. The districts/consortia will also administer the state’s end-of-year Georgia Milestones assessments as necessary to establish comparability. Throughout the demonstration authority, the state will conduct technical evaluations of the innovative assessment systems and collect stakeholder feedback in order to select one assessment system for possible statewide expansion.</p> <p>CTLS-Assess. The purpose of the CTLS-Assess is to support students and teachers in the learning process by utilizing valid and reliable assessments given throughout the year. CTLS-Assess assessments</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>indicate a student’s grade level mastery of each standard in a course (for example, every standard in third-grade mathematics). The assessments are delivered using a scalable, online platform that provides a student’s progress on the assessments to teachers in real time. CTLS-Assess is designed to provide information on each standards to help students and their teachers know how they are doing throughout the year. This detailed, standards-level information for each student can be combined at the end of the school year for state and federal accountability.</p> <p>The Georgia MAP Assessment Partnership (GMAP) proposes to partner with the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) to implement a unified assessment system that reduces testing time, provides educators with instructional guidance, and challenges students to develop the higher-order thinking skills they need to succeed in college and careers. The through-year system consists of computer adaptive assessments administered in fall, winter, and spring to measure student learning relative to grade-level</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>expectations and adapts within, below, or above grade level based on the student’s performance. NWEA has plans to develop performance tasks to confirm higher-order thinking skills and writing skills are addressed as part of the through-year assessment system. To that end, NWEA plans to phase-in performance tasks, scoring protocols, and training over three years, starting in Year 3. Including performance tasks in the through-year assessment system will ultimately improve alignment of the testing system and the validity of the summative scores.</p> <p>The Putnam Consortium seeks to implement an innovative, through-year assessment system (“Navy”) to support teaching and learning of the Georgia Standards of Excellence. Navy is an on-demand assessment system that provides real-time and reliable diagnostic data upon which teachers can continuously act to customize learning opportunities for students. Navy is a novel standards-level assessment system designed to produce valid and reliable inferences that pinpoint student competencies of individual state standards.</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>(a)(1)(ii)</p> <p>The CTLS-Assess will be a collection of district-developed, formative assessments aligned to the Georgia Standards of Excellence in English Language Arts, mathematics, and science. With CTLS-Assess, teachers will give the assessments throughout the year and will receive immediate assessment results on each standard so that students and their teachers can easily recognize student progress toward mastery of state standards throughout the year rather than at the end of the year. Teachers can also benefit from the use of the CTLS-Assess item creation tool, which allows teaches to create multiple choice items (with one or more correct responses and distractor rationales) as well as constructed response items. CTLS-Assess supports full credit, partial credit and rubric-based scoring. CTLS-Assess supports rubric-based manual scoring and is currently used for scoring written constructed response items. During the IADA period, CCSD will expand and refine its innovative assessments and establish the</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>comparability between the innovative standards-level assessments and the existing state assessment system, Georgia Milestones.</p> <p>GMAP adaptive assessments administered in fall, winter, and spring will provide timely data about student and class achievement, including performance against grade-level expectations (and performance below or above grade level), show longitudinal academic growth within and across years, and yield summative proficiency scores for the year by summing up grade-level performance data from the three assessments.</p> <p>The Putnam Consortium leverages the Navvy family of diagnostic psychometric methods to assess a student's competency on a standard-by-standard basis using short, web-based assessments that provide actionable, real-time feedback to support timely, personalized instruction. Navvy allows students multiple attempts to update their competence status of each standard, thereby fostering student engagement and ownership in the learning and</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>assessment processes for all students and reducing the anxiety often associated with statewide assessment. The Putnam Consortium anticipates that the Navvy diagnostic system will improve student learning of key concepts delineated by state academic standards for all students by providing feedback that is useful to students for setting goals and monitoring learning; to teachers for identifying students who need additional support or instruction to learn specific standards; and to administrators for identifying trends in successful teaching and learning.</p>	
<p>(a)(2) (25 points if factor (3) is applicable; 30 points if factor (3) is inapplicable) The plan the SEA or consortium, in consultation with any external partners, if applicable, has to--</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">(i) Develop and use standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, methods, or other strategies for scoring innovative assessments throughout the demonstration authority period, consistent with</p>	<p>(a)(2):</p>	<p>15</p>	<p>(a)(2)(i)</p> <p>Georgia will seek an external expert through a competitive bid process to conduct an independent evaluation of technical quality of the innovative assessment systems toward the end of the demonstration authority related to evidence of reliability (including inter-rater) and validity, score comparability, accuracy of classifications for achievement level designations, and the alignment between items on the innovative</p>	<p>Teachers using the CTLS-Assess can pick items of their choice to create a form. This practice raises serious questions about the reliability of scores and the comparability of scores for purposes of reporting results and aggregating scores for the generation of an annual summative score.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>relevant nationally recognized professional and technical standards, to ensure inter-rater reliability and comparability of innovative assessment results consistent with 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4)(ii), which may include evidence of inter-rater reliability; and</p> <p>(ii) Train evaluators to use such strategies, if applicable; (25 points if factor (3) is applicable; 30 points if factor (3) is inapplicable) and</p>			<p>assessments with the Georgia Standards of Excellence content standards.</p> <p>CTLS-Assess. The CTLS-Assess will be administered throughout the school year and assessment results will be delivered instantly to teachers at the standard and standard element level. CTLS-Assess supports full credit, partial credit, and rubric-based scoring. All digitally scored items are scored as right/wrong by default. The application allows evidence-based selected response and multi-part items to be scored with partial credit. CTLS-Assess supports rubric-based manual scoring and is currently used for scoring written constructed response items. Rubric scored items are weighted based on the maximum number of points within the rubric. Additionally, users may alter the weighting of items on a test by adjusting the number of possible points. The application displays both percent and raw scores and allows user-defined performance levels for each assessment. To ensure the reliability, validity and comparability of scores, CCSD relies on the expertise of both within-district</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>technical and professional experts and outside consultants. Cobb County’s Assessment Department team, for example, includes four Assessment Supervisors, all of whom have expertise in several areas of assessment development and implementation. The National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment (Center for Assessment, Dover, New Hampshire), an external resource with extensive experience in the construction of standards-based formative and summative assessment platforms, further supports the technical soundness of the CTLS-Assess.</p> <p>GMAP. The purpose of MAP Growth for Georgia, a through-year model, is to create a system that would eliminate the need for an additional traditional annual summative assessment and provide a solution that helps facilitate student learning throughout the year. GMAP will provide timely data about student and class achievement, performance against grade-level expectations (and performance below or above grade level), show longitudinal academic growth within and across years, and</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>recommendations for classroom-based performance tasks tailored to student needs, provide national comparisons, and yield summative proficiency scores by aggregating grade-level performance data from the three interim assessments. Preliminary linking between existing MAP Growth assessments and Georgia Milestones has been completed, and MAP Growth data is currently being used by Georgia districts to help inform instructional decisions. Key NWEA staff who are currently engaged in the design and development of this work bring extensive state and assessment consortia experience to the pilot, are familiar with the IADA peer review expectations, and have helped to successfully create new assessments through the design, development, implementation, and approval process. Appendix C-1 presents résumés of NWEA’s key personnel.</p> <p>Putnam County. The purpose of Navy is to assess real-time competencies of the state’s academic standards throughout the year, thereby increasing both the quality of instructionally-relevant feedback</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>provided to support teaching and learning and the quality of data collected for monitoring the learning opportunities provided by schools. At the end of the year, the information the Navvy system collects on each student throughout the year will be summarized for accountability purposes. Throughout the IADA period, the Center for Assessment will provide technical assistance for establishing both the comparability of scores between Navvy and the statewide assessment system and annual summative determinations.</p> <p>CTLS-Assess. Table B-3 on p. 155 provides an overview of the tasks to be accomplished throughout the implementation period of CTLS-Assess. The tasks included in the table include the development of additional assessments, technology implementation and training, assessment administration implementation and training, data collection.</p> <p>GMAP. The Georgia Center for Assessment will facilitate workshops with educators to help examine learning progressions, blueprints, and</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>achievement level descriptors in a standardized way. Test administration guideline documents and training materials for MAP Growth, including for administrations with accommodations, are available. MAP Growth includes embedded online resources, available at any time, to provide help materials, tutorials, videos, and training for Georgia educators. Online, on-demand training in the NWEA Professional Learning Online system, which incorporates a wide range of activities, from learning the basics of MAP Growth assessments to using data to support student learning, is available free to partners. Resources for the through-year assessment will be made available as the test is developed, and GMAP members will be involved in the review/feedback of these guides as they are used in Years 3-5. With respect to the introduction of performance tasks into the GMAP pilot, and to align the performance tasks with the through-year assessment model, NWEA intends to collect sample responses to the performance tasks, guide teachers in matching student work to Georgia Achievement Level Descriptors, and</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>build training guides and next-step guides. As a result, teachers can both administer the tasks and have a framework for analyzing student thinking along learning progressions.</p> <p>Putnam Consortium. As the developer of the assessments, Navy Education works closely with LEAs and provides training, professional development, and support to successfully use and implement the system. Putnam County, participating LEAs, and Navy Education have partnered with the Institute for Performance Improvement (the “Institute”) to provided professional development to support implementation of the innovative assessment system. The Institute’s programs and services support meeting ESSA requirements for school improvement with an emphasis on leadership, developing high-impact professional learning, and planning and evaluating school improvement interventions.</p>	
(a)(3) (10 points, if applicable) If the system will initially be administered in a subset of schools or LEAs in a State--	(a)(3):	6	<p>(a)(3)(i)</p> <p>A report will be provided upon request to the State Board of</p>	<p>The Cobb County School District did not provide information for section (a)(3)(iii) regarding a plan for how it will ensure that, during the</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>(i) The strategies the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, will use to scale the innovative assessment to all schools statewide, with a rationale for selecting those strategies;</p> <p>(ii) The strength of the SEA’s or consortium’s criteria that will be used to determine LEAs and schools that will initially participate and when to approve additional LEAs and schools, if applicable, to participate during the requested demonstration authority period; and</p> <p>(iii) The SEA’s plan, including each SEA in a consortium, for how it will ensure that, during the demonstration authority period, the inclusion of additional LEAs and schools continues to reflect high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse LEAs and schools, or contributes to progress toward achieving such implementation across demographically diverse LEAs and schools, including diversity based on enrollment of subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act and student achievement. The plan must also</p>			<p>Education (SBOE) describing the progress made by all innovative assessment systems. At that time, all districts/consortia will have the opportunity to include additional school districts in the consortium for the following year. Districts that choose to join one of the approved innovative assessments would be required to seek amendment of their state performance contracts with the SBOE, which currently require them to use only Georgia Milestones.</p> <p>The selection criteria the state used in summer 2018 to select the innovative assessments that would be part of the program will be applied to the selection and inclusion of additional LEAs and schools within the existing approved pilots. As shown on Appendix A-8, the criteria included the strength of their description of their proposed assessment system, including the type of assessment (i.e., single summative assessment, series of interim assessments, computer adaptive, etc.), administration mode (i.e., technology-based, paper/pencil, etc.), grades and content areas and/or courses to be included, purpose of the assessments, intended interpretations</p>	<p>demonstration authority period, the inclusion of additional LEAs and schools continues to reflect high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse LEAs and schools, or contributes to progress toward achieving such .</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>include annual benchmarks toward achieving high-quality and consistent implementation across participating schools that are, as a group, demographically similar to the State as a whole during the demonstration authority period, using the demographics of initially participating schools as a baseline. (10 points, if applicable)</p>			<p>and uses of the results, and anticipated benefits for the district, schools, and for student learning.</p> <p>(a)(3)(iii)</p> <p>All participating districts/consortia are required to provide an annual report to the State that addresses annual benchmarks toward achieving high-quality and consistent implementation across participating schools that are, as a group, demographically similar to the State as a whole during the demonstration authority period, using the demographics of initially participating schools as a baseline. These reports will inform the state’s annual report to the U.S. Department of Education on the overall progress of the state’s implementation. Furthermore, the use of the selection criteria used in summer 2018 will ensure that any additional participants continue to reflect high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse LEAs and schools and contributes to progress toward achieving such implementation across demographically diverse LEAs and</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>schools, including diversity based on enrollment of subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the ESEA and student achievement.</p> <p>GMAP. NWEA anticipates that affiliate partners will transition to collaborating members in future years. It is also expected that the number of affiliate partners will grow, as there are currently fifty-six school districts in Georgia that use MAP Growth. At such time that they are interested in becoming participating members, and development activities are at a stage that supports it, GMAP and NWEA will work with the Georgia Department of Education to bring new partners on board, with the expectation that by the end of the GMAP Pilot, all districts who desire to participate will be supported.</p> <p>Putnam Consortium. Twelve LEAs that represent geographically and demographically diverse students in Georgia are currently committed to participating in this innovative assessment consortium. The expectation is that additional districts will join the consortium as the pilot</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>progresses with the eventual goal of having all interested districts shift to Navvy’s learning focused approach to accountability. To ensure that the inclusion of additional LEAs and schools will continue to reflect geographic and demographic diversity that is representative of the state’s population, the Navvy scaling plan provides LEAs the option to join as full/partial participant or affiliate to let them move at a pace that allows them to implement Navvy successfully. The plan also provides guardrails for participation and oversight for entry into participation, such as the requirement to commit representatives at the Putnam Consortium Innovative Assessment Leadership Team, and appropriate technology infrastructure to support online assessment. To systematically grow participation in the Navvy innovative assessment system from the current twelve LEA members, Putnam County in collaboration with Navvy Education and the Georgia Innovative Assessment Team will hold quarterly Innovative Assessment Summits to facilitate in-person presentations opportunities and webinar at geographically diverse</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			locations across the state for all LEAs to learn more about participating. In addition, the Putnam Consortium Innovative Assessment Executive Team and Navvy Education will work with a communications vendor to develop and produce a series of short informational videos that introduce the Navvy assessment system to interested LEAs.	
Total (out of 40) Criteria (a) (auto-total):	26			
<p>(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support. (Up to 20 points total) (b)(1) (5 points) The extent and depth of prior experience that the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, and its LEAs have in developing and implementing the components of the innovative assessment system. An SEA may also describe the prior experience of any external partners that will be participating in or supporting its demonstration authority in implementing those components. In evaluating the extent and depth of prior experience, the Secretary considers—</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">(i) The success and track</p>	(b)(1):	4	<p>(b)(1)(i)</p> <p>The state of Georgia has prior experience in developing both traditional and innovative formative assessment systems. Georgia Milestones is the state’s current summative assessment system. With the transition to the state’s current summative assessment, the Georgia Milestones, in 2014-2015, the state has expanded the use of technology to support assessment. In 2018-2019, Georgia Milestones will be administered 100% online, except for students who cannot interact with a computer due to their disability. Additionally, Georgia Milestones has included technology-enhanced items</p>	<p>NWEA does not provide information on prior experience developing performance assessments for large-scale use.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>record of efforts to implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items aligned to the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act in LEAs planning to participate; and</p> <p>(ii) The SEA’s or LEA’s development or use of--</p> <p>(A) Effective supports and appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR part 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act for administering innovative assessments to all students, including English learners and children with disabilities, which must include professional development for school staff on providing such accommodations;</p> <p>(B) Effective and high-quality supports for school staff to implement innovative assessments and innovative assessment items, including professional</p>			<p>since 2015-2016. Georgia Milestones <i>Substantially Met Requirements</i> in its April 2018 federal peer review decision letter from the U.S. Department of Education. The state of Georgia will develop and monitor an implementation plan to review each consortium’s progress in meeting the requirements outlined in part ii of this section.</p> <p>CTLS-Assess, GMAP, Putnam Consortium</p> <p>All three consortia that the state has approved for participation in the IADA have several years of experience implementing their proposed innovative assessment systems, which are aligned to the state’s academic standards. All three consortia are also working with external experts who have expertise in innovative assessments.</p> <p>The Cobb County School District has successfully implemented the CTLS-Assess since 2011. Education Incites, headquartered in Chicago, IL and with a multi-national product development team based in Charlotte, NC, has extensive experience in the construction of standards-based</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>development; and (C) Standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, methods, or other strategies for scoring innovative assessments, with documented evidence of the validity, reliability, and comparability of annual summative determinations of achievement, consistent with 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4) and (7). (5 points)</p>			<p>formative and summative assessment platforms. It supports the Cobb County School District. NWEA demonstrates capacity for large-scale online testing through statewide administrations in Nebraska, Arkansas, and Nevada. It also has a history of delivering large-scale assessments across the country, including in some of the country’s largest school districts, such as Chicago Public Schools in Illinois, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools in North Carolina, and Baltimore County Public Schools in Maryland, and provides support to the Georgia MAP Assessment partnership. The Putnam Consortium, in collaboration with Navvy Education, has demonstrated success in implementing Navvy in twelve Georgia school districts. The Center for Assessment, which provided support the New Hampshire’s innovative assessment and accountability pilot, Performance Assessment of Competency Education (PACE), will provide technical expertise and policy assistance to the Putnam Consortium.</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>(b)(1)(iiA to iiC)</p> <p>CTLS-Assess A. The CTLS-Assess assessment system will utilize the same accommodation guidelines for children with disabilities and English learners as Georgia Milestones and will be consistent with the statewide system moving forward as the state potentially transitions from the current state assessment system to CTLS-Assess. (B) The menu of training opportunities developed and utilized in Cobb County School District for CTLS-Assess described in Appendix B-1 will be utilized to support CTLS-Assess training and support for leaders, teachers, and support staff. Some of the training topics include Navigating the Dashboard, Sound Assessment Practices, Data Analysis for Teachers and Administrators, Item Builder, and others. Professional learning sessions for CTLS-Assess are available through face-to-face trainings as well as through a digital format. (C). CTLS-Assess supports full credit, partial credit, and rubric-based</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>scoring. All digitally scored items are scored as right/wrong by default. The application allows evidence-based selected response and multi-part items to be scored with partial credit. CTLS-Assess supports rubric-based manual scoring and is currently used for scoring written constructed response items.</p> <p>GMAP</p> <p>A. NWEA develops products considering universal design and accessibility standards from the start. For example, alternative text descriptions (alt-tags) for images are an important feature on a website to provide access to those using screen readers. Alt-tags provide descriptions of pictures, charts, graphs, etc., to those who may not be able to see the information. Laying this foundation means NWEA products are accessible for students using various accommodations. The new through-year test designs and assessments will be built upon existing supported accommodations and features.</p> <p>B. MAP Growth training materials include screenshots and are delivered via narrated PowerPoint web presentations, interactive online</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>courses, and as PDF documents available online or in print. Test administration guideline documents and training materials for MAP Growth, including for administrations with accommodations, are available. They can be read online as a PDF or printed by Georgia educators with a user login. Resources for the through-year assessment will be made available as the test is developed, and GMAP members will be involved in the review/feedback of these guides as they are used in Years 3-5.</p> <p>C. Based on Item Response Theory scoring mechanisms, the GMAP through-year system consists of assessments that adapt within, below, or above grade level based on the student's performance. Summative proficiency scores are generated for accountability using grade-level performance data from the three interim assessments and optional performance tasks.</p> <p>Putnam Consortium.</p> <p>A. Navvy provides all students with access to effective supports and appropriate instructional and assessment accommodations for students with disabilities and English</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>learners consistent with relevant federal and state laws by using a consistent set of support and accommodation policies. Navvy has adopted the same policies and set of accommodations as the state in its first two years of administration and will continue to be consistent with the statewide system moving forward as needed for the Putnam Consortium.</p> <p>B. For the Navvy assessments, joining members are provided face-to-face, on-site professional development, including an overview of implementation from an administrative perspective, an in-depth introduction to the Navvy components of the assessment system, how to make appropriate interpretations of Navvy results, and hands-on training of how to use the online technology.</p> <p>C. The Putnam Consortium leverages the Navvy family of diagnostic psychometric methods to assess a student's competency on a standard-by-standard basis using short, web-based assessments that provide actionable, real-time feedback to support timely, personalized instruction. The questions in the Navvy assessments were designed to</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>be representative of the construct operationalized in terms of (a) the components of the construct that were essential to competency of the standard and the (b) depth of knowledge required by the standard. Items were developed iteratively with a rigorous review process requiring collaboration among authors, content experts, and assessment experts.</p>	
<p>(b)(2) (5 points) The extent and depth of SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, and LEA capacity to implement the innovative assessment system considering the availability of technological infrastructure; State and local laws; dedicated and sufficient staff, expertise, and resources; and other relevant factors. An SEA or consortium may also describe how it plans to enhance its capacity by collaborating with external partners that will be participating in or supporting its demonstration authority. In evaluating the extent and depth of capacity, the Secretary considers--</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) The SEA’s analysis of how capacity influenced the success of prior efforts</p>	<p>(b)(2):</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>(b)(2)(i)</p> <p>Since the transition to the Georgia Milestones Assessment System in 2014-2015, Georgia has expanded the use of technology to support assessment. During the 2018-2019 school year, 100% of Georgia Milestones assessments will be administered online. Additionally, Georgia Milestones has utilized technology-enhanced items since 2015-2016. Georgia’s ability to transition successfully to online assessments and technology-enhanced item types was driven by the state’s investment in technological infrastructure for educational purposes. In 2015, all school districts received a single internet connection bandwidth</p>	<p>No information is provided from Cobb County School District regarding (ii) the strategies it is using, or will use, to mitigate risks, including those identified in its analysis, and support successful implementation of the innovative assessment.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>to develop and implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items; and</p> <p>(ii) The strategies the SEA is using, or will use, to mitigate risks, including those identified in its analysis, and support successful implementation of the innovative assessment. (5 points)</p>			<p>upgrade equal to 100 Mbps per school. Over the next three years, grant funding continued that supported additional infrastructure upgrades that increased internal school capacity and wireless access. These grant funds also included student devices for schools that served economically disadvantaged areas of the state. This support of technological infrastructure at the state level, combined with local support, has led to the success of Georgia Milestones implementation and ensures Georgia is prepared to support multiple innovative assessments that utilize online assessments and troubleshoot problems that may occur. Paper/pencil assessments are available for accommodated students who cannot interact with a computer due to their disability.</p> <p>CTLS-Assess. For eight years, the Cobb County School District (CCSD) has been developing and enhancing the CTLS-Assess. Currently, the CTLS-Assess is being utilized in all 113 CCSD schools at scale by more than 112,000 students and 7,500 teachers. During the 2017-2018</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>school year, CTLS-Assess was used by teachers across the CCDS to deliver over 890,000 assessments.</p> <p>GMAP. GMAP districts, beginning as early as 2013, have been using MAP Growth as a benchmark assessment throughout the school year to measure the academic growth of their students, although MAP Growth assessments have been delivered online since 2001. The NWEA testing platform supports over sixty million student test events each year. In September 2018, the platform supported over one million test events in a single day. The platform is designed with highly scalable architecture and is capable of scaling up based on partner needs.</p> <p>Putnam Consortium. The Putnam Consortium has successfully implemented Navvy in 12 school districts in Georgia. The Putnam Consortium will work collaboratively with Navvy Education to coordinate continued implementation and scaling of Navvy. This collaboration has demonstrated capacity to scale the solution to 7% of the state's school districts in a short amount of</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>time.</p> <p>(b)(2)(ii)</p> <p>Georgia will be seeking additional funds from the General Assembly to hire five state-level positions to support the innovative assessment pilot. Moreover, Georgia is seeking the assistance of external experts through a Request for Proposals (RFP) process to assist Georgia and its pilot districts in planning, developing, implementing, evaluating, and scaling Georgia’s innovative assessment pilot program. Among other activities, the provider will provide the state with an annual report summarizing the technical assistance needs and recommendations for future pilot program activities. Georgia will utilize this information to identify risks, continually improve its technical supports, and improve implementation of the innovative assessment pilot program.</p> <p>GMAP. GMAP districts, beginning as early as 2013, have been using MAP Growth as a benchmark assessment throughout the school</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>year to measure the academic growth of their students on an equal-interval scale. The state and GMAP districts will have the support of NWEA organizational resources, including a Georgia-based account management team. The NWEA program team, under the experienced leadership of a Program Manager, will identify potential risks and employ strategies and processes to mitigate these impacts before they become issues. These risks will be managed/mitigated internally and shared with stakeholders during regular team meetings. Some risks identified may be on the GMAP side and, if so, those will be identified with the GMAP consortium as the owner to manage/mitigate.</p> <p>Putnam Consortium. The Putnam Consortium in collaboration with Navvy Education has put in place processes to evaluate the technical quality of the assessment system to ensure the system produces valid, reliable, and fair results. As part of on-going evaluation and continuous improvement, external partners will provide additional evaluation and feedback as an independent source of</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			evidence to ensure validity, reliability, and fairness.	
<p>(b)(3) (10 points)The extent and depth of State and local support for the application for demonstration authority in each SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, as demonstrated by signatures from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Superintendents (or equivalent) of LEAs, including participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority period. (ii) Presidents of local school boards (or equivalent, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority. (iii) Local teacher organizations (including labor organizations, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority. (iv) Other affected stakeholders, such as parent 	(b)(3):	3	<p>(b)(3i to 3iii) Resolutions from the State Board of Education’s September 27, 2018 and December 13, 2018 in support of Georgia’s participation in the IADA are found in Appendix A-10 and Appendix A-11, respectively.</p> <p>GMAP. Reference letters of support from superintendents of participating LEAs for the Georgia MAP Assessment Partnership are provided in Appendix C-5.</p> <p>Putnam Consortium. Signed applications from superintendents of participating LEAs and memoranda of understanding from LEAs for the Putnam Consortium are provided in Appendix D-2.</p>	<p>No letters of support are provided from Cobb County for the CTLS-Assess are provided.</p> <p>No letters of support are provided from the participating LEAs in each consortia from presidents of local school boards, local teacher organizations, parent organizations, civil rights organizations, business organizations and other affected stakeholders.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
organizations, civil rights organizations, and business organizations. (10 points)				
Total (out of 20) Criteria (b) (auto-total):	<u>11</u>			
<p>(c) Timeline and budget. (Up to 15 points) The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s timeline and budget for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the timeline and budget, the Secretary considers-- (c)(1) (5 points). The extent to which the timeline reasonably demonstrates that each SEA will implement the system statewide by the end of the requested demonstration authority period, including a description of--</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The activities to occur in each year of the requested demonstration authority period; (ii) The parties responsible for each activity; and (iii) If applicable, how a consortium’s member SEAs will implement activities at different paces and how the consortium 	(c)(1):	3	<p>(c)(1) In the fall of 2018, the state released a Request for Proposals (RFP) seeking the services of a technical assistance provider to support the state’s innovative assessment pilot. This contract is expected to begin in January of 2019. The General Assembly provides funding for this contract for the first year. Georgia will request additional funding from the General Assembly to support the technical assistance contract in future years as well as fund five state-level project management positions.</p> <p>(c)(1)(i and ii) From Year 1 (2019-2020) to Year 5 (2023-2024), Georgia will continue to contract with an external technical assistance provider to support the state’s innovative assessment pilot. In Year 4 (2020-2021) Georgia will release an RFP seeking services for a technical evaluation of all three</p>	<p>Not clear what services the proposed state’s Technical Assistant will be specifically providing to support the state’s innovative assessment pilot.</p> <p>Cobb County did not provide specific information about what areas/topics the provider of teacher training will be offering.</p> <p>NWEA does not provide information on whether the proposed performance assessments will be included in the comparability of score studies.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>will implement interdependent activities, so long as each non-affiliate member SEA begins using the innovative assessment in the same school year consistent with 34 CFR part 200.104(b)(2); (5 points) and</p>			<p>innovative assessment systems, including assessing comparability with Georgia Milestones and content alignment studies. Georgia will request continued funding from the General Assembly to support the technical assistance contract in future years as well as the state-level project management positions and will request additional funding to support the external technical evaluation planned for Year 5. In Year 5, an external technical evaluation of all three innovative assessment systems is conducted. Georgia will complete its evaluation and select one assessment system for possible statewide expansion beginning in 2024-2025. Georgia will request additional funding, if needed, to implement the selected assessment system statewide.</p> <p>(c)(1)(iii)</p> <p>Cobb County. Table B-3 provides an overview of the tasks to be accomplished throughout the implementation period of CTLS-Assess. The tasks included in the table include the development of additional assessments, technology</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>implementation and training, assessment administration implementation and training, data collection. These tasks will continue throughout the IADA period to allow for possible statewide expansion by the end of the demonstration authority period.</p> <p>GMAP. During the five-year GMAP Pilot, NWEA, in partnership with Georgia stakeholders, intends to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Years 1-2: Develop the through-year model while implementing MAP Growth. • Years 3-4: Pilot and field test the through-year model and continue testing with MAP Growth as needed; conduct comparability studies for the through-year model and Georgia Milestones. • Year 5: Scale the through-year model, resulting in a comprehensive assessment system that meets both district and State needs, yielding data that can be used throughout the year to inform instruction and be aggregated at the end of the year to make determinations about summative proficiency. Throughout the GMAP pilot, GMAP districts, teachers, and administrators will have 	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>input and be involved in the development of the through-year assessment model.</p> <p>Putnam Consortium. Table D-3 on p. 161 provides an overview of the activities related to assessment design and development, assessment implementation, data collection, data analyses, score and technical reporting, and project management meetings necessary for ensuring the high-quality implementation of Navy. These activities will re-occur each year of the demonstration authority period and will allow Navy to possibly scale statewide by the end of the demonstration authority period.</p>	
<p>(c)(2) (10 points). The adequacy of the project budget for the duration of the requested demonstration authority period, including Federal, State, local, and non-public sources of funds to support and sustain, as applicable, the activities in the timeline under paragraph (c)(1) of this section, including--</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) How the budget will be sufficient to meet the expected costs at each</p>	<p>(c)(2):</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>(c)(2i and 2ii)</p> <p>The three innovative assessment consortia are bearing the cost of developing its innovative assessment solutions. The state of Georgia will seek funds from the General Assembly to 1) contract annually with an external technical assistance provider to support the innovative assessment pilot, 2) fund five state-level positions to manage the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No information is provided whether Cobb County’s funding for the CTLS-Assess pilot is contingent upon future appropriations. • Pending contract negotiations between the GMAP districts and the Georgia Department of Education, no information is provided regarding the adequacy of the GMAP pilot budget and whether the funding will be

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>phase of the SEA’s planned expansion of its innovative assessment system; and (ii) The degree to which funding in the project budget is contingent upon future appropriations at the State or local level or additional commitments from non-public sources of funds. (10 points)</p>			<p>innovative assessment pilot, and 3) contract with an independent, external provider to evaluate the technical quality of the proposed innovative assessments. Table A-1 on p. 162 provides a break-down of the necessary funds. Appendix A-11 on p. 264 provides the SBOE’s resolution in support of seeking these funds.</p> <p>Cobb County. The 2019-2020 budget for CTLS-Assess includes funding for CTLS-Assess technology implementation, support and training; assessment development, standard setting, and training; software licensing fee; data collection, psychometric analyses, and reporting; leadership meetings; and public presentations. Table B-4 on p. 163 shows the costs associated with each of the main budgetary components along with the total projected budget for CTLS-Assess in 2019-20 equal to \$3,500,000 for Year 1. Recurring costs for Years 2 to 5 total another \$1,100,000.</p> <p>GMAP. The funding needed to support the GMAP pilot throughout the IADA timeline has not yet been</p>	<p>contingent upon future appropriations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No information is provided regarding the adequacy of the Putnam Consortium pilot budget and whether the funding will be contingent upon future appropriations.

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>estimated since it will depend on the deliverables expected by GMAP districts and the Georgia Department of Education. Districts generally utilize their local and/or charter district funds for their partnership with NWEA. NWEA will maintain ownership of all content and intellectual property developed under this program.</p> <p>Putnam Consortium. The Putnam Consortium and Navy Education, LLC are responsible for the development and implementation of its innovative assessment system during the IADA period. Navy Education, LLC will maintain ownership of all content and intellectual property developed under this program.</p>	
Total (out of 15) Criteria (c):	<u>8</u>			
<p>(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents. (Up to 25 points) The quality of the SEA or consortium’s plan to provide supports that can be delivered consistently at scale to educators, students, and parents to enable successful implementation of the</p>	(d)(1):	5	<p>(d)(1) CTLS-Assess. The menu of training opportunities described in Appendix B-1 will be utilized to support CTLS-Assess training and support for leaders, teachers, and support staff. These trainings are designed to be delivered in 30-45-minute sessions</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>innovative assessment system and improve instruction and student outcomes. In determining the quality of supports, the Secretary considers--</p> <p>(d)(1) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 9 points if factor (4) is inapplicable). The extent to which the SEA or consortium has developed, provided, and will continue to provide training to LEA and school staff, including teachers, principals, and other school leaders, that will familiarize them with the innovative assessment system and develop teacher capacity to implement instruction that is informed by the innovative assessment system and its results;</p>			<p>which minimizes the need for substitute teacher utilization. Training topics include, Navigating the Dashboard, Sound Assessment Practices, Data Analysis for Teachers and Administrative Teams, Item Builder, Assessment Builder, and others. Professional learning sessions for CTLS-Assess are available through face-to-face trainings as well as through a digital format.</p> <p>GMAP. NWEA has a large set of training and professional learning resources available to partner districts. In the first couple of years of the GMAP program, this learning will be tailored to district needs surrounding the existing MAP Growth assessments. Schools and districts that have been using the assessments will be able to continue professional learning that helps them develop deeper understandings of growth data, while districts that are new to giving MAP Growth assessments will be supported in learning about the system, assessments, and how to interpret and use GMAP data at a more basic level. NWEA will support the through-year assessment model by providing</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>guidance to teachers in matching student work to Georgia Achievement Level Descriptors, and by building training guides and next-step guides. Onsite and virtual professional learning and coaching sessions will be offered to support teachers in administering performance tasks and deepening their understanding of student thinking to better utilize learning progressions to inform instruction. As performance tasks are integrated in the through-year assessment system, teachers will learn to leverage information that measures student learning against grade-level expectations to create clear learning targets and instructional plans that maximize student growth. Table C-12 describes recommended professional learning options. NWEA will work with GMAP and state stakeholders to add through-year assessment-focused professional learning to these offerings.</p> <p>Putnam Consortium. Putnam County, participating LEAs, and Navy Education have partnered with the Institute for Performance Improvement (the “Institute”) to</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>provided professional development to support implementation of the innovative assessment system. The Institute is a group of performance improvement specialists dedicated to developing, certifying, and supporting school improvement facilitators at state and local education agencies and at school levels. In addition, the Putnam Consortium Innovative Assessment Executive Team and Navy Education will also develop online modules to communicate directly with all teachers and school leaders who will be implementing Navy who may not attend the in-person training provided. Professional development partners will provide training for school improvement leaders via quarterly summits.</p>	
<p>(d)(2) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 8 points if factor (4) is inapplicable) The strategies the SEA or consortium has developed and will use to familiarize students and parents with the innovative assessment system;</p>	<p>(d)(2):</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>(d)(2) Cobb County. CCSD will develop additional supports and documents to familiarize students and parents with the innovative assessment system in collaboration with the CCSD communications department. The initial focus of this effort will be to</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>convert the standards-level information available in CTLS-Assess into an easy-to-understand description of the subject/course proficiency consistent with the existing Georgia Milestones. The CCSD utilizes a variety of resources to engage parents of English Learners in their child’s education, including the use of Language Facilitators, district support staff, and technology-related services. When practicable, CCSD uses the English Learner’s home language as a means of providing parents with school-related information. This includes utilizing interpreters for parent meetings across the district.</p> <p>GMAP. NWEA has resources available to familiarize students and parents with its assessments, including 1) reports that provide teachers, parents, and students with information about the value of both growth and proficiency data to help paint a fuller picture of what a student knows and can do, and 2) practice tests that provide students with the type of items they will encounter during testing, with questions appropriate to the student's</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>grade of enrollment. NWEA provides culturally sensitive resources in multiple languages that describe MAP Growth assessments and explain the results of NWEA tests. NWEA plans to develop similar parent resources for the through-year assessment. Parents can learn more about the vital role assessments play through the Parent’s Guide to MAP Growth, which explains what NWEA assessments measure, how they measure it, and how teachers use the data.</p> <p>Putnam Consortium. Student reports pinpoint standards students have learned and ones they need additional help to learn to provide real-time, up-to-date communication with the student, as well as their parents and teachers, about what the specific learning needs the student has. Reports will be provided to the extent practicable, in a language parents can understand. The Putnam Consortium Innovative Assessment Leadership Team will work collaboratively with Navvy Education to support locally developed communication plans with parents by facilitating discussions</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			around parent communication and by developing shared materials for communicating with parents, including short instructional videos that will introduce parents to the purpose and uses of the Navvy assessment system.	
<p>(d)(3) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 8 points if factor (4) is inapplicable) The strategies the SEA will use to ensure that all students and each subgroup of students under section 1111(c)(2) of the Act in participating schools receive the support, including appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR part 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act, needed to meet the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act; and</p>	<p>(d)(3):</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>(d)(3)</p> <p>The Georgia Department of Education ensures that all students have access to effective supports and appropriate accommodations consistent with relevant federal and state laws by using a common set of support and accommodation policies across the state for Georgia Milestones.</p> <p>The CTLS-Assess innovative assessment system is accessible for students with disabilities and English learners as it provides appropriate accommodations as specified in a student’s Individualized Education Plan (IEP), Individual Accommodation Plan (IAP), or English Learner-Testing Participation Committee (EL-TPC) plan. Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will continue to be</p>	<p>Not clear whether schools in the GMAP pilot use the state’s supports and accommodations available for the Georgia Milestones or those NWEA offer.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>assessed by the Georgia Alternate Assessment.</p> <p>GMAP. NWEA has worked with partners to develop a variety of accommodations, along with universal and designated supports, for special populations, including for students with disabilities, English learners, and other students with special needs or considerations. NWEA offers a flexible accommodations approach to allow students to use their own third-party assistive technology. All NWEA items are written with the intent of reducing language demands so that the focus of the item is on the construct of interest, such as writing items in active voice; using present tense; avoiding complex sentence construction; and reducing vocabulary load. The new through-year test designs and assessments will be built upon existing supported accommodations and features. Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will continue to be assessed by the Georgia Alternate Assessment.</p> <p>Putnam Consortium. All students</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>will have access to effective supports and appropriate accommodations consistent with relevant federal and state laws by using a consistent set of support and accommodation policies across the statewide and the innovative assessment systems. In addition, Navy Education will gather empirical evidence on fairness by conducting differential item functioning analyses to ensure items do not systematically function differently for subgroups of students in a way that disadvantages one group of students over another. Further, the Putnam Consortium Innovative Assessment Leadership Team will work with Navy Education to conduct analyses to monitor proficiency rates among students with disabilities to ensure the Navy assessment system provide all students with an equitable opportunity to learn the state's academic standards and does not harm subgroups of students who are generally considered more at risk in terms of educational disparities. Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will continue to be assessed by the Georgia Alternate Assessment.</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>(d)(4) (10 points if applicable). If the system includes assessment items that are locally developed or locally scored, the strategies and safeguards (e.g., test blueprints, item and task specifications, rubrics, scoring tools, documentation of quality control procedures, inter-rater reliability checks, audit plans) the SEA or consortium has developed, or plans to develop, to validly and reliably score such items, including how the strategies engage and support teachers and other staff in designing, developing, implementing, and validly and reliably scoring high-quality assessments; how the safeguards are sufficient to ensure unbiased, objective scoring of assessment items; and how the SEA will use effective professional development to aid in these efforts (10 points if applicable)</p>	<p>(d)(4):</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>(d)(4)</p> <p>Cobb County. CTLS-Assess assessments will be collaboratively developed by Cobb County teacher leaders at each grade level and content area. Currently, all staff involved in the development of assessments participate in professional learning designed to train staff in how to write quality, rigorous items for district assessments. Teacher teams work alongside Cobb County School District Curriculum and Assessment Leaders and third-party assessment development experts throughout the development process (i.e. development of the assessment blueprint, development of items, and development of the assessment). Once assessments are developed, they are reviewed by Cobb County assessment and curriculum leaders for item quality and bias and alignment with state standards.</p> <p>GMAP. NWEA will have a team led by test developers with expertise in applying state standards to assessments, and will collaborate</p>	<p>No specifics are provided regarding the strategies and safeguards the Cobb County’s assessment and curriculum leaders will follow to ensure the quality of developed items.</p> <p>Not clear what strategies NWEA will use to ensure inter-rater reliability.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>with GMAP educators about items and specifications to gain a deeper understanding of Georgia standards. As NWEA moves forward with the implementation of the through-year model, Content Specialists will work with the state to review and refine content alignment and to expand item pool coverage of the state standards. NWEA plans to develop performance tasks to confirm higher-order thinking skills and writing skills are part of the through-year assessment system. To that end, NWEA plans to phase in performance tasks, scoring protocols, and training over three years, starting in Year 3.</p> <p>Putnam Consortium. Student responses to Navvy assessment items are objectively scored as correct/incorrect via machine, automated scoring to allow for real-time feedback.</p>	
Total (out of 25) Criteria (d):	<u>20</u>			
<p>(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement. (Up to 20 points) The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s plan to annually evaluate its implementation of innovative assessment</p>	(e)(1):	10	<p>(e)(1) The Program Manager at the Georgia Department of Education will oversee annual implementation of the innovative assessment pilot,</p>	<p>Need details (data collection, analyses, etc.) of the state’s evaluation of how each pilot has to perform annually in order to make a final decision on which pilot will be selected for statewide implementation</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers—</p> <p>(e)(1) (12 points) The strength of the proposed evaluation of the innovative assessment system included in the application, including whether the evaluation will be conducted by an independent, experienced third party, and the likelihood that the evaluation will sufficiently determine the system’s validity, reliability, and comparability to the statewide assessment system consistent with the requirements of 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4) and (9); and</p>			<p>including the collection of data and information to inform an annual report and evaluation of the pilot. A final independent evaluation of the technical quality of the three innovative assessments will be determined through a competitive bid process (via a Request for Proposals (RFP)). The awarded independent contractor will provide services for comparability studies with Georgia Milestones at the end of the demonstration authority, or potentially earlier if the innovative assessment pilots are fully developed and ready for an evaluation. The final independent evaluation of technical quality will include a series of content alignment studies, including analyses of assessment framework documents (e.g., test blueprints and specifications for test items) and convening panels of educators (including Georgia teachers and external expert facilitators) to examine the alignment between items on the innovative assessments with the state academic content standards. The evaluation will also include a series of score comparability studies including empirical analyses for linking procedures (to establish</p>	<p>in Year 5.</p>

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			concordance tables), building reliability and validity evidence, classification accuracy analyses (for achievement level designations), analyses by subgroups of students, and performance differentiation by schools. Additional analyses will explore the comparability of administration procedures (including availability of accommodations), as well as scoring specifications (including protocols for scoring constructed response items) and inter-rater reliability statistics.	
<p>(e)(2) (8 points) The SEA's or consortium's plan for continuous improvement of the innovative assessment system, including its process for--</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Using data, feedback, evaluation results, and other information from participating LEAs and schools to make changes to improve the quality of the innovative assessment; and (ii) Evaluating and monitoring implementation of the innovative assessment system in participating LEAs and 	(e)(2):	8	<p>(e)(2)</p> <p>Georgia is seeking the assistance of external experts through a Request for Proposals (RFP) process to assist the state and its pilot districts in planning, developing, implementing, evaluating, and scaling the innovative assessment pilot program. The selected technical assistance expert will provide technical assistance to each assessment pilot in the development and implementation of their assessment systems, and will also convene a technical advisory committee (TAC) twice each year to provide independent, objective</p>	

IADA Application Technical Review Form Application B: Georgia

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
schools annually.			technical assistance regarding the technical quality of the assessment systems. Georgia will utilize this information to continually improve its technical supports and implementation of the innovative assessment pilot program and provide the state with an annual report summarizing the technical assistance needs and recommendations for future pilot program activities. Furthermore, the State Board of Education (SBOE) will review each pilot’s annual report submitted to the SBOE to verify compliance with individual performance contracts as well as to identify any local school system in the pilot program that is not complying with the terms of its performance contract and may remove any such system from the pilot program and subject it to the existing state-wide assessment requirements and the accountability system.	
Total (out of 20) Criteria (e): (auto-total)	<u>18</u>			
Total (a+b+c+d+e) (auto-total)	<u>83</u>			