

**Final Technical Review Summary for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**Score Summary: Averages Across Five Reviewers**

**Application A: Louisiana**

***(a) Project narrative. (40 points total)***

*(a)(1)* \_ 2.8

*+(a)(2)* 22.6

*+(a)(3)*\_\_ 6.8

***Total Average Score(a) Project Narrative*** 32.6

***(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support. (15 points total)***

*(b)(1)* \_\_\_\_ 3.2

*+(b)(2)*\_\_ 3.4

*+(b)(3)*\_\_ 2.2

***Total Score(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support*** 8.8

***(c) Timeline and budget. (15 points total)***

*(c)(1)* \_\_\_\_ 3

*+(c)(2)*\_\_ 2.2

***Total Average Score(c) Timeline and budget*** 5.2

***(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents. (25 points total)***

*(d)(1)* \_\_\_\_ 8

*+(d)(2)*\_\_ 5.4

*+(d)(3)*\_\_ 6.6

*+(d)(4)*\_\_ (if applicable)

***Total Average Score(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents.*** 20

***(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement. (15 points total)***

*(e)(1)* \_\_\_\_ 6.2

*+(e)(2)*\_\_ 3.4

***Total Average Score(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement.*** 9.6

***Total Average Score (a+b+c+d+e)*** 75.8

**Individual Reviewer Forms with comments follow**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**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.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**(a) Project narrative. (40 points total)**

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--

***(1) The rationale for developing or selecting the particular innovative assessment system to be implemented under the demonstration authority, including--***

- (i) The distinct purpose of each assessment that is part of the innovative 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;

***Score for (a)(1)                    if factor (a)(3) is applicable   4   of 5 points;  
    if factor (a)(3) is not applicable    of 10 points***

<p>Strengths</p> <p>The application provides a clear, reasonable explanation of why the IADA project focuses on assessments which value rich and meaningful background knowledge instead of traditional random content. This form of assessment content is innovative (not the traditional assessment structure) and should promote classroom instruction that is consistent with that focus and clearly addressing the State content standards. The proposed IADA assessments should facilitate a reduction in testing time, as the assessment content and items proposed use rich, meaningful texts that are covered in the State curriculum across subject areas. Each level of schooling (ES, MS, HS) will be addressed during the rollout of the IADA assessments across the grant timeframe. Thus, the proposed IADA project will address LEAs in the entire K-12 system during the project. The goal of the project is reasonable, that at the end of the IADA project, every student in the State will have an opportunity to take a LEAP 2025 assessment whose format matches the curriculum their teachers use and the instruction they receive on a daily basis.</p>
---

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

Weaknesses

The application is not clear on how the interim and summative assessments are combined to yield a total score. This is a very important decision, as it would impact the eventual achievement level designation of students, and when combined with other students, the overall school achievement level designation for Title I purposes.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(2) The plan the SEA or consortium, in consultation with any external partners, if applicable, has to--***

- (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
- (ii) Train evaluators to use such strategies, if applicable;

***Score for (a)(2) if factor (a)(3) is applicable 25 of 25 points;  
if factor (a)(3) is not applicable    of 30 points***

**Strengths**

The application narrative describes the activities/task requirements that an assessment administration vendor will need to address, with a thorough description of each task. For example, the requirements around scoring extended-response items include a detailed plan and scoring methodology, how the vendor will use human/hybrid scoring, and evidence to support any automated plan's reliability, validity, and past success. Overall, 23 distinct and critical tasks are delineated in the narrative, which cover the entire test scoring process, from student registration for testing, to documenting scoring rules and developing strategies and procedures for identification of plagiarism and cheating.

**Weaknesses**

None noted.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(3) If the system will initially be administered in a subset of schools or LEAs in a State--***

- (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;
  
- (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
  
- (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.

***Score for (a)(3) if factor (a)(3) is applicable   9   of 10 points;  
if factor (a)(3) is not applicable no points awarded***

**Strengths**

The application provides a thorough description of how the SEA will scale up their innovative assessment to all schools in the State. A table presented in the narrative includes each level of schooling and what will occur during each year of the IADA implementation for that level. A logical and sensible rollout occurs, beginning with High School frameworks and piloting of items. The next year frameworks and items are piloted at the Middle School level, with High Schools involved in the first phase taking the innovative assessment. After two years of selected high schools taking the innovative assessment, statewide accessibility to the assessment will be available. The Elementary School level will develop frameworks and pilot test items the year following this phase at the Middle School. Thus state resources can be focused on activities and tasks related to specific development and implementation issues one education level (HS/MS/ES) at a time, and can use lessons learned from one education level to improve implementation at other levels.



**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support. (15 points total)**

***(1) 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—

(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--

(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;

(B) Effective and high-quality supports for school staff to implement innovative assessments and innovative assessment items, including professional 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).

***Score for (b)(1)   2   of 5 points***

Strengths

The narrative provides substantial information regarding numerous supports the SEA has developed for school staff, including participation in PARCC, the current State assessment (LEAP 360), ELA Guidebooks and curricular resources. Overall, these are substantial supports

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

directly related to implementing innovative assessments, with a lot of professional development available aligned to the ELA Guidebooks.

**Weaknesses**

The narrative provides limited, insufficient information on extent and depth of prior experience with accommodations, as required in critical element part (A) and with standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, methods for scoring innovative assessments (part C). In addition, the narrative focuses on extent and depth of prior experience of the SEA, but little information on the LEAs depth of prior experience with these criteria.

***(2) 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--

- (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 of the innovative assessment.

***Score for (b)(2)   3   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

The application includes a thorough description of numerous initiatives that LDOE has implemented that required development, piloting, and execution to improve academic instruction, student assessment, and improvement of academic learning. Examples include the

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

Instructional Materials Review, the ELA Guidebooks 2.0, and LEAP 360 diagnostic and formative assessments. Teams and divisions involved in the successful development and implementation of these and other initiatives will be the major staff involved in the IADA project. The external partners selected for the project will expand the SEA's capacity to develop and implement the innovative assessment project, as the LEAP 2025 assessment will be administered during the IADA pilot project. The external partners are particularly important for providing technical advice and evaluation throughout the project to SEA staff.

**Weaknesses**

The application did not address LEA capacity for implementation of an innovative assessment, particularly while needing to administer LEAP 2025 throughout the project time period. Also, the narrative did not provide the strategies the SEA is using, or will use, to mitigate risks.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(3) 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:

- (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 organizations, and business organizations.

***Score for (b)(3)   1   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

The application includes signed letters of support from the Superintendents of the five LEAs initially selected to participate in the first year of the IADA project.

**Weaknesses**

The application does not include letters of support from local school boards or teacher organizations of the LEAs participating in the first year of the project. The application does not include letters of support from affected stakeholders, such as parent organizations, business organizations, or civil rights organizations. The letters of support from the Superintendents are identical, potentially suggesting only a modicum of support, as none of them include specifics on how the IADA will directly impact their particular LEA.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**Total Score(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder  
support (b)(1) \_\_2\_\_**

**+(b)(2)\_3\_\_**

**+(b)(3)\_\_1\_\_**

**\_\_6\_\_ of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**(c) Timeline and budget. (15 points total)**

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--

***(1) 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;
- (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);

***Score for (c)(1)   2   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

The timeline provided in the narrative describe appropriate and necessary activities for each year of the project for successful implementation throughout the IADA time period. The narrative separates test format and content activities from test administration and scoring tasks, providing the necessary tasks unique to that year of the project. For example, as high school will be the initial level for testing, during 2018-19 high school assessment frameworks will be developed. The assessment frameworks for elementary schools will not be developed until 2020-21 because grades 3-5 will not be assessed until 2021-22.

**Weaknesses**

The timeline of activities provided in narrative is at a very general (i.e. yearly) level. Thus, it is not possible to determine if sufficient time is allocated for an activity to be completed for timely accomplishment of subsequent tasks, and if the activity is scheduled at an appropriate time, and if sufficient time is allocated for that activity. For example, "gather feedback and evidence for

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

year 1 evaluation and reporting" is listed next to last for Year One. It is unclear if that means this activity will only occur during the end of Year One, or throughout the year. Also, the timeline did not specify the party responsible for activities in sufficient detail to determine if the plan is feasible and realistic to complete with appropriated resources.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(2) 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.

***Score for (c)(2)   2   of 10 points***

**Strengths**

The application provides a general overall amount of state and federal funds that are available for all State assessment activities: \$16 million Federal, \$20.7 million State.

**Weaknesses**

The application provides insufficient budget information for the IADA project, as it does not specify the amount of funds needed to develop, administer, score, and report the new innovative assessments, while at the same time continue the LEAP 2025 assessments. The narrative does not provide any contingency plans for years 2-5 if non-public funding is not secured to fund IADA activities. The narrative does not address the degree to which funding for the project is contingent upon future appropriations at the State level.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**Total Score(c) Timeline and budget**

**(c)(1) \_2\_\_**

**+(c)(2) \_2\_**

**\_4\_\_ of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents. (25 points total)**

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--

***(1)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;***

***Score for (d)(1) if factor (d)(4) is applicable \_\_\_ of 5 points;***

***if factor (d)(4) is not applicable \_7\_ of 9 points***

**Strengths**

The narrative provides substantive information on numerous components of a comprehensive professional learning support system which the State has developed. This includes technical assistance resources (e.g., state network teams which work directly with LEAs) as well as online resources focused on the State Standards, curriculum, and instruction. The narrative highlights several components, including the LDOE School System Planning Guide, the Educator Resource Guide, Toolboxes for teachers, counselors, principals, and school systems, ELA Guidebooks 2.0, instructional materials, LEAP 2025 guides, LEAP 360 guides, and guides on engaging parents and families. In total, these provide wide ranging support for LEA staff, including both principals and teachers. To supplement these resources, in-person meetings and periodic newsletters, webinars, and phone calls will inform and communicate to LEA staff information related to the innovative assessment developments, formats, available resources, etc.

**Weaknesses**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

The narrative does not provide any indication of how the SEA will monitor LEA activities on teacher training and support for curriculum, instruction, and assessment. The SEA does not train teachers, relying on LEAs for that activity. However, there is no information on how the SEA will determine that the LEAs are providing sufficient training to its teachers in support of the IADA implementation.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(2) The strategies the SEA or consortium has developed and will use to familiarize students and parents with the innovative assessment system;***

***Score for (d)(2) if factor (d)(4) is applicable \_\_\_ of 5 points;***

***if factor (d)(4) is not applicable \_5\_ of 8 points***

Strengths

The application provides examples of a variety of strategies currently used to inform parents about statewide curriculum, instruction, and assessment issues, and how they will be updated to provide parents with information on the IADA assessments. These strategies include adding IADA participation designation to the online Louisiana School Finder application, and specific IADA information for teachers and school staff to use in their communications with parents and families. Development of a parent-specific website for the IADA is planned, which is an appropriate and likely a key source of information for parents regarding the IADA.

Weaknesses

Though the resources planned for informing parents about the IADA might be useful for students, the application does not address specific strategies and information to familiarize students with innovative assessments, or how teachers will systematically discuss how instruction and curriculum supports comprehension of complex texts that build on student background knowledge.

***(3) 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***

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act, needed to meet the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act;***

***Score for (d)(3) if factor (d)(4) is applicable \_\_\_ of 5 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable \_\_5\_\_ of 8 points***

**Strengths**

The application narrative indicates that existing State resources that focus on standards-aligned instruction will be used for the IADA project. These are appropriate for use as they were designed to increase achievement for Students with Disabilities and students performing at lower achievement levels. Important components of the process for IADA include an increased SEA emphasis on promoting the suite of teacher resources and planning guides to implement the ELA Guidebooks 2.0 and the Diverse Learners Guide, combined with specific tracks at the Teachers Leader Summit and quarterly communications focused on diverse learners. Overall, these SEA activities should sufficiently address the issue of IADA supporting the use of appropriate accommodation to facilitate SWD's achievement of the challenging State standards.

**Weaknesses**

The application does not address the issue of how the SEA ensures that LEA teachers are actually being exposed to and using the State resources that focus on accommodations and instructional strategies for improving the academic performance of SWD and low achieving students. The narrative does not indicate the SEA collects any data or monitors teacher use the online resources to implement ELA Guidebooks 2.0 and the Diverse Learners Guide.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(4) 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)

***Score for (d)(4) if factor (d)(4) is applicable \_\_\_ of 10 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable no points awarded***

Strengths
-----------

Not Applicable
----------------

Weaknesses
------------

Not Applicable
----------------

**Total Score(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents.**

**(d)(1) \_7\_**

**+(d)(2)\_5\_**

**+(d)(3)\_5\_**

**+(d)(4)\_ (if applicable)**

**\_17\_ of 25**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement. (15 points total)**

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—

***(1) 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); (10 points) and

***Score for (e)(1)   7   of 10 points***

**Strengths**

The Center for Assessment will serve as an independent, external evaluator for the LDOE IADA project. The Center for Assessment has a proven track record of program and project evaluations which provide substantive data to determine validity and reliability of evaluated projects. The Center for Assessment has recently completed an evaluation to determine the comparability of the current LEAP to results from State assessments in 2015 and 2016. The evaluation indicates the 2017 LEAP results can be meaningfully compared to assessments in those prior years.

The application provides sufficient information on the evaluation design to conclude that the Center for Assessment will conduct a strong, credible evaluation throughout the entire project timeframe, collecting relevant data for analysis of validity, reliability and comparability. For example, the Center for Assessment will be charged to produce studies and use methods to show test reliability and validity, with a plan for providing evidence for a number of essential statistics, including: 1) the reliability of scores for the intended purposes for all students, as indicated by the standard error of measurement across the score continuum; 2) the precision of the assessments at cut scores, and consistency of student level classification; 3) how the content of the assessments reflects Louisiana's ELA content standards; 4) how data produced from the assessments can validly inform school effectiveness and improvement; individual principal and teacher effectiveness; and individual student gains and performance.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**Weaknesses**

There may be an inherent conflict of interest regarding the external evaluator, as the Center for Assessment will also be performing a variety of functions and activities within the project. A true, independent, external evaluator needs to be used for the project evaluation, a vendor that has no responsibility for other tasks/activities in the project implementation.

***(2) The SEA's or consortium's plan for continuous improvement of the innovative assessment system, including its process for--***

- (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. (5 points)

***Score for (e)(2)   3   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

The narrative indicates that LDOE will use its existing system of oversight and continuous improvement to monitor and evaluate IADA implementation. The LDOE will use ongoing data and information to make necessary adjustments to the assessment design and implementation plan throughout the IADA project. The narrative includes the specific changes LDOE will make for the IADA to key statewide guides (e.g., School Support Planning Guide, Professional Learning and Collaboration resources, State Network Teams and District Technical Assistance, and District Monitoring). The changes noted in the narrative for the IADA are directly related to IADA activities and should strengthen IADA implementation (e.g., providing regular updates on the progress of the innovative assessment pilot to BESE).

**Weaknesses**

The application does not indicate any specific plan, activities, and strategies for direct monitoring and data collection of implementation of the IADA in participating LEAs and schools. It is not clear in the narrative if the current data collection processes and activities will

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

collect relevant and essential data for making changes during the project to improve the quality of the innovative assessment. For example, it is unclear if data collected include classroom monitoring or attendance at IADA ELA team meetings at a school to collect relevant data on implementation in schools and classrooms. This is an essential activity to verify and quantify actual project implementation at a classroom level.

**Total Score(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement.**

**(e)(1) \_7\_\_**

**+(e)(2)\_3\_**

**\_10\_\_ of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**Final Score Summary Louisiana**

<i>(a) Project narrative</i>	<b>38</b>	<b>of 40</b>
<i>(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support</i>	<b>6</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<i>(c) Timeline and budget</i>	<b>4</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<i>(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents</i>	<b>17</b>	<b>of 25</b>
<i>(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement</i>	<b>10</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<b>Total:</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>of 110</b>

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**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.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**(a) Project narrative. (40 points total)**

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--

***(1) The rationale for developing or selecting the particular innovative assessment system to be implemented under the demonstration authority, including--***

- (i) The distinct purpose of each assessment that is part of the innovative 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;

***Score for (a)(1)                    if factor (a)(3) is applicable   1   of 5 points;  
    if factor (a)(3) is not applicable     of 10 points***

Strengths

1. Splitting the state assessment into 2-3 interim assessments plus a shorter summative assessment should help get student results back to teachers in a timely fashion that could be used for instructional planning.
2. Integrating English/Language Arts (ELA) and Social Studies into the same assessment can be an efficient way to gather information about student learning with less overall testing time.

Weaknesses

1. Testing for English/Language Arts content that has been explicitly taught in the classroom is not likely to promote high-quality instruction or mastery of the most important challenging State academic standards. These kinds of tests would be useful for teachers to use as classroom-based tests to determine students' day-to-day mastery of content being taught. However, an important goal of large-scale testing is to determine how well students can apply their knowledge and skills

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

to new contexts. The new LEAP 2025 assessment is described as being designed to measure students' acquisition of knowledge, understanding, and analysis of texts in English and Social Studies that have already been taught to the students. That type of assessment will encourage teachers to focus on just the content of the texts students are learning in class rather than to help students learn how to process and determine meaning in any piece of text they will encounter in life. And similarly, students will be encouraged to simply memorize what they have learned in class to prepare for the state test. This approach is not likely to lead to students' using higher-level or deeper thinking (e.g., analysis, synthesis, evaluation) because they will already have been taught how to analyze and evaluate the particular texts being used in the assessment. In fact, it could likely foster direct "teaching to the test."

2. One aspect of the state's rationale is that using an assessment that is based on content that has already been taught in class will level the playing field across students no matter how much background knowledge they might have. That may be true, but any resulting narrowing of the achievement gap is likely to be attained at the expense of students not learning how to read and think about any piece of text that might come their way. In other words, the gap may be lessened, but it would be as a result of the bar being lowered for all students, rather than raising the bar for all students.

3. Another aspect of the state's rationale is that as a result of having used state assessments in which the content of the texts has not been the focus of the assessment, teachers have developed misconceptions about what it means for students to be literate. If this is true, then appropriate professional development may be what is needed, rather than a new assessment. In other words, changing the assessment to match content taught in class because teachers are finding it difficult to help students be able to effectively read, process, and understand new text does not seem like the best strategy when striving for high quality instruction. Furthermore, it is unclear how the teachers are having the students "practice reading and writing skills in isolation," when it is impossible to read or write without content. In addition, this part of the state's rationale is contradicted in several other places in the application where the state describes the professional development provided to teachers as being of high quality.

4. A further aspect of the state's rationale refers to the testing of social studies separate from English/Language Arts, which currently adds additional testing time. While it is an excellent idea to integrate social studies content into the ELA assessment, the area of social studies is not a federal requirement to be included in the state assessment system, but rather a state choice. Therefore, the state could lessen the amount of time spent on testing by simply converting the current social studies assessments into classroom-based assessments, rather than having them be seen as stand-alone state assessments.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

5. When considering alignment to the standards, it is important to acknowledge that when a standard is stated something like, "Determine an author's point of view or purpose in a text and analyze how the author responds to conflicting viewpoints," being able to "meet" this standard when having previously studied the particular text in question is very different (and much easier) than when determining author's point of view from a new piece of text. Therefore, making an assumption that the same standards would be measured using previously studied texts as they would be in new pieces of text is a major misconception, since the cognitive requirements on students will change from higher-level thinking (when looking at new text) to memory-based thinking (when looking at pre-studied text). In other words, the Depth of Knowledge level would be lower when students consider something like author's point of view on text they have already studied compared to applying this thinking to new text.

6. In terms of equity for students, highly mobile students would be at quite a disadvantage when they move into the state (or district) from somewhere that did not teach the same texts as being covered in the state assessment.

7. The SEA describes benefits to the field as their making their curriculum and assessment materials available to others across the country. However, given the points outlined in this section of the Technical Review Form, encouraging other states to base their state ELA assessments on previously taught texts would likely lower the quality of instruction in other parts of the country, which is not a benefit to be sought.

***(2) The plan the SEA or consortium, in consultation with any external partners, if applicable, has to--***

(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

(ii) Train evaluators to use such strategies, if applicable;

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**Score for (a)(2) if factor (a)(3) is applicable 20 of 25 points;  
if factor (a)(3) is not applicable     of 30 points**

**Strengths**

The SEA will use an assessment administration vendor to develop a plan for scoring the assessment, and the steps that are listed for this vendor to accomplish are generically accepted as those that are consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical standards, including mechanisms for determining inter-rater reliability.

**Weaknesses**

1. While the application addresses strategies to determine comparability between the overall current state assessment and the proposed assessment, it is unclear how the proportion of selected-response to constructed-response items compares between the two assessments, or how the proposed scoring approaches compare to what is currently in place for the state.
2. While generic steps are listed for the assessment vendor to develop with regard to scoring procedures, it is unclear how these will specifically apply to the new IADA assessment. For example, it is unclear if the vendor will be developing scoring guides, anchor papers, etc., using pilot items, and then each year of the field test and/or implementation year, or if the same guides and other materials will be used over years for items that might be repeated across years.
3. It is unclear how the scoring of the interim assessments will be combined with the scoring of the short summative to produce an overall performance score and level.

***(3) If the system will initially be administered in a subset of schools or LEAs in a State--***

- (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;
- (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

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

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.

***Score for (a)(3) if factor (a)(3) is applicable 2 of 10 points;  
if factor (a)(3) is not applicable no points awarded***

**Strengths**

1. One of the three criteria for selecting districts to participate in the piloting and field testing of the new ELA assessment – whether the district's participation improves the grade-level coverage, student diversity, and demographic representation – is very important to the selection of a representative sampling of students.
2. Although the plan does not call for the district participants to provide a student sample that is demographically representative of the state until the fifth year of the project, there is a progression from Year 1 to Year 5 that moves in that direction.

**Weaknesses**

1. Two of the three selection criteria – whether the district has used the ELA Guidebooks for at least a year, and the district's quality of implementation of the Guidebooks – will not result in a set of participants that is representative of the state as a whole and will likely skew the results toward higher scores. Based on these two selection criteria, it essentially sounds as if the assessment is being designed to evaluate the curriculum rather than students' progress toward meeting the state standards, and the teachers whose students will be included are those who are most heavily invested in the texts being tested on the new assessment.



**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support. (15 points total)**

***(1) 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—

(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--

(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;

(B) Effective and high-quality supports for school staff to implement innovative assessments and innovative assessment items, including professional 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).

***Score for (b)(1)   3   of 5 points***

Strengths

1. The SEA was a governing member of PARCC, which used new approaches in item and test design, giving the state experience with these kinds of assessment approaches.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

2. The SEA made available to districts the LEAP 360 assessment system, consisting of diagnostic, interim, and formative assessments, which by their description could be excellent tools for classroom use, and the SEA provided professional development to support implementation of these materials. While the state does not appear to have developed the LEAP 360, their experience in rolling it out and supporting it is likely to be helpful in the implementation of this project.

3. The development of the Guidebooks involved teachers in developing tasks, writing prompts, and basic frameworks that included related assessments, so that teachers would better understand how to meet the needs of diverse learners. This experience could be helpful in the IADA work.

4. The application lists two external partners who do have a strong track record in developing and/or studying innovative assessments. The role of both partners for this project is described generally in the application, and the role of the Center for Assessment in this project is listed in its letter of support. Their prior experience would be crucial to the success of this project.

**Weaknesses**

1. While the application states that the usage rates of the LEAP 360 ELA interim assessments are "as high as 89% of students in some districts," it is unclear how many districts actually use either this part of the system or other parts of the LEAP 360. Therefore, it is unclear how successful the SEA's efforts have been with implementing this assessment.

2. The LEAP 360 assessments are listed as an important part of previous experience of the SEA staff, but these assessments are not linked to specific texts or curricula that the teachers use. It is unclear why this set of classroom-based assessments do not use the text-based approach that the SEA is proposing for the state assessment, when that context would appear to be far more appropriate for the text-based strategy than the state assessment. It appears that the state did not develop this assessment system, but somehow acquired it, rolled it out, and provided support to teachers.

3. While the external partners who are listed have a strong track record of working with innovative assessments, it is unclear what the specific role of the Johns Hopkins Institute will be in the proposed IADA project.

4. While the external partners have experience with standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, and other strategies for scoring innovative assessments, including documenting the validity,

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

reliability, and comparability of annual summative determinations of achievement, the SEA does not indicate having this experience in terms of their internal staff.

5. The SEA appears to have more experience developing materials and providing support to teachers in the area of curriculum, rather than in the area of innovative assessments.

6. It is not clear what explicit experience either the SEA or the external partners have in the area of accommodations for administering innovative assessments for EL students and those with disabilities.

***(2) 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--

- (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 of the innovative assessment.

***Score for (b)(2) 3 of 5 points***

**Strengths**

1. Based on the resumes included in the application, the SEA staff appear to have strong backgrounds working with assessments used in the state.
2. The two SEA divisions listed as having responsibility for leading and managing the IADA effort have been involved in the development, administration, scoring and reporting of the LEAP 2025 Assessment.
3. The external partners will add valuable expertise to the SEA capacity, in terms of providing technical and policy advice and guidance, evaluation of the implementation of the IADA assessment, and other supports.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**Weaknesses**

1. While two SEA divisions are listed as having responsibility for leading and managing the IADA implementation effort, including developing the assessment design, content, and administration procedures, and delivering the accompanying supports, it is unclear what role each of the SEA staff whose resumes are included in the application would be playing in the proposed project. In addition, since both divisions seem to have some responsibility overseeing assessment in the state, it is unclear how the leadership and the work will be divided and coordinated across the divisions for a smooth implementation.
2. The application does not mention the status of the technology infrastructure across districts in the state, and since the proposed assessment is to be at least partly computer-based, this aspect is important in terms of the likely success of implementation of the proposed assessment.
3. No strategies are described for how the SEA will mitigate risks.

***(3) 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:

- (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 organizations, and business organizations.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**Score for (b)(3) 2 of 5 points**

**Strengths**

Letters of support are provided from Superintendents (or the equivalent) of each of the five LEAs participating in the first year of the demonstration authority period.

**Weaknesses**

No letters are provided from local school boards, teacher organizations, or other stakeholders.

**Total Score(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support**

(b)(1) 3

+(b)(2) 3

+(b)(3) 2

8 of 15

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**(c) Timeline and budget. (15 points total)**

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--

***(1) 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;
- (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);

***Score for (c)(1)   2   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

Phasing in development and implementation of the assessment across grade bands over the five years of the demonstration period is a good strategy for spreading the work out and being able to build upon the lessons learned.

**Weaknesses**

1. It is unclear if the IADA assessment will ever be fully implemented statewide, since it appears that districts will be allowed to choose to use either the traditional assessment or the IADA version of the assessment.
2. The timeline calls for a large number of key activities to be accomplished in time for pilot items to be taken by high school students in the 2018-19 school year. This part of the timeline appears to be very ambitious and potentially unrealistic.
3. In terms of delineating the parties responsible for each activity, it is unclear for all the vendor activities except for that of annual evaluation of implementation, which specific vendor, or if both vendors, will be the partner responsible for the activities assigned to an assessment vendor

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

in the application. In addition, in places where the description lists "vendors" as being responsible, it is unclear how the two external partners would be working together and coordinating the work across the two organizations.

4. While the timeline allows for the revision of the assessment frameworks each year if needed, it does not account for addressing the possibility of the IADA assessment not yielding comparable scores with the current state assessment or other possible findings that could require major revisions to the conceptualization that underlies the IADA assessment model.

***(2) 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.

***Score for (c)(2)   0   of 10 points***

Strengths

None found.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**Weaknesses**

1. The application does not include the expected costs of the project. In the absence of this information, it is impossible to know whether the budget would be adequate to support this project.
2. The project funding would be contingent on the continuation of current levels of state and federal appropriations for assessment as well as on the securing of non-public sources of funding in order to be able to accomplish the stated goals. The current state and federal funding for assessment is also needed to cover the costs of the current assessment system, but it is unclear how much of the current state and federal appropriations are used for the current assessment system. In addition, it is unclear what type of track record the SEA has for securing non-public funding for assessment projects.

**Total Score(c) Timeline and budget**

**(c)(1)   2**

**+(c)(2)   0**

**2   of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents. (25 points total)**

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--

***(1) 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;***

***Score for (d)(1) if factor (d)(4) is applicable \_\_\_ of 5 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable 7 of 9 points***

Strengths

The SEA has many mechanisms for providing training and resources to principals, supervisors, teacher leaders, and other educational leaders across the state, with much of the training focused on curriculum and instruction. These existing mechanisms can be leveraged to provide training to these groups about the IADA assessment.

Weaknesses

It is not clear how the training that is provided for the various sets of educational leaders in the state is disseminated throughout the state to all the classroom teachers, nor is it clear if the dissemination of training is monitored in any way for degree of implementation and/or quality.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(2) The strategies the SEA or consortium has developed and will use to familiarize students and parents with the innovative assessment system;***

***Score for (d)(2) if factor (d)(4) is applicable \_\_\_ of 5 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable 4 of 8 points***

**Strengths**

The SEA plans to provide written resources for parents about the innovative assessment process, and to hold meetings and discussions with school and teacher leaders about ways to communicate with parents about the new assessment, the pilot, and the implementation, all of which can be helpful for giving resources and talking points to district and school leaders as they communicate with parents.

**Weaknesses**

1. While resources and talking points will be made available to school and teacher leaders, it is not clear what the expectations will be from the state for how this information will be shared with parents and families at each site.
2. Except for students participating in taking pilot items during the first year that their school will be involved, there are no strategies described for familiarizing students with the new assessment. And in regard to the use of pilot items as a way to familiarize students with the new assessment, high school students will be in other courses the following year of the assessment becoming operational, so the interaction with pilot items would not be helpful at that level. Also, it is unclear whether there might be sample or practice items available to be shared with students for either the pilot or the actual assessment implementation.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(3) 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;***

***Score for (d)(3) if factor (d)(4) is applicable \_\_\_ of 5 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable 5 of 8 points***

**Strengths**

The SEA plans to develop the IADA assessment using the same accessibility features and accommodations that are currently available on the LEAP 2025 ELA assessments for students with disabilities and English learners, as well as those available for all learners. Since these features and accommodations have been reviewed at the federal level as part of the peer review process, they should be acceptable in terms of meeting the needs of all students and relevant subgroups without altering the constructs being assessed.

**Weaknesses**

1. The SEA believes that using an assessment based on content that has already been taught in class will level the playing field across students no matter how much background knowledge they might have. That may be true, but it is unclear what supports will be put into place to help all students, and especially those from disadvantaged homes and therefore may have less background knowledge than others, to be able to apply the skills they learn from texts in class to new content and texts. And if students cannot effectively apply these literacy skills to new situations, they will not be college or career ready.
2. In terms of equity for students, highly mobile students would be at a disadvantage when they move into the state (or district) from somewhere that did not teach the same texts as being covered in the state assessment. The SEA does not address what kinds of supports would be provided to these students so that the assessment would be a fair measure of what these students know and can do.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(4) 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)

***Score for (d)(4) if factor (d)(4) is applicable \_\_\_\_ of 10 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable no points awarded***

Strengths

NA

Weaknesses

NA

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**Total Score(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents.**

**(d)(1) 7**

**+(d)(2) 4**

**+(d)(3) 5**

**+(d)(4)      (if applicable)**

**16 of 25**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement. (15 points total)**

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—

***(1) 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); (10 points) and

***Score for (e)(1) 7 of 10 points***

**Strengths**

1. Given that the SEA has previously arranged for their current assessment to be evaluated for validity, reliability, and comparability, the expectation based on their previous experience in this area is that they will arrange for an annual evaluation to be conducted appropriately for this IADA assessment.
2. The plan presented for the evaluation of reliability, validity, and comparability reflects current professional and technical standards in these areas.

**Weaknesses**

1. The evaluation is listed as being conducted by the Center for Assessment, which although it is a third party, it is also listed as performing other tasks in the IADA project (in their letter, they list doing overall assessment system design, item design, scoring and calibration, and more). Therefore, this entity would not be independent of the work and not an appropriate organization to do evaluation. The evaluation should be done by an organization that is not involved in the development, administration, or implementation of the assessment project.
2. Since LEAs will be allowed to choose which interim assessments they will use based on the texts they will be teaching, it is unclear how the SEA will determine comparability of the different interim assessments across these different options.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(2) The SEA's or consortium's plan for continuous improvement of the innovative assessment system, including its process for--***

- (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. (5 points)

***Score for (e)(2)   3   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

1. The state has several mechanisms in place that could be used for continuous improvement of the IADA assessment system. One example – the quarterly collaborations and Teacher Leader Summit – will have a specific track developed related to the IADA assessment for educational leaders in participating districts. Using existing mechanisms and groups in this way to gather input about the assessment process and plan for addressing issues that arise as well as appropriate training could be a powerful way to use data to make changes to improve the quality of the assessment.
2. The district monitoring process currently in place holds promise as long as the protocols are adjusted to include IADA participants as a separate category of districts to be closely monitored for the IADA implementation, no matter what their current level of risk might be independent of the IADA. In other words, if an LEA that is categorized as “low risk” on the district monitoring rubric is new to the IADA system, that LEA should receive closer monitoring both for impacts on instruction as well as for test administration and security than they would have received from being in the “low risk” category.

**Weaknesses**

1. While the application indicates that feedback will be collected from districts and school staff, educators, parents, and students, it is unclear how the SEA will be collecting representative feedback from these groups, especially from teachers and students, about the new assessment.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

There are no descriptions of systematic data collection methods, such as surveys or focus groups, other than discussions with educational leaders in the various meetings and consultations.

2. It is unclear what type of monitoring and evaluation of changes to the instructional program will occur. Given that a text-dependent assessment using pre-taught texts is the premise of the proposed assessment, such an assessment strategy poses a strong danger of teachers' narrowing their teaching to just the texts being covered by the assessment. It would be important for the SEA to monitor changes in the instructional program as a result of the changes in the assessment system, to ensure that the quality of instruction is not hampered by this assessment approach.

3. The SEA does not describe steps that would be taken to address deficiencies that might be found in the evaluation.

**Total Score(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement.**

**(e)(1)   7**

**+(e)(2)   3**

**10   of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**Final Score Summary Louisiana:**

<i>(a) Project narrative</i>	<b>23</b>	<b>of 40</b>
<i>(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support</i>	<b>8</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<i>(c) Timeline and budget</i>	<b>2</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<i>(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents</i>	<b>16</b>	<b>of 25</b>
<i>(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement</i>	<b>10</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<b>Total:</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>of 110</b>

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**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.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**(a) Project narrative. (40 points total)**

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--

***(1) The rationale for developing or selecting the particular innovative assessment system to be implemented under the demonstration authority, including--***

- (i) The distinct purpose of each assessment that is part of the innovative 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;

***Score for (a)(1)                    if factor (a)(3) is applicable   4   of 5 points;  
   if factor (a)(3) is not applicable    of 10 points***

<p>Strengths</p> <p>(i) This project narrative clearly articulates the purpose of the proposed LEAP 2025 Humanities assessment, which assesses both ELA and social studies standards as part of the innovative assessment system. Purposefully assessing content aligned to the social studies standards, students are assessed on their ELA skills within the context of specific social studies knowledge, thus promoting literacy. Developing both interim and summative assessments in three phases, aligned to existing and implemented curriculum and identified texts will foster focus on instruction, instead of test preparation, directly assess taught social studies content and ELA skills, and yield valid and reliable data for instructional and accountability purposes. The alignment of LEAP 2025 Humanities assessments with current curricular materials will further the process of assessment development.</p> <p>(ii) LEAP 2025 Humanities assessments, which will directly assess content taught in existing instructional texts, will likely foster the increase in student knowledge as well as student ELA skills, collaboration among teachers and result in coherent learning experiences for students.</p>
--

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

Agreement on critical content to be learned and texts used to convey this knowledge exists, captured in Louisiana ELA 2.0 Guidebooks currently implemented in 80% of districts.

LDOE plausibly contends that improved student outcomes will result by directly assessing ELA skills and content taught in the classroom. Such an assessment model is expected to level the playing field for students of varied socio economic backgrounds and background knowledge. Teachers have access to various resources to inform their instructional practices including a Diverse Learners Guide for English learners and students who struggle with reading and a guidebook for teachers who work with students with disabilities. The assessment will be designed using the principles of universal design, students with disabilities may use assistive technologies and accommodations cited in their IEPs, and English learners may use accommodations.

**Weaknesses**

LDOE states, "By developing a LEAP format that measures student understanding of pre-identified knowledge and texts, students can draw on deep knowledge of content and books from their daily classroom experiences." However, if the taught and assessed texts are the same, how are students assessed on their ability to apply ELA skills to new texts? If the same texts are used for instruction and assessment, the student's scores may not indicate how well the student can apply ELA skills to texts not used during instruction.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

(2) The plan the SEA or consortium, in consultation with any external partners, if applicable, has to—

(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

(ii) Train evaluators to use such strategies, if applicable;

**Score for (a)(2) if factor (a)(3) is applicable 25 of 25 points;  
if factor (a)(3) is not applicable     of 30 points**

**Strengths**

(i) The proposal provides in detail the components that must comprise a scoring plan that will be developed in collaboration with an assessment vendor. LEAP 2025 Humanities assessments will not be scored locally. The assessment vendor will provide scoring services during both field and operational testing and will provide psychometric services throughout the entire assessment process. All requirements of the assessment vendor are technically sound and reflect accepted professional standards to produce scores that are valid and reliable. These requirements include tasks that must occur before, during, and after the assessment; details of scoring for both selected response, interactive, and constructed response items, as well as human scoring of extended response items, including criteria for selection of on-site scoring project leader, scoring directors, and readers. Inter-rater reliability (IRR) is addressed sufficiently; the daily provision of IRR statistics will be used to monitor scoring quality and industry-standard or higher agreement rates will be implemented.

(ii) The scoring plan requires training for the evaluators and also requires the development of procedures to ensure that evaluators are scoring accurately. These procedures include reader monitoring by viewing daily score reliability and validity reports, conducting read-behinds, distributing validity responses among readers, and providing recalibration and retraining.

**Weaknesses**

None

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(3) If the system will initially be administered in a subset of schools or LEAs in a State--***

- (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;
  
- (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
  
- (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.

***Score for (a)(3) if factor (a)(3) is applicable \_\_ 7\_\_ of 10 points;  
if factor (a)(3) is not applicable no points awarded***

**Strengths**

(i) The strategy LDOE will implement to scale the LEAP 2025 Humanities assessments by 2023, is piloting these assessments in a few districts and evaluating and learning from the pilot prior to statewide implementation and in a few grades initially. Implementation will occur first in high schools, then middle schools, and finally elementary schools. School levels will be included as items are developed, which is consistent with other initiatives previously implemented in this state to improve standards and assessments. Additionally, tools, supports, and infrastructures - school system planning structures and teacher leader supports, similarly used for previous initiatives, will be provided to guide early implementers. The use of these strategies with other initiatives has been successful, e.g., use of standards-aligned curriculum increased from 20% to 80% implementation. Additionally, interested districts and schools will be required to pilot items prior to the year they want to join IADA.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

(ii) LDOE identified three logical criteria to select LEAs and schools for initial participation in LEAP 2025 Humanities: (1) the district used the ELA Guidebooks for at least one year, (2) the district's quality of implementation of the ELA Guidebooks, (based on their Curriculum Implementation Scale), and (3) whether the district's participation represents needed grade-level coverage, diversity of students, and demographic representation of student subgroups. After initial implementation in selected districts, all LEAs and schools may subsequently elect to participate during the demonstration period.

Initially, districts will apply for participation by some or all schools. Selected schools will administer the LEAP 2025 Humanities in some or all of the courses/grades once the district is approved to participate. All students in a course in a selected school must participate in LEAP 2025 Humanities.

(iii) The plan includes a detailed table of annual benchmarks for student demographics inclusive of the pilot and full operational years for each grade level. LDOE indicates that student demographics change annually and they will adjust the benchmarks to reflect current demographics during the demonstration period.

**Weaknesses**

(i) There does not appear to be an expectation that all schools will implement this innovative assessment by year 5; "statewide availability of the grades 3-5 LEAP 2025 Humanities format would occur in the following year (2023-2024)."

The plan does not discuss what LDOE will do if, in subsequent years, districts do not elect to participate in LEAP 2025 Humanities. It is not apparent if, once the assessment is available statewide, all districts and schools must administer the LEAP 2025 Humanities. The chart on page 46 indicates:

Available statewide	Full operational Humanities 6-8 assessments
Available statewide	Full operational Humanities I and Humanities II tests

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**Total Score(a) Project Narrative**

**(a)(1) 4**

**+(a)(2) 25**

**+(a)(3) 7 (if  
applicable)**

**36 of 40**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support. (15 points total)**

***(1) 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—

(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--

(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;

(B) Effective and high-quality supports for school staff to implement innovative assessments and innovative assessment items, including professional 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).

***Score for (b)(1)   4   of 5 points***

Strengths

(i) This plan indicates LDOE's understanding of the work involved in making and sustaining systems change at the classroom, school, and district levels. This plan details recent successful development and implementation of innovative assessments by LDOE, including (a) comprehensive descriptions of LA's involvement in summative assessment innovation as a

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

governing state in PARCC, which encompassed myriad experiences for LA educators to be involved in this assessment development and implementation, including professional development, and for students and parents to be involved in implementation, (b) development and implementation of LEAP 360, a system of diagnostic, formative, and interim assessments (89% usage rate) which teachers use to inform instruction, and instructional practices, and (c) pilot of ELA Guidebooks 2.0. The implementation of these guidebooks was a result of curriculum reviews that demonstrated lack of alignment to CCR standards. Based on teacher input LDOE released, in partnership with a vendor, the open-source ELA Guidebooks 2.0. Citations from test scores and studies indicate widespread use of these instructional materials.

The two external partners for LDOE IADA, the Johns Hopkins Institute for Education Policy and the Center for Assessment, have deep expertise and experience collaborating with states to implement assessment systems.

(ii) (A) The plan asserts that the state, in collaboration with the assessment vendor, will develop, pilot, and deliver the innovative assessment with the full suite of accommodations and assessment features that are currently available for the LEAP 2025. The current LDOE's Manuals for Accessibility and Accommodations on LEAP Grade 3-8 and End-of-Course Assessments is cited in a footnote. These manuals include accessibility features available for all students and accommodations for students with disabilities and English learners. Examples of accommodations are listed and described in the plan and reflect typical accommodations available during assessments.

(ii) (B) The plan describes a wealth of supports and a continuum of professional development that were available to district and school staff during past implementations of innovative assessments. See response to (i) above for a description of instructional supports. These instructional supports, in combination with the strategies in Louisiana's School System Planning Guide, which guides districts through decisions that need to be made during implementation; collaborative meetings of principals, supervisors, Chief Academic Officers, Assessment Coordinators, and Curriculum Directors; the network and role of 7,000 Teacher Leaders, the role of Teacher Leader Advisors, and regional network teams were utilized to effectively implement previous innovative assessments.

(ii) (C) The list of scoring procedures, discussed in (a)(2)(i) and (ii) that will be implemented is indicative of past experience and considerable expertise in this area.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

Weaknesses

(ii) (A) Specific mention was not located that professional development related to selecting and administering accommodations was provided to staff.

***(2) 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--

- (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 of the innovative assessment.

***Score for (b)(2)   4   of 5 points***

Strengths

- (i) LDOE provides numerous detailed examples of how their staff responsibilities and experiences, teams' expertise, infrastructures - their capacity - has contributed to successful implementation of innovations: implemented higher CCR standards state-wide, aligned LEAP assessments and LEAP 360 to these standards, and developed ELA Guidebooks 2.0. Recognition and implementation of solid infrastructures for learning and adjusting practice have been instrumental to LDOE's successful implementation of innovations. LDOE will enhance their capacity by collaborating with two renowned and respected external partners to ensure technical validity, reliability, and comparability of LEAP 2025 Humanities assessment format to LEAP 2025 ELA format and inform the quality and efficacy of LDOE's resources for participating districts, schools, and educators.
- (ii) Implementing past successful practices, infrastructures, continuum of professional development, internal collaboration among teams and collaboration with external partners and assessment vendors will mitigate risk and support successful implementation of the innovative assessment.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**Weaknesses**

(ii) The plan does not make specific mention of strategies based on analyses that will be implemented to mitigate risks.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(3) 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:

- (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 organizations, and business organizations.

***Score for (b)(3)   3   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

Signatures are included for the three superintendents and managers of two charter schools that will be involved in the first year of the demonstration authority period.

**Weaknesses**

Signatures of support were not included for presidents of local schools boards, teacher organizations, or other affected stakeholders.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**Total Score(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder  
support (b)(1) \_\_4\_\_**

**+(b)(2) \_\_4\_\_**

**+(b)(3) \_\_3\_\_**

**\_\_11\_\_ of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**(c) Timeline and budget. (15 points total)**

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--

***(1) 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;
- (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);

***Score for (c)(1)   4   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

- (i) The timeline is comprised of activities to be accomplished during each year of the requested demonstration authority period and includes activities for which each party is responsible.
- (ii) The plan identifies clear roles and responsibilities for the LDOE, content and administration assessment vendors, the Center for Assessment, and the TAC. Although each activity in (i) is not specifically keyed to the party/parties responsible, based on the descriptions of the roles of each partner, it is readily discernable which party/parties would be responsible for the implementation of each activity.
- (iii) N/A

**Weaknesses**

The activities to be accomplished during each year are presented in a list format but does not reflect the month each activity is expected to start and end. It appears that the list of activities to be completed in year one is especially ambitious.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(2) 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.

***Score for (c)(2)   5   of 10 points***

**Strengths**

- (i) LDOE asserts that they can leverage current state and federal funding for the initial years of the demonstration authority period. However, no budget or additional details are provided.
- (ii) LDOE will, in collaboration with their external partners, seek additional, non-public funding to pilot and scale the innovative assessment for subsequent years of the demonstration authority period. They will not have adequate funds in subsequent years due to the use of current federal and state funds for ongoing assessment implementation.

**Weaknesses**

Information is not provided about the expected costs at each phase.

The plan indicates neither the amount needed to implement the innovative assessment across the demonstration period, nor potential sources for additional funding.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**Total Score(c) Timeline and budget**

**(c)(1) \_\_4\_\_**

**+(c)(2) \_\_5\_\_**

**\_\_9\_\_ of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents. (25 points total)**

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--

***(1) 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;***

***Score for (d)(1) if factor (d)(4) is applicable \_\_\_ of 5 points;***

***if factor (d)(4) is not applicable \_9\_ of 9 points***

Strengths

LDOE has established and is committed to incorporating their professional development learning system for district and school staff into all aspects of the LEAP 2025 Humanities assessment development process. Through this professional development learning system, district and school staff will engage in a continuum of professional development from consultation to develop this application and communication and outreach endeavors, to piloting items and full implementation of the operational assessment, and along the way providing feedback to LDOE to ensure improvement. LDOE thoroughly describes the process and content of the professional development learning system, which includes technical assistance, resources, in-person meetings and events, and other communication streams that are available to districts and schools during the development, pilot, and operational components of the LEAP 2025 Humanities assessment. Additional communications and webinar opportunities will be provided for participants in the initial phases of LEAP 2025 Humanities. Technical assistance provided by state network teams to piloting districts and schools focuses on the assessment's purpose and format, use of the ELA Guidebooks 2.0, administration of the assessment including accessibility features and accommodations, and also provides a feedback loop to LDOE that is used to inform information and supports to districts and schools. The resources are described in detail, are available to

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

districts, schools, and teachers, and convey a systems-approach to change. In-person meetings and events calendared will provide information about the assessments and opportunities for collaboration and there are standing newsletters and webinars.

Weaknesses

None

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(2) The strategies the SEA or consortium has developed and will use to familiarize students and parents with the innovative assessment system;***

***Score for (d)(2) if factor (d)(4) is applicable \_\_\_ of 5 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable \_\_6\_\_ of 8 points***

Strengths

LDOE recognizes that effective communication with parents and students in participating schools will be a key to successful implementation of the LEAP 2025 Humanities. LDOE intends to offer quarterly collaborations with administrators and teachers to discuss strategies to communicate information about the assessment, provide resources to ensure that staff can accurately communicate information about the pilot assessment, both formally and informally, and develop a parent-specific website for the IADA which will include guides and other resources.

Weaknesses

There is no specific mention of the process for informing students about this new assessment.

***(3) 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;***

***Score for (d)(3) if factor (d)(4) is applicable \_\_\_ of 5 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable \_\_8\_\_ of 8 points***

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**Strengths**

LDOE incorporates supports during instruction and assessment to ensure that each subgroup of students meets state academic standards. Assessments reflect the books and texts that students study and thus the content knowledge and ELA instruction they receive via the ELA Guidebooks 2.0. LDOE contends that directly assessing ELA skills and content taught in the classroom will level the playing field for students of varied socio economic backgrounds and background knowledge. Teacher resources include a Diverse Learners Guide for ELs and students who struggle with reading and a guidebook for teachers who work with students with disabilities. State network teams and professional vendors will provide professional development to districts and schools. The professional development continuum includes technical assistance. The assessment will be designed using the principles of universal design, students with disabilities may use assistive technologies and accommodations cited in their IEP, and English learners may use accommodations.

**Weaknesses**

None

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(4) 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)

***Score for (d)(4) if factor (d)(4) is applicable \_\_\_ of 10 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable no points awarded***

Strengths
-----------

N/A
-----

Weaknesses
------------

N/A
-----

**Total Score(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents.**

**(d)(1) \_\_9\_\_**

**+(d)(2)\_\_6\_**

**+(d)(3)\_\_8\_\_**

**+(d)(4)\_\_N/A\_\_(if applicable)**

**\_\_23\_\_ of 25**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement. (15 points total)**

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—

***(1) 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); (10 points) and

***Score for (e)(1)   7   of 10 points***

**Strengths**

LDOE predicates the success of the evaluation plan presented in this proposal on previous evaluations their external partner, Center for Assessment, conducted for LDOE. The results and process of this evaluation laid the groundwork for the plan for the Center to conduct a similar evaluation of the LEAP 2025 Humanities to determine comparability of results between students taking LEAP 2025 assessments and students taking LEAP 2025 Humanities assessment, as well as a focus on ensuring that the LEAP system, as a whole, meets the federal peer review requirements. During the design phase, LDOE will ensure necessary specifications are included so that the assessment vendor and LDOE can collect necessary data to conduct this evaluation of test validity, reliability and comparability. Additionally, LDOE will collect qualitative data from feedback of participating district and school staff, students, and families on the trainings, supports, tools, and other resources LDOE provides for IADA implementation. Based on the history the Center has had conducting evaluations for validity, reliability and comparability for LA assessments, the data that will be available, and the evaluation plan, the proposed evaluation will provide the necessary analyses to determine validity, reliability, and comparability to the statewide assessment system.

**Weaknesses**

Although the Center for Assessment is clearly an experienced third party, it is not apparent that the Center for Assessment is an independent evaluator given that they have committed to

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

providing "expertise, technical capacity, and guidance . . . related to at least the following activities: overall assessment system design and programmatic data collection, item design, scoring and calibration, creation of summative determinations, establishing comparability, and evaluating reliability and validity . . ."

Will the evaluation include a review of the implication of permitting districts to select the texts that will be assessed and the use of text for both instruction and the assessment?

***(2) The SEA's or consortium's plan for continuous improvement of the innovative assessment system, including its process for--***

- (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. (5 points)

***Score for (e)(2)   5   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

- (i) LDOE cites how data and evaluation results from participating LEAs and schools will be used to make changes to improve the quality of the innovative assessment. LDOE describes how existing resources and tools will be revised to adjust practices related to IADA, i.e. the School System Planning Guide, Data for Planning and Collaboration, State Network Teams and District Technical Assistance, Ongoing Stakeholder engagement, and District Monitoring.
- (ii) Schools piloting IADA will receive additional monitoring from LDOE, including for test administration and security.

**Weaknesses**

None

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**Total Score(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement.**

**(e)(1) \_7\_\_**

**+(e)(2)\_5\_**

**\_\_\_12\_\_ of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**Final Score Summary Louisiana:**

<i>(a) Project narrative</i>	<b>36</b>	<b>of 40</b>
<i>(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support</i>	<b>11</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<i>(c) Timeline and budget</i>	<b>9</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<i>(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents</i>	<b>23</b>	<b>of 25</b>
<i>(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement</i>	<b>12</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<b>Total:</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>of 110</b>

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**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.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**(a) Project narrative. (40 points total)**

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--

***(1) The rationale for developing or selecting the particular innovative assessment system to be implemented under the demonstration authority, including--***

- (i) The distinct purpose of each assessment that is part of the innovative 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;

***Score for (a)(1)                    if factor (a)(3) is applicable   2   of 5 points;  
    if factor (a)(3) is not applicable     of 10 points***

Strengths

(i) The proposal outlines a strong rationale for developing content non-agnostic assessments combining ELA and related disciplines. This approach is innovative because no statewide assessment (known to this reviewer) indicates which texts or themes will be included or referenced in its assessment program.

(ii) The proposal makes a strong case for why and how the innovative assessments will promote high-quality instruction and the right kind of "teaching to the test." The proposal also explains why the assessment approach taken would lead to improved student outcomes, especially for students whose content knowledge acquisition is largely limited to what is learned in school.

Weaknesses

(i) Not clear how the interim and summative assessments will be related, especially with whether (and how) results from these two distinct assessments will be combined into a composite result

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

or score for each student. This has implications for comparability to the statewide assessment. More information on the distinctions between the two assessments would have been helpful.

It is not clear how this innovation will promote instruction that encourages students to approach new (non-Guidebook) texts. One strength of more traditional ways to assess ELA is that application of reading skills to new texts is explicitly assessed, thereby allowing for greater generalizability of inferences.

The stated approach for assessing comparability between the (innovative) Humanities assessment and the (statewide) ELA assessment is vague and relies too heavily on standard setting processes. Comparing students' prior-year ELA assessment results to current-year Humanities assessment results is inferior to a contemporaneous design – where a representative sample of students either (a) takes both assessments around the same time (with counterbalancing), or (b) is assigned randomly to take one or the other assessment.

The proportion of CR vs SR on the new assessment in relation to the statewide assessment is unclear.

(ii)

More research on this point should have been referenced, to support claim that the innovation will promote mastery of challenging State standards, particularly those standards dealing with reading and understanding texts not previously encountered.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(2) The plan the SEA or consortium, in consultation with any external partners, if applicable, has to--***

- (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
- (ii) Train evaluators to use such strategies, if applicable;

***Score for (a)(2) if factor (a)(3) is applicable 23 of 25 points;  
if factor (a)(3) is not applicable     of 30 points***

**Strengths**

- (i) The proposal indicates that no items on the Humanities assessments will be locally scored. It lays out a plan, with requirements for developing and using standardized and calibrated rubrics for scoring the innovative assessments, to ensure inter-rater reliability.
- (ii) The plan for training evaluators is general, but covers all important aspects including qualification, training, and monitoring.

**Weaknesses**

- (i) How will the criteria for scoring of CRs on the innovative assessment be developed so as to make them comparable to the scoring of the CRs on the statewide assessment?
- (ii) How will scorers be trained in such a way as to ensure comparability between this training and that of the statewide assessment?

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(3) If the system will initially be administered in a subset of schools or LEAs in a State--***

- (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;
- (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
- (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.

***Score for (a)(3) if factor (a)(3) is applicable 8 of 10 points;  
if factor (a)(3) is not applicable no points awarded***

**Strengths**

- (i) The proposed rationale for scaling the innovative assessment to all schools statewide is based on the degree to which inclusion of a candidate district improves the demographic representation (low income, Black/White/Hispanic, EL, SWD) of the demonstration group, the length of time in which the district has used the relevant curriculum (Guidebooks 2.0), and the quality of that district's implementation of the relevant curriculum.
- (ii) The SEA's criteria for determining the schools initially participating are like those for scaling the innovative assessments.
- (iii) The SEA has in place school planning structures and teacher leader support portals to help ensure consistent and high-quality implementation across districts.



**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support. (15 points total)**

***(1) 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—

(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--

(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;

(B) Effective and high-quality supports for school staff to implement innovative assessments and innovative assessment items, including professional 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).

***Score for (b)(1)   4   of 5 points***

Strengths

(i) The State has demonstrated strong evidence of implementing innovative assessments, including PARCC and LEAP 360.

(ii)

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

(A) The proposal indicates that in the development of Guidebooks 2.0, the State developed professional development for implementation of the Guidebooks for English learners and student with disabilities.

(B) LEAP 360 assessment guides, among other resources, show that the State has experience implementing innovative assessment, including professional development.

(C) None.

**Weaknesses**

(i) None.

(ii)

(A) Could not locate specific evidence of the State's or its external partners' experience in developing or using effective supports / accommodations for administering innovative assessments.

(B) None.

(C) Could not locate specific evidence of the State's or its external partners' experience in developing or using strategies for scoring innovative assessments.

***(2) 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--

- (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

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

(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.

***Score for (b)(2)   3   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

(i) The application argues that the SEA has capacity for wide-ranging reform. It states that two of LDOE's divisions, which will be leading the implementation of the IADA work, previously lead the LDOE's creation of rubrics for the evaluation of instructional materials, conducted instructional material quality reviews, developed the ELA Guidebooks 2.0, and identified and vetted professional vendors to provide high-quality learning opportunities for educators.

(ii) None.

**Weaknesses**

(i) None.

(ii) No specific risks were identified, so it was not possible to assess strategies to mitigate those risks.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(3) 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:

- (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 organizations, and business organizations.

***Score for (b)(3)   2   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

- (i) Signatures from several superintendents (or equivalent) are included in the application.
- (ii) . None.
- (iii) . None.
- (iv) None.

**Weaknesses**

- (i) None
- (ii) No signatures from local school boards.
- (iii) No signatures from any local teacher organizations.
- (iv) No signatures from other affected stakeholders.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**Total Score(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder  
support (b)(1) \_4\_\_**

**+(b)(2)\_3\_\_**

**+(b)(3)\_2\_\_**

**\_9\_\_ of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**(c) Timeline and budget. (15 points total)**

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--

***(1) 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;
- (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);

***Score for (c)(1)   4   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

(i) and (ii) The parties responsible for different types of activities are listed, and specific key activities are listed by implementation year. Except for Year 1, the timeline can reasonably be met with sufficient support.

(iii) Not applicable.

**Weaknesses**

(i) and (ii) The parties responsible for different types of activities are listed, but not for each specific activity.

Year 1 seems ambitious and not meeting its key deliverables (such as developing a successful testing platform) could have a large impact.

(iii) Not applicable.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(2) 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.

***Score for (c)(2)   4   of 10 points***

**Strengths**

- (i) Amount allocated by the State to assessment activities is provided.
- (ii) It is clear from the application that the State will need to, and intends to, seek additional, non-public funds to pilot and scale the innovation.

**Weaknesses**

- (i) No budget is presented for the project. Amount spent on assessment is not provided.
- (ii) Not clear how much additional funding will be needed.

**Total Score(c) Timeline and budget**

**(c)(1)   4**

**+(c)(2)   4**

**8   of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents. (25 points total)**

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--

***(1)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;***

***Score for (d)(1) if factor (d)(4) is applicable \_\_\_ of 5 points;***

***if factor (d)(4) is not applicable \_8\_ of 9 points***

Strengths

The State has an extensive structure in place for providing assessment-related training, which it plans to leverage for innovative-assessment training for LEAs and school staff.

Weaknesses

No indication of how State has monitored or evaluates the quality of the training.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(2) The strategies the SEA or consortium has developed and will use to familiarize students and parents with the innovative assessment system;***

***Score for (d)(2) if factor (d)(4) is applicable \_\_\_ of 5 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable \_6\_ of 8 points***

Strengths

The State has a well-conceived and mature system for familiarizing parents with its assessment system, exemplified in School Finder.

Weaknesses

Strategies that the State plans to use for familiarizing students with the new assessment system are not explicitly documented. For example, will sample or practice tests be provided?

***(3) 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;***

***Score for (d)(3) if factor (d)(4) is applicable \_\_\_ of 5 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable \_7\_ of 8 points***

Strengths

To help ensure that ELs and SWDs receive appropriate support, the State plans to rely on its robust system of standards-aligned instructional supports and resources. It plans to make available in its innovative assessments all accommodations currently available in LEAP.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

Weaknesses

Not addressed: How the State will **monitor** that ELs and SWDs receive appropriate support.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(4) 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)

***Score for (d)(4) if factor (d)(4) is applicable \_\_\_ of 10 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable no points awarded***

Strengths
-----------

Weaknesses
------------

**Total Score(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents.**

**(d)(1) \_\_8\_\_**

**+(d)(2) \_\_6\_\_**

**+(d)(3) \_\_7\_\_**

**+(d)(4) \_\_N/A\_\_ (if applicable)**

**\_\_21\_\_ of 25**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement. (15 points total)**

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—

***(1) 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); (10 points) and

***Score for (e)(1)   2   of 10 points***

**Strengths**

The plan is for the Center for Assessment, an experienced party, to conduct an evaluation, the plan for which has multiple components for triangulation. Experts from the Center for Assessment are aware of the challenges of determining comparability in contexts such as the IADA, where results from two assessments, which are substantially distinct, must be compared. The September 7, 2016 memo from the Center for Assessment shows that staff have considered the challenges extensively.

**Weaknesses**

The effect of a school's choice among interim assessments raises questions, not addressed in the application, of comparability (across alternative configurations of the innovative assessment) and exposure.

The Center for Assessment is involved in several other aspects of the innovation, including overall system design, item design, scoring and calibration, establishing comparability, and supporting LA DOE to implement the assessments, which precludes them being an independent third party. (major weakness)

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(2) The SEA's or consortium's plan for continuous improvement of the innovative assessment system, including its process for--***

- (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. (5 points)

***Score for (e)(2)   3   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

- (i) The state has an extensive system for using data, feedback, evaluation results, and other information from LEAs for improvements to the school system generally.
- (ii) School districts participating in the IADA will, in addition to monitoring currently in place, will receive additional monitoring on test administration and security.

**Weaknesses**

- (i) The proposal does not show how feedback will be incorporated to improve the innovative assessment system.
- (ii) The proposal does not outline the processes that will be used to monitor implementation of the new assessments specifically.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**Total Score(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement.**

**(e)(1) \_2\_\_**

**+(e)(2)\_3\_\_**

**\_5\_\_ of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**Final Score Summary Louisiana:**

<i>(a) Project narrative</i>	<b>33</b>	<b>of 40</b>
<i>(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support</i>	<b>9</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<i>(c) Timeline and budget</i>	<b>8</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<i>(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents</i>	<b>21</b>	<b>of 25</b>
<i>(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement</i>	<b>5</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<b>Total:</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>of 110</b>

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**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.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**(a) Project narrative. (40 points total)**

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--

***(1) The rationale for developing or selecting the particular innovative assessment system to be implemented under the demonstration authority, including--***

- (i) The distinct purpose of each assessment that is part of the innovative 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;

***Score for (a)(1)                    if factor (a)(3) is applicable   3   of 5 points;  
    if factor (a)(3) is not applicable     of 10 points***

Strengths

Pages 11-12 describe the fact that teachers who have used the Guidebook 2.0 texts and curricula believe the state assessment does not adequately assess the higher-level skills that are promoted by the Guidebook materials. Teachers would like the assessment to be better aligned in terms of content, texts, and a range of language and critical thinking skills.

Specifically, "teachers believed the Guidebooks were helping their students deeply understand and engage with books and other texts, build critical knowledge, and grow academically, but were concerned that the kinds of teaching practices the Guidebooks encouraged were not fully reflected in the summative LEAP assessments."

The emphasis on using feedback from teachers who are trying to implement the intended curriculum communicates that the state values what is happening in the classroom and what influences deep learning. By aiming to build an assessment that targets deeper, connected knowledge (i.e., connecting ideas from two content areas and across key texts), the state is promoting high quality instruction and improved student outcomes.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

Page 14 discusses how improving the LEAP to support better instructional practices, increase the emphasis on formative assessment, promote integrated instruction, reduce overall testing time, streamline assessments, and so on, was a goal derived from the state's ESSA plan.

The motivation appears to derive from consultation with stakeholders. The state met with diverse groups of stakeholders particularly in Fall 2016. These meetings led to discussions regarding the goals the state set out in its ESSA plan and concerns about low alignment of discrete, state assessments to the new, higher goals for student achievement. The proposed assessment directly responds to the state's desire to reduce overall testing time per student and increase the alignment of assessments to the instructional goals including deeper and more integrated knowledge.

**Weaknesses**

While the argument is logical and relatively sound from an educational perspective, the purposes of the innovation and discussion of how it will achieve its aims are not explicitly supported by relevant literature with appropriate citations or documented evidence that this type of assessment achieves the intended goals of the project.

The motivation and rationale are primarily stakeholder driven. Relatively little advice from experts or citations to relevant literature-based recommendations are included.

Throughout the proposal there is limited information describing precisely how the state will incorporate texts and standards from social studies or history as it develops the "humanities" assessment. The proposal describes more frequently how the innovation will assess more deeply the intended ELA standards, alignment to specific social studies or history standards or use of particular historical texts are not provided.

There may be a risk of narrowing the curriculum to the specific texts that are taught in the Guidebooks and therefore selected for testing. There may be a risk to generalizability because of the potential narrowing of the curriculum

Through scheduling of assessment throughout the academic year introduces the possibility of proficiency losses. What is the state's plan to address this potential issue? In a related question, the state did not describe clearly how the scores will be accumulated over the course of multiple assessment instances.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(2) The plan the SEA or consortium, in consultation with any external partners, if applicable, has to--***

- (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
- (ii) Train evaluators to use such strategies, if applicable;

***Score for (a)(2) if factor (a)(3) is applicable 20 of 25 points;  
if factor (a)(3) is not applicable \_\_\_ of 30 points***

**Strengths**

The proposal states that appropriate tools, rubrics, and methods for scoring innovative assessments will be developed within the first two years of the five-year period. Language from relevant nationally recognized professional and technical standards are used to describe the requirements the SEA will ask of the assessment vendor. Appropriate steps for achieving inter-rater reliability and comparability, including the use of external support from the Center for Assessment, is included in the plan. Training of scorers is assigned to the assessment vendor.

**Weaknesses**

Vendor expectations are phrased using rather boiler-plate language. Plan does not include specific information about equating forms or examining relationships between innovative and traditional forms of the LEAP (linking).

Scoring: Requirements for scoring of open-ended (OE) items is clearly described. Qualifications to serve as a rater are also described. However, who might be eligible to apply to rate OE items is not precisely described. While the proposal states that all scoring will be the responsibility of the assessment vendor, will LA teachers be eligible to apply to serve as raters? This is popular model used by the College Board and other states, which not only increases the engagement of teachers in the assessment program, but also serves as effective PD for interested teachers.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(3) If the system will initially be administered in a subset of schools or LEAs in a State--***

- (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;
- (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
- (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.

***Score for (a)(3) if factor (a)(3) is applicable \_8\_ of 10 points;  
if factor (a)(3) is not applicable no points awarded***

**Strengths**

LEAs and charter systems largely volunteered and were offered opportunities to provide input to the plan and application. State relied on previous relationships with LEAs that have used and helped to develop the Guidebooks to select initial pilot sites. This strategy will likely promote high-fidelity implementation during the pilot because teachers and administrators should already be familiar with key texts and how to integrate the main ideas in the standards across the key texts.

**Weaknesses**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

The proposal states that LDOE expects the pilot group to be representative. The proposal contain some numerical information describing relative proportions of different demographic groups in the participating schools, districts and states. The pilot group is substantially higher income, more White, and less Hispanic than the state. The pilot group has a higher proportion of students with disabilities. The pilot group is located in or around New Orleans, meaning it is not very rural, which may not be representative of the state. What has the state considered about the effect of rural/urban homes on students' development of background knowledge from reading key texts (which is one of the aims of the overall state initiative described on page 1)? This comes to bear where the state claims that content agnostic assessments favor students from higher income homes. If indeed content agnostic assessments favor students from higher income homes, and the piloting schools have more higher income families, then the SEA will not be able to detect whether the innovation really reduces the favoring aspect of the assessment based on pilot results.

Information about the participation rates throughout the demonstration period appears to be presented inconsistently throughout the application. The proposal's language in some places implies broad opportunity to identify the sample participants during all years of the demonstration period. Alternatively, information elsewhere indicates that the state will select the samples during the first 3 years, and the test will be available state wide only in years 4 and 5. No discussion of how and when the innovative assessment would be adopted/mandated statewide.

**Total Score(a) Project Narrative**      **(a)(1) \_3\_\_**  
**+ (a)(2) \_20\_\_**  
**+ (a)(3) \_8\_\_ (if applicable)**  
**\_31\_\_ of 40**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support. (15 points total)**

***(1) 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—

(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--

(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;

(B) Effective and high-quality supports for school staff to implement innovative assessments and innovative assessment items, including professional 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).

***Score for (b)(1) \_3\_ of 5 points***

**Strengths**

The choice to preselect districts that have implemented the Guidebook 2.0 curriculum and resources strengthens the proposal because students and teachers in these districts are providing instruction that is well-aligned to the intended state standards.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

The state already provides appropriate supports for all students taking LEAP assessments and will draw on those supports as a new administration system is developed to deliver the innovative LEAP.

State previously worked with teachers to develop Guidebooks 2.0, which have been implemented successfully in several districts.

The state currently provides professional development to staff members through existing channels and technology solutions. This experience and infrastructure indicates the state has the tools needed to provide educators with the information and supports they need as the state rolls out a new assessment.

**Weaknesses**

No information is provided to indicate the state's prior experience providing PD specifically targeting assessment practices and procedures or implementing appropriate supports and accommodations during assessments.

Documented evidence of the reliability and validity of scoring mechanisms is stated as a requirement the SEA will have of its assessment vendor, but current documentation of the planned methods is not available.

***(2) 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--

- (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

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

(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.

***Score for (b)(2) \_4\_ of 5 points***

**Strengths**

The SEA sufficiently described qualitatively the history of the state assessments, their strengths and limitations, and why the state is seeking to innovate in the proposed way.

The SEA is relying heavily on districts to selectively participate, which appears to be a means to mitigate risks and support successful implementation of the innovative assessments,

The SEA has a plan to communicate with all stakeholders, which will improve understanding, and in turn, support successful implementation.

**Weaknesses**

The proposal does not discuss available technologies such as computers/tablets in schools, internet connectivity, etc. Perhaps it can be assumed that if the state implemented the PARCC assessment in the past, then schools typically acquired adequate technology in 2010, but the availability of adequate, up-to-date internet-equipped computers or tablets should be more fully described along with students' and teachers' access and preparation to use these technologies.

Capacity of LEAs to implement the innovative assessments was not discussed.

No discussion about mitigating risks was provided.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(3) 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:

- (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 organizations, and business organizations.

***Score for (b)(3)   3   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

Sufficient partnerships and agreements were documented with letters of support from superintendents and experts from the Center for Assessment. Letters of support were supplied for local school boards; at least one such letter was signed by the superintendent of the district. Letters of support were **not** supplied for teacher organizations or parent groups.

The state has a plan to communicate with all stakeholders directly and support LEAs in their communications with families to provide clear understanding of the new assessments,

**Weaknesses**

State should furnish letters of support for all four categories of stakeholders.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**Total Score(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder  
support (b)(1) \_3\_\_**

**+(b)(2)\_4\_\_**

**+(b)(3)\_3\_\_**

**\_10\_\_ of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**(c) Timeline and budget. (15 points total)**

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--

***(1) 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;
- (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);

***Score for (c)(1)   3   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

Annual plans provided in bulleted lists of requirements and high-level activities.

Assessment vendor responsibilities are listed and include tasks that are typically assigned to such a vendor. No expected delivery dates are provided with the list of assessment vendor tasks.

Yearly tasks for the entire innovative assessment roll out are shown.

**Weaknesses**

Year one appears to be ambitious. The list of activities includes creation of testing frameworks and development of items. The state also lists the goal of building or obtaining an appropriate assessment platform. It may not be realistic to develop an entire testing platform in a one-year period. The state lists the goal of obtaining district feedback in year one, yet the test forms are not scheduled to be developed in Year one. So, what would districts be providing feedback about? Similarly, the state lists the goal of gathering data and evidence of Year 1. What exactly does this mean, if there is no test form yet?

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

Detailed within-year objectives are not provided, nor are expected delivery dates for tasks listed within each year. Additionally, the proposal does not make explicit which office or group will take responsibility for completing the high-level tasks that are listed.

Transitioning from two within content-area assessments to a blended assessment requires substantial analysis of the content domains being sampled. It is not clear from the proposal how the state plans to approach the development of a blueprint that incorporates material from the two content areas. The timeline should contain steps that specify a plan for this component of the innovation.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(2) 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.

***Score for (c)(2)   0   of 10 points***

Strengths

Weaknesses

A specific budget for the components of the innovative assessment program is not provided.

The funding appears to rely entirely on public appropriations. Does this imply that the state is able to carry out the proposed innovation without additional funding? The proposal contains a substantial amount of new development, including a new assessment framework, new test delivery technology, and new items. How will that be funded while the majority of the state continues to implement the existing LEAP?

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**Total Score(c) Timeline and budget**

**(c)(1) \_3\_\_**

**+(c)(2)\_0\_\_**

**\_3\_\_ of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents. (25 points total)**

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--

***(1) 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;***

***Score for (d)(1) if factor (d)(4) is applicable \_\_\_ of 5 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable \_9\_ of 9 points***

Strengths

The planned supports for stakeholders and educators are sufficiently described. (1) The state has selected for the pilot period districts where the intended curriculum is being taught by teachers who currently incorporate the advanced concepts, skills, and connections that will be tested with the proposed innovative assessment. (2) The state plans to build on previous successes it has with supplying educators with support and PD through a web-based system to provide needed PD and supports for the innovative assessment program. (3) The state describes the training and deployment of several technical assistance teams to assist schools and educators in the implementation of the proposed innovative assessment.

Weaknesses

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(2) The strategies the SEA or consortium has developed and will use to familiarize students and parents with the innovative assessment system;***

***Score for (d)(2) if factor (d)(4) is applicable \_\_\_ of 5 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable \_6\_ of 8 points***

Strengths

The SEA will rely on established direct and indirect lines of communication to parents.

Weaknesses

No information was provided to describe how students will be made aware of the innovative assessment.

*Comment:* The state indicates a requirement to pilot one year prior to administering the innovative tests, perhaps districts should be offered the option to pilot a grade down as well – to acquaint students with what their “real” test the following year will be like. This option would provide students a glimpse of what the new test will look like.

***(3) 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;***

***Score for (d)(3) if factor (d)(4) is applicable \_\_\_ of 5 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable \_8\_ of 8 points***

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**Strengths**

Documentation for this requirement is sufficient. The state has Guidebooks written specifically for teachers of students with disabilities. The state will implement the same accessibility and accommodations that are already available on the LEAP 2025. The listed features are consistent with industry standards (e.g., large font, Braille, read-aloud, etc.).

**Weaknesses**

The state should describe more completely how it will ensure students are receiving the supports to which they are entitled and that these supports operate as intended to allow students to who their proficiency on the challenging State academic standards.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

***(4) 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)

***Score for (d)(4) if factor (d)(4) is applicable \_\_\_ of 10 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable no points awarded***

Strengths
-----------

Does not apply
----------------

Weaknesses
------------

**Total Score(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents.**

**(d)(1) \_\_9\_\_**

**+(d)(2)\_6\_\_**

**+(d)(3)\_8\_\_**

**+(d)(4)\_\_\_\_(if applicable)**

**\_\_23\_\_ of 25**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement. (15 points total)**

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—

***(1) 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 part200.105(b)(4) and (9); (10 points) and

***Score for (e)(1)   8   of 10 points***

**Strengths**

State relied on its recent studies of comparability and has contracted with the same vendor to monitor comparability of the innovated assessments. Sufficient documentation of recent comparability studies was included. Center for Assessment possesses sufficient experience and expertise to carry out this work.

The state indicates reliability, validity, and comparability of scores (to the LEAP 2025 ELA) will be monitored and that the state will rely on external partners to assist in this regard. External partners include the assessment vendor and the Center for Assessment. Psychometric support for monitoring reliability, validity, and comparability will be supplied by the assessment vendor and monitored by the Center for Assessment.

**Weaknesses**

Regarding comparability, Center for Assessment advised that the innovative test should aim for similar or higher performance expectations. However, is it possible that if teachers implement parts of the innovative assessment throughout the year, directly following instruction of a particular text, that the innovative assessment could actually seem easier and promote inflated scores? State is advised to consider this seeming contradiction.

What processes will be carried out to monitor the comparability of within-grade assessments based on different texts?

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

After the pilot, the state will "offer" the innovative assessment statewide – this is interesting language. At that time, will the state need to equate different test forms for the same grade and content area? In particular, how will an innovative assessment for ELA be linked to LEAP 2025 tests of ELA?

The Center for Assessment is assigned to study comparability and to evaluate implementation. There may be a conflict of interest.

***(2) The SEA's or consortium's plan for continuous improvement of the innovative assessment system, including its process for--***

- (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. (5 points)

***Score for (e)(2)   3   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

Proposal describes sufficient existing means to continuously collect and use feedback, evaluation, and other information from LEAs to improve assessment programs. The proposal states that it will rely on these existing programs to craft productive feedback channels for the innovative assessment.

Monitoring discussion summarizes existing processes for monitoring assessment implementations.

**Weaknesses**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

Does the state have plans for innovations to the monitoring processes for the new assessment, such as monitoring the text choices and timing of when certain texts are selected?

What plans does the state have to monitor text and item exposure rates?

The proposal does not include specific monitoring process for the innovation; however, there is ample discussion of how the state will engage diverse stakeholders to gather their feedback. It remains unclear how the state will monitor perceptions of how and whether the innovative assessment is received by stakeholders in terms of whether it is achieving the intended goals.

What steps will be taken if there are deficiencies noted by the external evaluator?

**Total Score(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement.**

**(e)(1) \_8\_\_**

**+(e)(2)\_3\_\_**

**\_11\_\_ of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "A" Applicant Name Louisiana:

**Final Score Summary Louisiana:**

<i><b>(a) Project narrative</b></i>	<b>31</b>	<b>of 40</b>
<i><b>(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support</b></i>	<b>10</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<i><b>(c) Timeline and budget</b></i>	<b>3</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<i><b>(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents</b></i>	<b>23</b>	<b>of 25</b>
<i><b>(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement</b></i>	<b>11</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<b>Total:</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>of 110</b>