

# IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

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

Application "A" Applicant Name North Carolina:

### Score Summary: Averages Across Four Reviewers

		possible	Application A State of North Carolina	
criteria		pts		
	a1	5	3	
	a2	25	22.25	
	a3	10	3.75	
<b>a. Narrative</b>		<b>40</b>	<b>29</b>	
	b1	5	4	
	b2	5	3.75	
	b3	10	3.5	
<b>b. Prior Experience</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>11.25</b>	
	c1	5	3.75	
	c2	10	3.5	
<b>c. Timeline, budget</b>		<b>15</b>	<b>7.25</b>	
	d1	9	6	
	d2	8	5.25	
	d3	8	7.5	
	d4	0(n/a)	--	
<b>d. Supports</b>		<b>25</b>	<b>18.75</b>	
	e1	12	6.25	
	e2	8	6.5	
<b>e. Evaluation</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>12.75</b>	
<b>Overall Total</b>		<b>120</b>	<b>79</b>	

# IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

---

## **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.

<b>Regulatory Requirement</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
-------------------------------	----------------------	--------------------

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p><b>(a) Consultation. Evidence that the SEA or consortium has developed an innovative assessment system in collaboration with--</b></p> <p>(1) Experts in the planning, development, implementation, and evaluation of innovative assessment systems, which may include external partners; and</p> <p>(2) Affected stakeholders in the State, or in each State in the consortium, including--</p> <p>(i) Those representing the interests of children with disabilities, English learners, and other subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act;</p> <p>(ii) Teachers, principals, and other school leaders;</p> <p>(iii) Local educational agencies (LEAs);</p> <p>(iv) Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State;</p> <p>(v) Students and parents, including parents of children described in paragraph (a)(2)(i) of this section; and</p> <p>(vi) Civil rights organizations.</p>	<p>(a)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>No evidence is provided that the SEA has developed this assessment in collaboration with those representing the interests of children with disabilities or those representing English learners, nor did they received input from students themselves or from representatives of Indian tribes located in the State. The list of stakeholders who gave input did include an organization that might be a civil rights organization, but this was not made clear in the application.</p> <p>Regarding the stakeholders meeting, the SEA having “invited” certain stakeholders does not ensure that those stakeholders were present at the meeting.</p>
<p><b>(b) Innovative assessment system. A demonstration that the innovative assessment system does</b></p>	<p>(b)(1)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan</p>	

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>required grade and subject under 34 CFR 200.5(a)(1) in which the SEA does not choose to implement an innovative assessment.</p>		
<p>(2)(i) Align with the challenging State academic content standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act, including the depth and breadth of such standards, for the grade in which a student is enrolled; and (ii) May measure a student’s academic proficiency and growth using items above or below the student’s grade level so long as, for purposes of meeting the requirements for reporting and school accountability under sections 1111(c) and 1111(h) of the Act and paragraphs (b)(3) and (b)(7)-(9) of this section, the State measures each student’s academic proficiency based on the challenging State academic standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled;</p>	<p><b>(b)(2)</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i>  <input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>Because the proposed innovative assessment is completely multiple-choice in English Language Arts, and almost all multiple-choice in math with some grid-in items, it is questionable whether a test with such limited item formats could adequately align across the full depth and breadth of the state standards. A plan needs to be in place that demonstrates that the proposed assessment will be able to measure the full depth and breadth across the state standards.</p> <p>Since the SEA has used technology-enhanced items in other assessments, it is not clear why they are not planning to use technology-enhanced items in the NCPAT. Including technology-enhanced items would increase the opportunity for the innovative assessment to align with the full depth and breadth of the state standards as well as to allow a greater range of ways for students to represent their knowledge and mastery of the standards.</p>
<p>(3) Express student results or</p>	<p><b>(b)(3)</b></p>	

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>competencies consistent with the challenging State academic achievement standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act and identify which students are not making sufficient progress toward, and attaining, grade-level proficiency on such standards;</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>The application indicates that the SEA will be basically developing cut-scores in two ways: (1) by equating the NCPAT with the state summative assessment to obtain new cut points for determining academic achievement standard categories in Year 4, and (2) conducting a standard-setting study for setting cut-points in Year 5. It is unclear how the SEA will reconcile the two sets of cut points. With the possibility of two independent sets of cut scores, it would not be possible to consistently identify which students are not making sufficient progress toward, and attaining, grade-level proficiency on the standards.</p>
<p>(4)(i) Generate results, including annual summative determinations as defined in paragraph (b)(7) of this section, that are valid, reliable, and comparable for all students and for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and</p>	<p><b>(b)(4)</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p>	<p>While the application describes comparability determination by administering the Math Assessment in both forms (innovative and state assessment) in grades 4 and 6, and the ELA in both forms in grades 5 and 8, this is only being done in Year 3. The regulatory requirement specifies that there be an annual determination of comparability during each year of the demonstration authority.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, to the results generated by the State academic assessments described in 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act for such students.</p> <p>Consistent with the SEA’s or consortium’s evaluation plan under 34 CFR 200.106(e), the SEA must plan to annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period in <b>one of the following ways:</b></p> <p>(A) Administering full assessments from both the innovative and statewide assessment systems to all students enrolled in participating schools, such that at least once in any grade span (i.e., 3-5, 6-8, or 9-12) and subject for which there is an innovative assessment, a statewide assessment in the same subject would also be administered to all such students. As part of this determination, the innovative assessment and statewide assessment need not be administered to an individual student in the same school year.</p> <p>(B) Administering full assessments from both the innovative and statewide assessment systems to a demographically representative</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>_X_Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>It is unclear how the SEA will ensure that all students will have had an opportunity to learn the standards being assessed at each point of administration of the NCPAT through the school year. Additionally, it is not clear how the state will deal with the issue of students potentially not demonstrating meeting an assessed standard early in the year, but being able to meet it later in the year without being able to demonstrate it because of its not being assessed on an interim assessment later in the year. To address this, the SEA needs a plan to demonstrate how they will aggregate the data from the three interim assessments to generate results that are valid, reliable, and comparable to the state summative assessment, for all students and for each subgroup of students.</p> <p>With regard to the embedded field-test model, with all field-test items for the NCPAT being embedded in available slots on the current end-of-grade assessments, it appears that students who take both assessments will be answering the same questions twice. It is unclear how the SEA will address the sequence issue of whether taking the same items is going to affect students’ ability to answer these items better the second time.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>sample of all students and subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, from among those students enrolled in participating schools, such that at least once in any grade span (i.e., 3-5, 6-8, or 9-12) and subject for which there is an innovative assessment, a statewide assessment in the same subject would also be administered in the same school year to all students included in the sample.</p> <p>(C) Including, as a significant portion of the innovative assessment system in each required grade and subject in which both an innovative and statewide assessment are administered, items or performance tasks from the statewide assessment system that, at a minimum, have been previously pilot tested or field tested for use in the statewide assessment system.</p> <p>(D) Including, as a significant portion of the statewide assessment system in each required grade and subject in which both an innovative and statewide assessment are administered, items or performance tasks from the innovative assessment system that, at a minimum, have been previously pilot tested or field tested for use in the innovative assessment system.</p> <p>(E) An alternative method for</p>		

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>demonstrating comparability that an SEA can demonstrate will provide for an equally rigorous and statistically valid comparison between student performance on the innovative assessment and the statewide assessment, including for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act;</p> <p>(ii) Generate results, including annual summative determinations as defined in paragraph (b)(7) of this section, that are valid, reliable, and comparable, for all students and for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, among participating schools and LEAs in the innovative assessment demonstration authority. Consistent with the SEA’s or consortium’s evaluation plan under 34 CFR 200.106(e), the SEA must plan to annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period;</p>		
<p>(5)(i) Provide for the participation of all students, including children with disabilities and English learners;</p> <p>(ii) Be accessible to all students by incorporating the principles of universal design for learning, to the</p>	<p><b>(b)(5)</b>            ____Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the</p>	<p>One of the key principles of Universal Design for Learning is to provide learners alternatives for demonstrating what they know. The proposed NCPAT is entirely multiple choice, which does not give learners alternative methods (such as essays or short answer items) to demonstrate what they know, especially in the area of English Language Arts.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>extent practicable, consistent with 34 CFR 200.2(b)(2)(ii); and (iii) Provide appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act;</p>	<p>authority period.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/>_X_Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(6) For purposes of the State accountability system consistent with section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the Act, annually measure in each participating school progress on the Academic Achievement indicator under section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the Act of at least 95 percent of all students, and 95 percent of students in each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, who are required to take such</p>	<p><b>(b)(6)</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/>___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/>_X_Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this</p>	<p>The application indicates that at least 95% of the overall student population will participate in the state assessment, but there is no mention of the commitment that 95% of students in each sub-group of students will participate in the assessment.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>assessments consistent with paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section;</p>	<p>requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i>            ___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>7) Generate an annual summative determination of achievement, using the annual data from the innovative assessment, for each student in a participating school in the demonstration authority that describes--            (i) The student’s mastery of the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act for the grade in which the student is enrolled; or            (ii) In the case of a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed with an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Act, the</p>	<p><b>(b)(7)</b>            ___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.             _X_Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>As mentioned under regulatory requirement (b)(4), it is not clear how the SEA will be using the data from the innovative assessment to generate an annual summative determination of achievement. The proposal says that students will receive a summative score by “combining results” from all three NCPAT through-grade assessments administered during the school year, but this is far too vague a statement to describe how that summative score will be determined.</p> <p>The application does not mention what assessment will be used for students with significant cognitive disabilities in the proposed NCPAT system.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>student's mastery of those standards;</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(8) Provide disaggregated results by each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, including timely data for teachers, principals and other school leaders, students, and parents consistent with 34 CFR 200.8 and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(x) and (xii) and section 1111(h) of the Act, and provide results to parents in a manner consistent with paragraph (b)(4)(i) of this section and part 200.2(e);</p>	<p><b>(b)(8)</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.   <input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i>   <input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p>	

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i>	
<p>(9) Provide an unbiased, rational, and consistent determination of progress toward the State’s long-term goals for academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(A) of the Act for all students and each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act and a comparable measure of student performance on the Academic Achievement indicator under section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the Act for participating schools relative to non-participating schools so that the SEA may validly and reliably aggregate data from the system for purposes of meeting requirements for--</p> <p>(i) Accountability under sections 1003 and 1111(c) and (d) of the Act, including how the SEA will identify participating and non-participating schools in a consistent manner for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement under section 1111(c)(4)(D) of the Act; and</p> <p>(ii) Reporting on State and LEA report cards under section 1111(h) of the Act.</p>	<p><b>(b)(9)</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>_____Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>_____Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>As mentioned under regulatory requirement (b)(4), it is not clear how the SEA will be using the data from the innovative assessment to generate an annual summative determination of achievement. The proposal says that students will receive a summative score by “combining results” from all three NCPAT through-grade assessments administered during the school year, but this is far too vague a statement to describe how that summative score will be determined.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p><b>(d) Assurances.</b></p> <p><b>This application contains assurances that the lead SEA and each SEA applying as a consortium will:</b></p> <p>(1) Continue use of the statewide academic assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science required under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act--</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) In all non-participating schools; and</li> <li>(ii) In all participating schools for which such assessments will be used in addition to innovative assessments for accountability purposes under section 1111(c) of the Act consistent with paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section or for evaluation purposes consistent with 34 CFR 200.106(e) during the demonstration authority period;</li> </ul>	<p><b>(d)(1)</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(2) Ensure that all students and each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act in participating schools are held to the same challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of</p>	<p><b>(d)(2)</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the</p>	

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>the Act as all other students, except that students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may be assessed with alternate assessments aligned with alternate academic achievement standards consistent with 34 CFR 200.6 and section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D) of the Act, and receive the instructional support needed to meet such standards;</p>	<p>authority period.</p> <p>___Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(3) Report the following annually to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may reasonably require:</p> <p>(i) An update on implementation of the innovative assessment demonstration authority, including--</p> <p>(A) The SEA's progress against its timeline under 34 CFR 200.106(c) and any</p>	<p><b>(d)(3)</b></p> <p>_X_Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>___Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this</p>	

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>identifiable information. 18</p> <p>(iii) If the innovative assessment system is not yet implemented statewide, school demographic information, including enrollment and student achievement information, for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, among participating schools and LEAs and for any schools or LEAs that will participate for the first time in the following year, and a description of how the participation of any additional schools or LEAs in that year contributed to progress toward achieving high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse LEAs in the State consistent with the SEA's benchmarks described in 34 CFR 200.106(a)(3)(iii).</p> <p>(iv) Feedback from teachers, principals and other school leaders, and other stakeholders consulted under paragraph (a)(2) of this section, including parents and students, from participating schools and LEAs about their</p>		

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>satisfaction with the innovative assessment system;</p>		
<p>(4) Ensure that each participating LEA informs parents of all students in participating schools about the innovative assessment, including the grades and subjects in which the innovative assessment will be administered, and, consistent with section 1112(e)(2)(B) of the Act, at the beginning of each school year during which an innovative assessment will be implemented. Such information must be--</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) In an understandable and uniform format;</li> <li>(ii) To the extent practicable, written in a language that parents can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent with limited English proficiency, be orally translated for such parent; and</li> <li>(iii) Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act, provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent; and</li> </ul>	<p><b>(d)(4)</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>_____Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>_____Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>(5) Coordinate with and provide information to, as applicable, the Institute of Education Sciences for purposes of the progress report described in section 1204(c) of the Act and ongoing dissemination of information under section 1204(m) of the Act.</p>	<p><b>(d)(5)</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p><b><u>(e)Initial implementation in a subset of LEAs or schools. If the innovative assessment system will initially be administered in a subset</u></b></p>	<p><b>(e)</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this</p>	

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p><b>of LEAs or schools in a State--</b>                      (1) A description of each LEA, and each of its participating schools, that will initially participate, including demographic information and its most recent LEA report card under section 1111(h)(2) of the Act; and                      (2) An assurance from each participating LEA, for each year that the LEA is participating, that the LEA will comply with all requirements of this section.</p>	<p>requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>This requirement is not applicable to this application</p>	
<p><b><u>(f)Application from a consortium of SEAs.</u></b> If an application for the innovative assessment demonstration authority is submitted by a consortium of SEAs--                      (1) A description of the governance structure of the consortium,</p>	<p><b>(f)</b>                      ____Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p>	<p>NA</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>including--</p> <p>(i) The roles and responsibilities of each member SEA, which may include a description of affiliate members, if applicable, and must include a description of financial responsibilities of member SEAs;</p> <p>(ii) How the member SEAs will manage and, at their discretion, share intellectual property developed by the consortium as a group; and</p> <p>(iii) How the member SEAs will consider requests from SEAs to join or leave the consortium and ensure that changes in membership do not affect the consortium's ability to implement the innovative assessment demonstration authority consistent with the requirements and selection criteria in this section and 34 CFR 200.106.</p> <p>(2) While the terms of the association with affiliate members are defined by each consortium, consistent with 34 CFR 200.104(b)(1) and paragraph (f)(1)(i) of this section, for an affiliate member to become a full member of the consortium and to use the consortium's innovative assessment system under the demonstration authority, the consortium must submit a revised application to the Secretary for approval, consistent with the requirements of this section and 34</p>	<p>___Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>_X_This requirement is not applicable to this application</p>	

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

---

<b>Regulatory Requirement</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
CFR 200.106 and subject to the limitation under 34 CFR 200.104(d).		

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p><b>(a) Project narrative.</b> The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s plan for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the plan, the Secretary considers--</p> <p><b>(a)(1) ; (5 points if factor (3) is applicable; 10 points if factor (3) is inapplicable)</b> The rationale for developing or selecting the particular innovative assessment system to be implemented under the demonstration authority, including--</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">(i) The distinct purpose of each assessment that is part of the innovative</p>	<p><b>(a)(1):</b> 2</p>	<p>The proposed plan has the potential to advance the design and delivery of large-scale, statewide academic assessments by demonstrating the feasibility of assessing student outcomes three times throughout the year using shorter assessments each time. If the design is found to elicit comparable results to the current end-of-grade summative assessment, this model could be useful to other states who might be interested in moving to a more “interim” assessment-based approach for their summative assessment.</p> <p>The stated purpose of the proposed innovative through-grade assessment,</p>	<p>While the delivery of the proposed innovative assessment as three shorter assessments throughout the year is innovative in its design, the fact that the assessments will be comprised solely of multiple-choice items (plus some numeric entry items in math) is not innovative at all and will not advance this aspect of the design of large-scale statewide academic assessments. In fact, the use of only multiple-choice items will limit the types of student outcomes that can be demonstrated on the assessment and will not mirror the depth and breadth of instructional outcomes sought throughout instruction (e.g., demonstrating thinking and reasoning</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>assessment system and how the system will advance the design and delivery of large-scale, statewide academic assessments in innovative ways; and (ii) The extent to which the innovative assessment system as a whole will promote high-quality instruction, mastery of challenging State academic standards, and improved student outcomes, including for each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act; <b>(5 points if factor (3) is applicable; 10 points if factor (3) is inapplicable)</b></p>			<p>to provide actionable data to teachers and parents throughout the school year so teaching and learning may be adjusted to increase student achievement, does hold promise for promoting high quality instruction and improved student outcomes. Whether this purpose will be met will depend a great deal on teachers' ability and willingness to use the actionable data to adjust their instructional program accordingly for all students.</p>	<p>through short-answer and essay type responses). Since the stated purpose is to help teachers improve instructional outcomes for students, the limited type of items used on the assessment will in fact limit the extent to which the data can be useful for teachers. The proposal defends this approach as a way to be optimally timely with the data for teachers, but other states have been able to get results from open-ended student responses in fairly timely ways by maximizing features available through technology. It is important to consider the balance of timeliness with the quality of the data provided.</p>
<p><b>(a)(2) (25 points if factor (3) is applicable; 30 points if factor (3) is inapplicable)</b> The plan the SEA or consortium, in consultation with any external partners, if applicable, has to--</p> <p>(i) Develop and use standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, methods, or other strategies for scoring innovative assessments throughout the demonstration authority</p>	<p><b>(a)(2):</b></p>	<p>23</p>	<p>Because the innovative assessment will be online and consist of only multiple-choice plus some numeric entry math items, there is no need for developing and using rubrics or other scoring methods that apply to open-ended student responses. Similarly, there is no need to compute inter-rater reliability or training of scorers.</p>	<p>The application states that there will be a paper-and-pencil mode available for students with disabilities as an accommodation on a very limited basis, but it is unclear how the scoring of these papers will be accomplished, with assurance of accuracy of scoring.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>period, consistent with relevant nationally recognized professional and technical standards, to ensure inter-rater reliability and comparability of innovative assessment results consistent with 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4)(ii), which may include evidence of inter-rater reliability; and</p> <p>(ii) Train evaluators to use such strategies, if applicable; <b>(25 points if factor (3) is applicable; 30 points if factor (3) is inapplicable)</b> and</p>				
<p><b>(a)(3) (10 points, if applicable)</b> If the system will initially be administered in a subset of schools or LEAs in a State--</p> <p>(i) The strategies the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, will use to scale the innovative assessment to all schools statewide, with a rationale for selecting those strategies;</p> <p>(ii) The strength of the SEA's or consortium's criteria that will be used to determine LEAs and schools that will initially participate and when to approve additional</p>	<p><b>(a)(3):</b></p>	<p>4</p>	<p>The application does provide a rationale for their choice of grade levels and content areas to meet the requirement of each content area of the innovative assessment being field-tested in a grade span, based on the non-participating grade levels (grades 3 and 8) having certain programs and/or assessments currently in place. This strategy should be able to provide information regarding the implementation and logistics of testing and the use of the data in the participating classrooms that can generalize to the rest of the</p>	<p>The proposed scale-up plan will have the numbers of participating students go from about 4% of the population (4500 participating students in a grade level) in Year 2, to about 15% of the total population in Years 3 and 4, to statewide in Year 5. The jump from 15% to statewide seems quite ambitious and perhaps unrealistic in terms of the goal of an effective statewide implementation. While the proposal states that teachers in the non-participating grade levels and schools are included in professional development and are provided an</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>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. <b>(10 points, if applicable)</b></p>			<p>grade span.</p> <p>The main criterion stated in the proposed plan for selection of initial participation schools is selecting those schools that volunteer, which helps promote buy-in from the early pilot participants to help provide useful feedback for informing implementation of the innovative assessment.</p>	<p>opportunity for input on the NCPAT, it is not clear the extent of this training or what specific strategies will be used to ensure buy-in and understanding of the new assessment across the state.</p> <p>While the proposed criteria for selection of schools for initial participation is based on the schools volunteering, it is unclear what criteria will be used to select schools if more than 15% volunteer for Years 2 and 3, or how additional schools will be recruited and selected if fewer than 15% volunteer. The application does state that the participating schools will reflect the statewide demographics with respect to student subgroups, region, and the mean scale score on the currently administered end-of-grade assessments, and that if necessary the state will require certain LEAs or schools to participate, but it is unclear when and how such actions would be triggered.</p> <p>Additionally, the plan does not 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 prior to Year 5 of the demonstration authority period, using</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses	
			the demographics of initially participating schools as a baseline	
<b>Total (out of 40) Criteria (a) (auto-total):</b>	<b><u>29</u></b>			
<p><b>(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support. (Up to 20 points total)</b>  <b>(b)(1) (5 points)</b> The extent and depth of prior experience that the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, and its LEAs have in developing and implementing the components of the innovative assessment system. An SEA may also describe the prior experience of any external partners that will be participating in or supporting its demonstration authority in implementing those components. In evaluating the extent and depth of prior experience, the Secretary considers—</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">(i) The success and track record of efforts to implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items aligned to the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act in LEAs planning to participate; and</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">(ii) The SEA’s or LEA’s development or use of--</p>	<b>(b)(1):</b>	3	<p>The state has adequate prior experience in the development and implementation of components of the innovative assessment system through their development and use of the NC Check-Ins that are derived from the same blueprints as the summative assessment. Success in this endeavor is demonstrated to some extent by the fact that this system has expanded to voluntarily be used in over 50% of the state’s schools, which implies that teachers like the system and find it useful for their instruction.</p> <p>The proposal documents that the state has prior experience in the development and use of effective supports and accommodations for English learners and students with disabilities on assessments that are in paper format, including a comprehensive accommodation monitoring process that has been in place.</p> <p>The SEA has experience with providing professional development for teachers in the implementation of</p>	<p>Part of the success of the NC Check-Ins is described through the reliability of this assessment as having improved over administrations, but no data are provided in terms of the actual reliability statistics.</p> <p>Similarly, construct validity is suggested by “positive correlations” between the NC Check-Ins and the summative assessment. However, no data are provided to back up this assertion, and any assessment designed to measure the same content as another assessment will have “positive” correlations. What is unclear is how high the correlations are between the NC Check-Ins and the summative assessment, and whether these correlations are high enough to indicate adequate construct validity.</p> <p>It is unclear what experience the SEA has with the development and use of accommodations for online testing in a high-stakes assessment.</p> <p>The majority of the responding participants in the Proof of Concept study did not perceive the training as</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>(A) Effective supports and appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR part 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act for administering innovative assessments to all students, including English learners and children with disabilities, which must include professional development for school staff on providing such accommodations;</p> <p>(B) Effective and high-quality supports for school staff to implement innovative assessments and innovative assessment items, including professional development; and</p> <p>(C) Standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, methods, or other strategies for scoring innovative assessments, with documented evidence of the validity, reliability, and comparability of annual summative determinations of achievement, consistent with 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4) and (7). <b>(5 points)</b></p>			<p>the NC Check-Ins and in the Proof of Concept study.</p>	<p>excellent. Two of their suggestions were: (1) to move to a hybrid/blended training method that includes online and face-to-face instruction, and (2) that for shared concepts, items that are similar no matter what subject area the teacher specializes in, professional development should be provided with the teachers together. Teachers also indicated a desire for additional training on the use of the data for instruction. It is important that the recommendations from the Proof of Concept study be addressed during the development and implementation of professional development for the innovative assessment.</p>
<p><b>(b)(2) (5 points)</b> The extent and depth of SEA, including each SEA</p>	<p><b>(b)(2):</b></p>	<p>4</p>	<p>The SEA has several groups and processes in place that have</p>	<p>While the proposal states that the SEA proactively engages with experts</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>in a consortium, and LEA capacity to implement the innovative assessment system considering the availability of technological infrastructure; State and local laws; dedicated and sufficient staff, expertise, and resources; and other relevant factors. An SEA or consortium may also describe how it plans to enhance its capacity by collaborating with external partners that will be participating in or supporting its demonstration authority. In evaluating the extent and depth of capacity, the Secretary considers--</p> <p>(i) The SEA’s analysis of how capacity influenced the success of prior efforts to develop and implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items; and</p> <p>(ii) The strategies the SEA is using, or will use, to mitigate risks, including those identified in its analysis, and support successful implementation of the innovative assessment. <b>(5 points)</b></p>			<p>influenced the success of the implementation of prior efforts such as the NC Check-Ins and Proof of Concept projects, including the Regional Accountability Coordinators and the Testing News Network.</p> <p>In terms of external partners, the SEA has had a long-standing relationship with North Carolina State University and the North Carolina Technical Advisors, which includes technical outreach support and a platform for online testing.</p> <p>State laws seem to support the goals and processes involved in the proposed innovative assessment.</p>	<p>in testing and accountability to identify technical approaches that yield valid and reliable results that “minimize risk,” there are no examples to explain how this approach will mitigate risk across all aspects of the innovative assessment to ensure successful implementation of the overall project.</p> <p>While designated (select) LEA staff have been trained and involved in implementing innovative assessments, it is not clear how strong LEA staff capacity is across non-participating schools.</p>
<b>(b)(3) (10 points)</b> The extent and depth of State and local support for the application for demonstration	<b>(b)(3):</b>	4	Letters of support are provided from the three superintendents of the LEAs	No letters are provided from school boards, teacher organizations, or other

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>authority in each SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, as demonstrated by signatures from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Superintendents (or equivalent) of LEAs, including participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority period.</li> <li>(ii) Presidents of local school boards (or equivalent, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority.</li> <li>(iii) Local teacher organizations (including labor organizations, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority.</li> <li>(iv) Other affected stakeholders, such as parent organizations, civil rights organizations, and business organizations. <b>(10 points)</b></li> </ul>			<p>that have volunteered to participate in the Year 2 pilot.</p> <p>Letters of support are provided from two of the external partners – SAS that helps with the growth model, and OAERS that has been designated as the external evaluator.</p>	<p>affected stakeholders such as parent organizations, civil rights organizations, or business organizations.</p>
<b>Total (out of 20) Criteria (b) (auto-total):</b>	<b><u>11</u></b>			
<p><b>(c) Timeline and budget. (Up to 15 points)</b> The quality of the SEA’s or</p>	<b>(c)(1):</b>	3	<p>The proposal includes a list of activities and the parties responsible</p>	<p>Missing in the list of activities in the timeline is training for the teachers in</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>consortium’s timeline and budget for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the timeline and budget, the Secretary considers--</p> <p><b>(c)(1) (5 points).</b> The extent to which the timeline reasonably demonstrates that each SEA will implement the system statewide by the end of the requested demonstration authority period, including a description of--</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) The activities to occur in each year of the requested demonstration authority period;</li> <li>(ii) The parties responsible for each activity; and</li> <li>(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); <b>(5 points)</b> and</li> </ul>			<p>for each activity in each year of the demonstration authority period, which for the most part appear to demonstrate that the SEA will implement the system statewide by the end of the requested demonstration authority period.</p>	<p>item development, alignment, fairness/sensitivity and test specs and test design – which are all areas in which teachers are listed as being participants either in development or in review processes. The foundational quality of the proposed innovative assessment is contingent on these activities being conducted by educators who truly understand the characteristics of quality assessment items as well as test design.</p> <p>Another important element missing from the timeline is revision – revision that should be based not only on correcting flawed items, but also on actions that might be needed based on data analyses regarding the technical qualities of the assessment. In fact, one of the short-term recommendations made in the NC Check-Ins External Evaluation Report (by Bartlett) was to continuously assess the quality of items and refine items.</p>
<p><b>(c)(2) (10 points).</b>The adequacy of</p>	<p><b>(c)(2):</b></p>	<p>3</p>		

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>the project budget for the duration of the requested demonstration authority period, including Federal, State, local, and non-public sources of funds to support and sustain, as applicable, the activities in the timeline under paragraph (c)(1) of this section, including--</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) How the budget will be sufficient to meet the expected costs at each phase of the SEA’s planned expansion of its innovative assessment system; and</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(ii) The degree to which funding in the project budget is contingent upon future appropriations at the State or local level or additional commitments from non-public sources of funds. <b>(10 points)</b></p>			<p>The proposal states that the annual state budget of \$12 million plus the annual federal State Assessment Grant of approximately \$9 million will meet “most” of the cost demands for the transition to a through-grade assessment system, and that this funding is consistently provided. These declarations imply that (1) the budget is sufficient to meet most of the expected costs and (2) while the funding is contingent on future appropriations at the state and federal level, that the expectation is high that these appropriations will continue.</p>	<p>No dollar figures are provided to support what the estimated costs of this proposed work will be to develop and implement a quality innovative assessment as described, and therefore it is impossible to determine if the annual state budgets as enumerated will in fact be sufficient to meet the costs of the proposed assessment project.</p> <p>It is unclear how much of the available state assessment budget is needed for state assessment work on other projects as well as for ongoing work on the regular state assessment.</p>
<b>Total (out of 15) Criteria (c):</b>	6			
<p><b>(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents. (Up to 25 points)</b></p> <p>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</p>	<b>(d)(1):</b>	6	<p>The SEA has a system in place with LEA staff that has been used with the NC Check-Ins project that has utilized webinars, trainings, and surveys that seems adequate for the dissemination of information to familiarize staff about the innovative assessment.</p> <p>With regard to training, the SEA has</p>	<p>The messages through the Regional Accountability Coordinators focus on the logistical pieces of assessment, but not on the use of data for instructional purposes. In addition, the Proof of Concept Interim Assessment Guide Training described the logistical aspects of administration but without mention of the use of the data for instruction.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>outcomes. In determining the quality of supports, the Secretary considers--</p> <p><b>(d)(1) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 9 points if factor (4) is inapplicable).</b> The extent to which the SEA or consortium has developed, provided, and will continue to provide training to LEA and school staff, including teachers, principals, and other school leaders, that will familiarize them with the innovative assessment system and develop teacher capacity to implement instruction that is informed by the innovative assessment system and its results;</p>			<p>utilized both a train-the-trainer model and also direct training through webinars, which provides more opportunity to ensure consistency of training messages across the participating teachers.</p> <p>Regional Accountability Coordinators provide training and technical assistance for aspects of testing and accountability, including test administration protocol and processes such as accommodations, online delivery requirements, security assurances and practices, and required policies and laws, which would familiarize teachers with the logistical implementation of the assessment.</p> <p>Based on teacher survey results from the evaluation of the Proof of Concept project, the highest rated item was “that through-grade testing provides more useful data than one summative test.” This finding indicates that teachers in general believe the data that would be generated from the proposed innovative assessment would be more useful to them than what they have been receiving.</p> <p>Results of a survey given as part of the Proof of Concept evaluation</p>	<p>While developing professional development materials is one of the activities listed in the timeline, there is no indication of when training with teachers will be conducted during the demonstration authority period or what that training will look like – duration, content, means of delivery, etc.</p> <p>The evaluation of the Proof of Concept project indicated that teachers reported using interim assessment results for improvement, but it was not evident how the teachers used them. The report recommended that the SEA determine how successful teachers use the data from interim reports and then to incorporate these instructional practices as content for training.</p> <p>The evaluation report also recommended that all teachers should receive training on how to use interim assessments to improve student achievement. And although the application states that training will be given to all teachers, there is no description of how this will occur.</p> <p>While the Proof of Concept evaluation report described training given during</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>indicated that a majority of teachers either strongly agreed or agreed with the statements “I look to the interim assessments to improve instruction” and “I changed my instructional practices.” These results indicate that the training provided has the potential to develop teacher capacity to implement instruction that is informed by the innovative assessment system and its results.</p> <p>The Proof of Concept evaluation describes the training that was provided during that project, with English Language Arts (ELA) training given online and Math training given face-to-face, with the description of the ELA training including a session on the use of Text Complexity in instruction.</p>	<p>that project that addressed instructional connections to some degree, the application does not explain the extent to which the training to be given during the innovative assessment demonstration authority period will be similar or different from that used during the Proof of Concept.</p> <p>Based on results of the Proof of Concept evaluation, the area that was most highly sought after by teachers for training was teaching and learning techniques that relate to the through-grade testing. This finding indicates that the SEA needs to devote more attention to this area in the training for the proposed innovative assessment.</p>
<p><b>(d)(2) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 8 points if factor (4) is inapplicable)</b> The strategies the SEA or consortium has developed and will use to familiarize students and parents with the innovative assessment system;</p>	<p><b>(d)(2):</b></p>	<p>6</p>	<p>Teachers reported that students shared they were more comfortable with the end-of-grade assessment administrations because of familiarity with the test format via NC Check-Ins. This finding would suggest that students will be familiar and comfortable with the proposed innovative assessment based on their familiarity with the NC Check-Ins.</p> <p>The SEA has developed a parent</p>	<p>It is unclear how students will become familiar with the innovative assessment system and for them to understand how it compares to the NC Check-Ins they have used in the past.</p> <p>It is unclear if there will be practice tests available for students to become familiar with the format of the innovative assessment. It is important for practice tests to be available and required for all students to take prior</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>portal that allows informational messages and surveys to gather feedback to be sent directly to parents. Based on a large parent response rate using this strategy, it appears that parents do indeed access information via this source. While this appears to be an effective way to reach parents, it needs also to be supplemented with a strategy to reach parents who may not have access to the Internet.</p> <p>The evaluation of the Proof of Concept project indicated that the reports created for parents are detailed and provide appropriate information.</p> <p>Results of a survey as part of the Proof of Concept evaluation indicated that a majority of teachers either strongly agreed or agreed with the statements “I have explained the process of through-grade testing to students,” “I communicate with parents on interim assessment results,” and “I explained to parents through-grade testing.”</p>	<p>to the first innovative assessment of the year, in order to have a similar opportunity as they have had for the state assessment.</p> <p>A cognitive labs strategy does not usually elicit direct information about students’ familiarity with an assessment system, but rather it is designed to gather information about how students interact with the assessment system. In addition, this data would only be available for the limited number of students who would be included in a cognitive lab and not necessarily representative of all participating students.</p> <p>While the majority of participating teachers in the Proof of Study project reported that they communicated with students about the process of through-grade testing, it is unclear if there will be consistent strategies, messages, and expectations for all teachers in their communications with students about the proposed innovative assessment.</p> <p>The Proof of Concept evaluation suggested that the Individual Level reports could be strengthened by adding details to help parents interpret the scores and by enhancing the data through visualization methods. This</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
				recommendation should be followed up for the innovative assessment.
<p><b>(d)(3) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 8 points if factor (4) is inapplicable)</b> The strategies the SEA will use to ensure that all students and each subgroup of students under section 1111(c)(2) of the Act in participating schools receive the support, including appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR part 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act, needed to meet the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act; and</p>	<p><b>(d)(3):</b></p>	<p>7</p>	<p>The proposal states that the test specifications for the NCPAT will require sufficient items for student-level content standard reporting, so teachers will know which content standards require additional instruction for each student. If done well and supported by appropriate training, this information can enable teachers to adjust and modify instruction throughout the school year for individual student needs, and particularly could help low-performing students, students with disabilities, and English learners.</p> <p>The training strategies include information about accommodations, which appears to be adequate for ensuring accommodations are properly administered.</p> <p>The SEA has a comprehensive assessment monitoring system that includes monitoring of the appropriate use of accommodations. As long as this strategy continues with the implementation of the proposed innovative assessment, and</p>	<p>Since the proposed innovative assessment will be online, but the current state assessment is in paper format, it is unclear what accommodations will be added to the online system to support students who need such accommodations.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			there is follow-up from the SEA when inconsistencies are found, this strategy should provide adequate support.	
<b>(d)(4) (10 points if applicable).</b> 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 <b>(10 points if applicable)</b>	<b>(d)(4):</b>	NA		
<b>Total (out of 25) Criteria (d):</b>	<b><u>19</u></b>			
<b>(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement. (Up to 20 points)</b> The quality of the SEA's or	<b>(e)(1):</b>	5	An evaluation will be conducted by an external independent third party	While the application states that the external evaluator will use surveys,

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>consortium’s plan to annually evaluate its implementation of innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers—</p> <p><b>(e)(1) (12 points)</b> The strength of the proposed evaluation of the innovative assessment system included in the application, including whether the evaluation will be conducted by an independent, experienced third party, and the likelihood that the evaluation will sufficiently determine the system’s validity, reliability, and comparability to the statewide assessment system consistent with the requirements of 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4) and (9); and</p>			<p>with information being collected throughout the authority demonstration period.</p>	<p>observations, and focus groups, it is unclear how and when these reviews will be conducted, which participants will be included in the data gathering, what sampling methods will be employed, how the data will be analyzed, what timeline will be employed, or how the results will be reported. In addition, it is unclear how frequently the evaluation will be conducted, and whether it will take place in one or more years of the IADA period.</p> <p>The listing of what the external evaluator will review does not include a review of the comparability findings.</p>
<p><b>(e)(2) (8 points)</b> The SEA’s or consortium’s plan for continuous improvement of the innovative assessment system, including its process for--</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">(i) Using data, feedback, evaluation results, and other information from participating LEAs and schools to make changes to improve the quality of the</p>	<b>(e)(2):</b>	5	<p>The SEA has in place a number of strategies for gathering and using data from participants during the demonstration authority period, including on-site observations and monitoring at schools as well as debrief sessions with the testing specialists involved in the project to address internal processes and make changes as needed. Because these</p>	<p>Having debrief sessions with the various testing experts only once at the end of each year of the demonstration authority period does not allow for catching and fixing potential issues in a timely fashion and could allow assessment data to be in use in schools during any school year that is not entirely sound.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>innovative assessment; and (ii) Evaluating and monitoring implementation of the innovative assessment system in participating LEAs and schools annually.</p>			<p>processes have been used during the NC Check-Ins and Proof of Concept project, there is a likelihood that they can be effective in effecting continuous improvement as needed.</p>	<p>It is not clear how the data that will be gathered will be acted upon to make the necessary changes, either in the administration processes or the statistical qualities. It would be helpful to know what processes and procedures will be in place to implement the changes that will be suggested by the collected data, when the revisions will be made, and who will be making these revisions as needed. This work should be reflected in the timeline.</p> <p>The evaluation of the Proof of Concept project suggested that it might prove useful to get feedback from students. This would help inform the SEA of the extent to which students are familiar with and understand the purpose of the innovative assessment system.</p>
<b>Total (out of 20) Criteria (e): (auto-total)</b>	<b><u>10</u></b>			
<b>Total (a+b+c+d+e) (auto-total)</b>	<b><u>29 + 11 + 6 + 19 + 10 = 75</u></b>			

# IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

---

## **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.

<b>Regulatory Requirement</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
-------------------------------	----------------------	--------------------

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
required grade and subject under 34 CFR 200.5(a)(1) in which the SEA does not choose to implement an innovative assessment.		
<p>(2)(i) Align with the challenging State academic content standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act, including the depth and breadth of such standards, for the grade in which a student is enrolled; and</p> <p>(ii) May measure a student’s academic proficiency and growth using items above or below the student’s grade level so long as, for purposes of meeting the requirements for reporting and school accountability under sections 1111(c) and 1111(h) of the Act and paragraphs (b)(3) and (b)(7)-(9) of this section, the State measures each student’s academic proficiency based on the challenging State academic standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled;</p>	<p><b>(b)(2)</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>There is not specific mention that alignment studies will include alignment to the depth and breadth of the state standards and if the depth and breadth of the state standards can be achieved using a multiple choice assessment.</p>
(3) Express student results or	<b>(b)(3)</b>	At the end of year four through grade assessments will be linked to current end of

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>competencies consistent with the challenging State academic achievement standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act and identify which students are not making sufficient progress toward, and attaining, grade-level proficiency on such standards;</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>grade assessments. Standard setting for achievement standards and descriptors will occur at end of year five.</p> <p>Clarification is needed as to how these two processes, occurring in different years, permits student results to be reported consistent with the State academic achievement standards.</p>
<p>(4)(i) Generate results, including annual summative determinations as defined in paragraph (b)(7) of this section, that are valid, reliable, and comparable for all students and for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and</p>	<p><b>(b)(4)</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p>	<p>It is not clear how results, reflecting annual summative determinations will be comparable given that the assessments are given at various times during the school year.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, to the results generated by the State academic assessments described in 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act for such students.</p> <p>Consistent with the SEA’s or consortium’s evaluation plan under 34 CFR 200.106(e), the SEA must plan to annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period in <b>one of the following ways:</b></p> <p>(A) Administering full assessments from both the innovative and statewide assessment systems to all students enrolled in participating schools, such that at least once in any grade span (i.e., 3-5, 6-8, or 9-12) and subject for which there is an innovative assessment, a statewide assessment in the same subject would also be administered to all such students. As part of this determination, the innovative assessment and statewide assessment need not be administered to an individual student in the same school year.</p> <p>(B) Administering full assessments from both the innovative and statewide assessment systems to a demographically representative</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>sample of all students and subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, from among those students enrolled in participating schools, such that at least once in any grade span (i.e., 3-5, 6-8, or 9-12) and subject for which there is an innovative assessment, a statewide assessment in the same subject would also be administered in the same school year to all students included in the sample.</p> <p>(C) Including, as a significant portion of the innovative assessment system in each required grade and subject in which both an innovative and statewide assessment are administered, items or performance tasks from the statewide assessment system that, at a minimum, have been previously pilot tested or field tested for use in the statewide assessment system.</p> <p>(D) Including, as a significant portion of the statewide assessment system in each required grade and subject in which both an innovative and statewide assessment are administered, items or performance tasks from the innovative assessment system that, at a minimum, have been previously pilot tested or field tested for use in the innovative assessment system.</p> <p>(E) An alternative method for</p>		

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>demonstrating comparability that an SEA can demonstrate will provide for an equally rigorous and statistically valid comparison between student performance on the innovative assessment and the statewide assessment, including for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act;</p> <p>(ii) Generate results, including annual summative determinations as defined in paragraph (b)(7) of this section, that are valid, reliable, and comparable, for all students and for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, among participating schools and LEAs in the innovative assessment demonstration authority. Consistent with the SEA's or consortium's evaluation plan under 34 CFR 200.106(e), the SEA must plan to annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period;</p>		
<p>(5)(i) Provide for the participation of all students, including children with disabilities and English learners;</p> <p>(ii) Be accessible to all students by incorporating the principles of universal design for learning, to the</p>	<p><b>(b)(5)</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the</p>	

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>extent practicable, consistent with 34 CFR 200.2(b)(2)(ii); and (iii) Provide appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act;</p>	<p>authority period.</p> <p>___ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>___ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(6) For purposes of the State accountability system consistent with section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the Act, annually measure in each participating school progress on the Academic Achievement indicator under section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the Act of at least 95 percent of all students, and 95 percent of students in each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, who are required to take such</p>	<p><b>(b)(6)</b></p> <p>___ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>_X_ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this</p>	<p>The plan does not specifically state that 95 percent of students in each subgroup will be measured.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>assessments consistent with paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section;</p>	<p>requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i>            ___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>7) Generate an annual summative determination of achievement, using the annual data from the innovative assessment, for each student in a participating school in the demonstration authority that describes--            (i) The student’s mastery of the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act for the grade in which the student is enrolled; or            (ii) In the case of a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed with an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Act, the</p>	<p><b>(b)(7)</b>            ___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.             ___X_ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>It is not clear how results, reflecting annual summative determinations will be comparable given that the assessments are given at various times during the school year.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>student's mastery of those standards;</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(8) Provide disaggregated results by each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, including timely data for teachers, principals and other school leaders, students, and parents consistent with 34 CFR 200.8 and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(x) and (xii) and section 1111(h) of the Act, and provide results to parents in a manner consistent with paragraph (b)(4)(i) of this section and part 200.2(e);</p>	<p><b>(b)(8)</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p>	

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i>	
<p>(9) Provide an unbiased, rational, and consistent determination of progress toward the State’s long-term goals for academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(A) of the Act for all students and each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act and a comparable measure of student performance on the Academic Achievement indicator under section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the Act for participating schools relative to non-participating schools so that the SEA may validly and reliably aggregate data from the system for purposes of meeting requirements for--</p> <p>(i) Accountability under sections 1003 and 1111(c) and (d) of the Act, including how the SEA will identify participating and non-participating schools in a consistent manner for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement under section 1111(c)(4)(D) of the Act; and</p> <p>(ii) Reporting on State and LEA report cards under section 1111(h) of the Act.</p>	<p><b>(b)(9)</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>It is not clear how results, reflecting annual summative determinations will be comparable given that the assessments are given at various times during the school year.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p><b>(d) Assurances.</b></p> <p><b>This application contains assurances that the lead SEA and each SEA applying as a consortium will:</b></p> <p>(1) Continue use of the statewide academic assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science required under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act--</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) In all non-participating schools; and</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(ii) In all participating schools for which such assessments will be used in addition to innovative assessments for accountability purposes under section 1111(c) of the Act consistent with paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section or for evaluation purposes consistent with 34 CFR 200.106(e) during the demonstration authority period;</p>	<p><b>(d)(1)</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>Application includes these signed assurances</p>
<p>(2) Ensure that all students and each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act in participating schools are held to the same challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of</p>	<p><b>(d)(2)</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the</p>	

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>the Act as all other students, except that students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may be assessed with alternate assessments aligned with alternate academic achievement standards consistent with 34 CFR 200.6 and section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D) of the Act, and receive the instructional support needed to meet such standards;</p>	<p>authority period.</p> <p>___Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(3) Report the following annually to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may reasonably require:</p> <p>(i) An update on implementation of the innovative assessment demonstration authority, including--</p> <p>(A) The SEA's progress against its timeline under 34 CFR 200.106(c) and any</p>	<p><b>(d)(3)</b></p> <p>___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>__X__Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this</p>	<p>It is not clear in the application how students' feedback will be elicited, although cognitive labs were mentioned, this is not the purpose of cognitive labs. It appears surveys and focus groups are centered on parents and educators.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>identifiable information. 18</p> <p>(iii) If the innovative assessment system is not yet implemented statewide, school demographic information, including enrollment and student achievement information, for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, among participating schools and LEAs and for any schools or LEAs that will participate for the first time in the following year, and a description of how the participation of any additional schools or LEAs in that year contributed to progress toward achieving high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse LEAs in the State consistent with the SEA’s benchmarks described in 34 CFR 200.106(a)(3)(iii).</p> <p>(iv) Feedback from teachers, principals and other school leaders, and other stakeholders consulted under paragraph (a)(2) of this section, including parents and students, from participating schools and LEAs about their</p>		

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>satisfaction with the innovative assessment system;</p>		
<p>(4) Ensure that each participating LEA informs parents of all students in participating schools about the innovative assessment, including the grades and subjects in which the innovative assessment will be administered, and, consistent with section 1112(e)(2)(B) of the Act, at the beginning of each school year during which an innovative assessment will be implemented. Such information must be--</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) In an understandable and uniform format;</li> <li>(ii) To the extent practicable, written in a language that parents can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent with limited English proficiency, be orally translated for such parent; and</li> <li>(iii) Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act, provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent; and</li> </ul>	<p><b>(d)(4)</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>(5) Coordinate with and provide information to, as applicable, the Institute of Education Sciences for purposes of the progress report described in section 1204(c) of the Act and ongoing dissemination of information under section 1204(m) of the Act.</p>	<p><b>(d)(5)</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____ Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____ Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p><b><u>(e)Initial implementation in a subset of LEAs or schools. If the innovative assessment system will initially be administered in a</u></b></p>	<p><b>(e)</b>            ____ Application demonstrates a plan to meet this</p>	<p>The proposal indicates the LEAs that will participate in the pilot in Year 2 but the participating schools for two of the LEAs have not yet been identified.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

---

<b>Regulatory Requirement</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
CFR 200.106 and subject to the limitation under 34 CFR 200.104(d).		

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p><b>(a) Project narrative.</b> The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s plan for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the plan, the Secretary considers--</p> <p><b>(a)(1) ; (5 points if factor (3) is applicable; 10 points if factor (3) is inapplicable)</b> The rationale for developing or selecting the particular innovative assessment system to be implemented under the demonstration authority, including--</p> <p>(i) The distinct purpose of each assessment that is part of the innovative assessment system and</p>	<p><b>(a)(1):</b></p>	<p>4</p>	<p>(i)This plan clearly conveys the State’s rationale for the development and implementation of the NCPAT, as well as the purpose of each assessment. The plan describes how feedback and input from stakeholders was the genesis of the recommendations of the Task Force on Summative Assessment in 2014, to develop through-grade assessments, or interim assessments - NC Check-Ins – in 2015-16 SY. The NCPAT, based on lessons learned from the voluntary-use NC Check-Ins, will be a through-grade assessment for both English language arts/reading and mathematics administered three</p>	<p>A description how the assessments will be combined to have a valid reliable summary of performance is not provided.</p> <p>Although the rationale indicates that having an assessment that provides immediate results is innovative, it does not provide a rationale that describes how multiple choice tests are considered innovative.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

<p>how the system will advance the design and delivery of large-scale, statewide academic assessments in innovative ways; and</p> <p>(ii) The extent to which the innovative assessment system as a whole will promote high-quality instruction, mastery of challenging State academic standards, and improved student outcomes, including for each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act; <b>(5 points if factor (3) is applicable; 10 points if factor (3) is inapplicable)</b></p>			<p>times during the school year online and will acquire a summative score based on the three through-grade administrations. Initially, the NCPAT will also include a summative assessment at the end of the year. The design is responsive to parent, teacher, and student input.</p> <p>(ii) Teachers will receive current, actionable student data from the through-grade assessments. Instructional resources and non-secure item bank aligned to state content standards will be available to teachers to be used to support student progress on not-mastered content standards. Teachers can focus their instruction and students can focus their learning on content standards that have not yet been mastered.</p>	<p>(ii) There is no specific reference to various subgroups of students.</p>
<p><b>(a)(2) (25 points if factor (3) is applicable; 30 points if factor (3) is inapplicable)</b> The plan the SEA or consortium, in consultation with any external partners, if applicable, has to--</p> <p>(i) Develop and use standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, methods, or other strategies for scoring innovative assessments throughout the</p>	<p><b>(a)(2):</b></p>	<p>22</p>	<p>(i) The assessments are administered online. The delivery platform will be verified to have items and associated keys correctly loaded; the SEA reviews each assessment and approves release. Scoring process is verified by review of sample of student responses.</p> <p>All English/Language Arts and reading items are multiple choice; mathematics items are multiple</p>	<p>A description of how paper administered assessments will be scored in a standardized manner is not provided.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

<p>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; <b>(25 points if factor (3) is applicable; 30 points if factor (3) is inapplicable)</b> and</p>			<p>choice or numeric entry.</p> <p>(ii) Not applicable to this assessment</p>	
<p><b>(a)(3) (10 points, if applicable)</b> 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</p>	<p><b>(a)(3):</b></p>	<p>5</p>	<p>(i) NC provides a 5-year plan to scale this assessment to all schools and students in the state. The need for necessary feedback from stakeholders and critical analyses of the data inform this timeline.</p> <p>(ii) The 2 LEAs that will initially participate in year 2 volunteered to do so. Participation appears to be guaranteed if an LEA volunteers to participate. If adequate numbers of LEAs do not volunteer to participate, NC laws and policies will be invoked to ensure adequate participation so that the assessments can be</p>	<p>(i) In years three and four, just 15% of statewide representation of the student population will either volunteer or be required to participate. In year five, all students must participate in NCPAT. Specific strategies that will be used to encourage voluntary participation in years three and four are not described. Specific strategies to ensure that all schools are ready to participate in NCPAT in year five are not presented.  There is inconsistency in the plan; it states that two districts will participate, but it also states that three districts will participate in year 1.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

<p>applicable, to participate during the requested demonstration authority period; and</p> <p>(iii) The SEA’s plan, including each SEA in a consortium, for how it will ensure that, during the demonstration authority period, the inclusion of additional LEAs and schools continues to reflect high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse LEAs and schools, or contributes to progress toward achieving such implementation across demographically diverse LEAs and schools, including diversity based on enrollment of subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act and student achievement. The plan must also 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. <b>(10 points, if applicable)</b></p>			<p>appropriately developed.</p> <p>(iii) The plan indicates that in years 3 and 4, the target will be 15% of the total student population. The sample included in year 3 will continue to participate in year 4. The plan asserts the participants will represent the student demographics of the state.</p>	<p>Other statements indicate that year one is a planning year and that only in year 2 will the assessment be implemented in selected grades.</p> <p>(ii) The plan does not include criteria for participation other than volunteering to participate and the need for participants to reflect state demographics. However, it is not clear that requiring an LEA to represent the state’s demographics is feasible.</p> <p>(iii) The application states that participants in each year will reflect student demographics. However, the application states that participants in year 2 do not reflect the state’s demographics.</p>
<p><b>Total (out of 40) Criteria (a) (auto-total):</b></p>	<p><b><u>31</u></b></p>			
<p><b>(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support. (Up to</b></p>	<p><b>(b)(1):</b></p>	<p>5</p>	<p>(i) The NCPAT assessments are informed by data and stakeholder</p>	

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

<p><b>20 points total)</b>  <b>(b)(1) (5 points)</b> The extent and depth of prior experience that the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, and its LEAs have in developing and implementing the components of the innovative assessment system. An SEA may also describe the prior experience of any external partners that will be participating in or supporting its demonstration authority in implementing those components. In evaluating the extent and depth of prior experience, the Secretary considers—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(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</li> <li>(ii) The SEA’s or LEA’s development or use of--             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(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</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			<p>input based on the successful implementation of the NC Check-Ins. NC Check-Ins, developed based on recommendations from the State BOE created Task Force, reflect successful voluntary implementation of innovative assessments that were built on active and ongoing stakeholder involvement. The SEA has collaboratively developed its state assessments with North Carolina State University for more than 20 years.</p> <p>(ii)(A) Detailed information is provided about the required provision of documented accommodations for students with disabilities and EI students. Documents indicate that all test administrators must participate in training related to providing accommodations during the assessment.</p>	
---	--	--	--	--

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

<p>all students, including English learners and children with disabilities, which must include professional development for school staff on providing such accommodations;</p> <p>(B) Effective and high-quality supports for school staff to implement innovative assessments and innovative assessment items, including professional development; and</p> <p>(C) Standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, methods, or other strategies for scoring innovative assessments, with documented evidence of the validity, reliability, and comparability of annual summative determinations of achievement, consistent with 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4) and (7). <b>(5 points)</b></p>			<p>(ii)(B) The task to develop materials for professional development is included in the timelines for years 2, 3, and 4.</p> <p>(ii)(C) This assessment will be an online administration and there is no human scoring required.</p>	
<p><b>(b)(2) (5 points)</b> 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</p>	<p><b>(b)(2):</b></p>	<p>3</p>	<p>(b)(2)(i) NC SEA articulates how its longstanding state, district and external partners created its capacity to develop and implement NC-Check-Ins, and how these continued partnerships provide the capacity to develop and implement NCPAT. The partners include NCDPI, TOPS team at NCSU, Regional Accountability</p>	

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

<p>collaborating with external partners that will be participating in or supporting its demonstration authority. In evaluating the extent and depth of capacity, the Secretary considers--</p> <p>(i) The SEA’s analysis of how capacity influenced the success of prior efforts to develop and implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items; and</p> <p>(ii) The strategies the SEA is using, or will use, to mitigate risks, including those identified in its analysis, and support successful implementation of the innovative assessment. <b>(5 points)</b></p>			<p>Coordinators, and external experts on their TAC.</p> <p>(ii) The NC SEA asserts that its continued collaboration with the state NCDPI team, the Technical Outreach for Public Schools team at NCSU, and other external partners ensure their capacity to develop and implement the NCPAT. NC SEA States that past and continued engagement with experts in testing and accountability to implement sound technical practices will yield valid and reliable results. “This approach has minimized risk with a clear focus on excellence.”</p>	<p>No strategies that the SEA is using or will use to mitigate risks are cited.</p>
<p><b>(b)(3) (10 points)</b>The extent and depth of State and local support for the application for demonstration authority in each SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, as demonstrated by signatures from the following:</p> <p>(i) Superintendents (or equivalent) of LEAs, including participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority period.</p> <p>(ii) Presidents of local school boards (or</p>	<p><b>(b)(3):</b></p>	<p>4</p>	<p>(b)(3)(i) Letters of support from superintendents in LEAs participating in first year of implementation are included.</p>	<p>(ii) Signatures of presidents of local school boards, including those in first year participating LEAs, are not included.</p> <p>(iii) Signatures of local teacher organizations, including those in first year participating LEAs, are not included</p> <p>(iv) Signatures of other affected stakeholders are not included.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

<p>equivalent, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority.</p> <p>(iii) Local teacher organizations (including labor organizations, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority.</p> <p>(iv) Other affected stakeholders, such as parent organizations, civil rights organizations, and business organizations.</p> <p><b>(10 points)</b></p>				
<p><b>Total (out of 20) Criteria (b) (auto-total):</b></p>	<p><b><u>12</u></b></p>			
<p><b>(c) Timeline and budget. (Up to 15 points)</b></p> <p>The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s timeline and budget for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the timeline and budget, the Secretary considers--</p> <p><b>(c)(1) (5 points).</b> The extent to which the timeline reasonably demonstrates that each SEA will implement the system statewide by the end of the requested demonstration authority period, including a description of--</p>	<p><b>(c)(1):</b></p>	<p>3</p>	<p>(c)(1)(i)</p> <p>Most major activities to occur in each year of the requested demonstration authority period are provided at a high level in charts, and more specific information related to the test development process is provided.</p>	<p>The narrative for this section states that the evaluation studies are not included in the timeline but will be conducted throughout the demonstration period.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

<p>(i) The activities to occur in each year of the requested demonstration authority period;</p> <p>(ii) The parties responsible for each activity; and</p> <p>(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); <b>(5 points)</b> and</p>			<p>(ii) The parties responsible for each activity in the yearly timelines are noted.</p> <p>(iii) Not applicable</p>	<p>The timeline does not indicate when professional development will occur for administrators or teachers involved in assessment administration, or when information to parents and students will be provided. There is no indication in the timeline for plans for ongoing communication with all NC educators to support voluntary participation and to ensure that the full-scale implementation in year five will be successful.</p>
<p><b>(c)(2) (10 points).</b>The adequacy of the project budget for the duration of the requested demonstration authority period, including Federal, State, local, and non-public sources of funds to support and sustain, as applicable, the activities in the timeline under paragraph (c)(1) of this section, including--</p> <p>(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</p>	<p><b>(c)(2):</b></p>	<p>3</p>	<p>(c)(2)(i) NC asserts that current funding from the state (\$12 million) and the federal State assessment grant (\$9 million) will likely be sufficient for the development and implementation of the NCPAT through year five.</p> <p>(ii) The budget will be monitored and, if needed, additional funding will be requested from the state.</p>	<p>(i) A specific budget that is aligned to every activity and year of the demonstration period is not provided. Therefore it cannot be determined if the funding available will likely be sufficient.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

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. <b>(10 points)</b>				
<b>Total (out of 15) Criteria (c): 6</b>				
<b>(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents. (Up to 25 points)</b> 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-- <b>(d)(1) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 9 points if factor (4) is inapplicable).</b> 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	<b>(d)(1):</b>	4	(d)(1) The narrative asserts that the training webinars provided for NC Check-Ins were adequate and that a similar training model will occur for NCPAT.	Details are lacking related to the professional development that will be provided statewide to: (1) inform educators about NCPAT to foster voluntary participation so that there is adequate district and school participation, (2) about the training webinars that will be available to familiarize educators with NCPAT, including when the webinars will be available for each assessment phase, the number of webinars that each educator must access, how attendance will be monitored, if assessments for test administrators will be required to ensure standardized test administration, and if the training will be evaluated. (3) how professional development will be delivered to educators who will administer NCPAT, (3) when these educators will receive or access professional development, and (4) the specific content of the professional development for NCPAT.

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

<p>instruction that is informed by the innovative assessment system and its results;</p>				<p>Specific information is not provided related to how teacher capacity to implement instruction that is informed by NCPAT results will be addressed by professional development opportunities.</p> <p>The evaluation report indicates short-term and long-term recommendations, but there is no plan described how these are being considered and implemented for the NCPAT professional development.</p>
<p><b>(d)(2) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 8 points if factor (4) is inapplicable)</b> The strategies the SEA or consortium has developed and will use to familiarize students and parents with the innovative assessment system;</p>	<p><b>(d)(2):</b></p>	<p>3</p>	<p>(d)(2) NC Dept of Public Instruction will collaborate with the Division of Communication to ensure that parents are informed about the purpose of the innovative assessment and what it means for students. The parent portal in PowerSchool will be one way information will be shared with parents.</p>	<p>(d)(2) There is no specific description provided about how parents who may not have access to the parent portal will receive information about this assessment. No information is provided about specific strategies that will be used to familiarize the students with the innovative assessment. There is no description of a plan to use the findings and recommendations from the proof of concept study.</p>
<p><b>(d)(3) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 8 points if factor (4) is inapplicable)</b> 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</p>	<p><b>(d)(3):</b></p>	<p>8</p>	<p>(d)(3) NC will require the use of accommodations for students with disabilities and English learners according to their IEPs and plans as is required for all state assessments. Training for providing test accommodations during test administration is required. Plans for monitoring in selected schools, as well as protocols for desk monitoring</p>	

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

<p>200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act, needed to meet the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act; and</p>			<p>and monitoring of test procedures prior to, during, and after test administration are presented in Appendix J. These procedures and protocols are currently used for other state assessments.</p>		
<p><b>(d)(4) (10 points if applicable).</b> 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 <b>(10 points if applicable)</b></p>	<p><b>(d)(4):</b></p>	<p>Not applicable</p>			
<p><b>Total (out of 25) Criteria (d):</b></p>		<p><b>15</b></p>			
<p><b>(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement. (Up to 20 points)</b> The quality of the SEA's or</p>	<p><b>(e)(1):</b></p>	<p>8</p>	<p>(e)(1) The University of North Carolina Greensboro, Office of Assessment,</p>	<p>It is not clear that an evaluation will be conducted annually; in some places of the application it states that an</p>	

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

<p>consortium’s plan to annually evaluate its implementation of innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers—</p> <p><b>(e)(1) (12 points)</b> The strength of the proposed evaluation of the innovative assessment system included in the application, including whether the evaluation will be conducted by an independent, experienced third party, and the likelihood that the evaluation will sufficiently determine the system’s validity, reliability, and comparability to the statewide assessment system consistent with the requirements of 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4) and (9); and</p>			<p>Evaluation, and Research Services will conduct the evaluation of NCPAT. The name of the evaluator is not indicated.</p> <p>A list of the materials, documents, procedures, annual surveys, focus groups, and ongoing technical analyses, is provided.</p>	<p>evaluation will be conducted, in other areas of the narrative, there is indication that evaluation will be ongoing.</p> <p>More detail is needed to explain the specific data that will be collected and how the data will be analyzed to determine the assessment systems validity, reliability, and comparability.</p>
<p><b>(e)(2) (8 points)</b> The SEA’s or consortium’s plan for continuous improvement of the innovative assessment system, including its process for--</p> <p>(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</p> <p>(ii) Evaluating and</p>	<p><b>(e)(2):</b></p>	<p>6</p>	<p>(e)(2)(i), (ii) A description provides details about the annual content and process that will be used to review the implementation of NCPAT. Information sources include test data, feedback, evaluation results, on-site observation and monitoring results.</p>	<p>(e)(2)(i) A plan that describes how and when the evaluation results and recommendations will be reviewed, considered for implementation, and plans for implementation needs to be provided.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

monitoring implementation of the innovative assessment system in participating LEAs and schools annually.				
<b>Total (out of 20) Criteria (e): (auto-total)</b>	14			
<b>Total (a+b+c+d+e) (auto-total)</b>	<b><u>31+12+6+15+14=78</u></b>			

# IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

---

## **Instructions:**

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

## Writing strengths and weaknesses:

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

## Scoring:

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p><b>(a) Consultation. Evidence that the SEA or consortium has developed an innovative assessment system in collaboration with--</b></p> <p>(1) Experts in the planning, development, implementation, and evaluation of innovative assessment systems, which may include external partners; and</p> <p>(2) Affected stakeholders in the State, or in each State in the consortium, including--</p> <p>(i) Those representing the interests of children with disabilities, English learners, and other subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act;</p> <p>(ii) Teachers, principals, and other school leaders;</p> <p>(iii) Local educational agencies (LEAs);</p> <p>(iv) Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State;</p> <p>(v) Students and parents, including parents of children described in paragraph (a)(2)(i) of this section; and</p> <p>(vi) Civil rights organizations.</p>	<p><b>(a)</b></p> <p>___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>Through its Task Force on Summative Assessment, the State has demonstrated that it has developed the plan for its innovative assessment system with experts as described in (a)(1).</p> <p>Not all stakeholder groups identified under (2) can be easily matched with one or more of the groups invited to participate in the State’s IADA stakeholders’ meeting on December 3, 2018.</p> <p>It is not clear where in the process the State included those representing the interests of children with disabilities or English learners, or their parents. It is also not clear where input was considered from representatives of Indian tribes or civil rights organizations.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>the case of science assessments, so long as the statewide academic assessments under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act are administered in any required grade and subject under 34 CFR 200.5(a)(1) in which the SEA does not choose to implement an innovative assessment.</p>		
<p>(2)(i) Align with the challenging State academic content standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act, including the depth and breadth of such standards, for the grade in which a student is enrolled; and                      (ii) May measure a student’s academic proficiency and growth using items above or below the student’s grade level so long as, for purposes of meeting the requirements for reporting and school accountability under sections 1111(c) and 1111(h) of the Act and paragraphs (b)(3) and (b)(7)-(9) of this section, the State measures each student’s academic proficiency based on the challenging State academic standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled;</p>	<p><b>(b)(2)</b>                      ___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.                       ___x___Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i>                      ___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the</p>	<p>The application states that it will ensure that its innovative assessment is aligned to the same state-adopted academic standards as its statewide assessment. However, it does not describe the plan for ensuring that the tests align with the breadth and depth of its standards.</p> <p>It seems especially critical to address how (2)(i) will not be negatively impacted by the State’s plan to develop an innovative assessment that is entirely multiple-choice (in ELA) and a mixture of multiple-choice and grid-in (in mathematics).</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i>	
(3) Express student results or competencies consistent with the challenging State academic achievement standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act and identify which students are not making sufficient progress toward, and attaining, grade-level proficiency on such standards;	<p><b>(b)(3)</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the</i></p>	<p>The State plans to equate the innovative assessments such that they are on the scale(s) of the current end of grade (EOG) assessments. The State also plans to commission a standard setting study to determine cut points on the innovative assessments. The equating, however, implies that cut points on the EOG assessments would transfer over to the innovative assessments. If the State wishes to employ these two independent sources of information for (3), it should describe its plan for reconciling competing findings from the two sources.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<i>application).</i>	
<p>(4)(i) Generate results, including annual summative determinations as defined in paragraph (b)(7) of this section, that are valid, reliable, and comparable for all students and for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, to the results generated by the State academic assessments described in 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act for such students.</p> <p>Consistent with the SEA’s or consortium’s evaluation plan under 34 CFR 200.106(e), the SEA must plan to annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period in <b>one of the following ways:</b></p> <p>(A) Administering full assessments from both the innovative and statewide assessment systems to all students enrolled in participating schools, such that at least once in any grade span (i.e., 3-5, 6-8, or 9-12) and subject for which there is an innovative assessment, a statewide assessment in the same subject would</p>	<p><b>(b)(4)</b></p> <p>___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>__x__Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>The State’s plan is to embed NCPAT (innovative assessment) items in its statewide (EOG) tests, thereby allowing for estimation of psychometric statistics on the NCPAT items in terms of the EOG scale. After field testing, the State will select test items to appear on both, on the NCPAT and EOG tests. The linking items would then allow for the estimation of a new scale encompassing both NCPAT and EOG.</p> <p>The plan, especially the second phases, is not described in enough detail to address some challenges of ensuring comparability in linking interim assessments with each other and with end of year assessments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How will the State ensure that all students should have had an opportunity to learn the content provided at each interim assessment?</li> <li>2. Will the interim assessments be comparable to each other in terms of standards assessed and blueprint considerations? If not, how will the State link them?</li> <li>3. Student proficiency is not fixed over the course of a school year. How will the State take this into account in its linking design?</li> <li>4. How will information from the first two interim tests be incorporated into a score report that explains student standing at the end of the school year?</li> </ol>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

---

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

---

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>7) Generate an annual summative determination of achievement, using the annual data from the innovative assessment, for each student in a participating school in the demonstration authority that describes--</p> <p>(i) The student’s mastery of the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act for the grade in which the student is enrolled; or</p> <p>(ii) In the case of a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed with an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Act, the student’s mastery of those standards;</p>	<p><b>(b)(7)</b>            ___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>__x__Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>See comments under (b)(4).</p> <p>The application does not address what assessment will be used for (b)(7)(ii).</p>
<p>(8) Provide disaggregated results by each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and</p>	<p><b>(b)(8)</b>            __x__Application demonstrates a plan</p>	

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, including timely data for teachers, principals and other school leaders, students, and parents consistent with 34 CFR 200.8 and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(x) and (xii) and section 1111(h) of the Act, and provide results to parents in a manner consistent with paragraph (b)(4)(i) of this section and part 200.2(e);</p>	<p>to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>____Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>____Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(9) Provide an unbiased, rational, and consistent determination of progress toward the State’s long-term goals for academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(A) of the Act for all students and each subgroup of students described in section</p>	<p><b>(b)(9)</b></p> <p>____Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p>	<p>See comments under (b)(4). Without addressing the issues laid out in that section, it will not be possible for the State to properly determine progress for participating schools relative to non-participating schools.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

---

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

---

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

---

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

---

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p><b>(a) Project narrative.</b> The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s plan for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the plan, the Secretary considers--</p> <p><b>(a)(1) ; (5 points if factor (3) is applicable; 10 points if factor (3) is inapplicable)</b> The rationale for developing or selecting the particular innovative assessment system to be implemented under the demonstration authority, including-</p> <p>-</p> <p>(i) The distinct purpose of each assessment that is part of the innovative assessment system and</p>	<p><b>(a)(1):</b></p>	<p>3</p>	<p>(factor 3 is applicable)</p> <p>The parts of the innovative assessment are specified.</p> <p>The implementation of assessments earlier in the year will help teachers and students respond to that information at the right instructional time, thereby promoting higher quality instruction.</p>	<p>The application does not show how adding its proposed interim assessments to its system helps alleviate the ongoing concern about time spent on interim assessments.</p> <p>The plan for implementing distinct interim assessments that align with content sequencing at all schools is unclear and unresolved, particularly for mathematics.</p> <p>The distinct purpose of each interim assessment is not specified, especially how poor performance in the first or second might be offset by better performance in the last assessment.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>how the system will advance the design and delivery of large-scale, statewide academic assessments in innovative ways; and</p> <p>(ii) The extent to which the innovative assessment system as a whole will promote high-quality instruction, mastery of challenging State academic standards, and improved student outcomes, including for each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act; <b>(5 points if factor (3) is applicable; 10 points if factor (3) is inapplicable)</b></p>				
<p><b>(a)(2) (25 points if factor (3) is applicable; 30 points if factor (3) is inapplicable)</b> The plan the SEA or consortium, in consultation with any external partners, if applicable, has to--</p> <p>(i) Develop and use standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, methods, or other strategies for scoring innovative assessments throughout the demonstration authority period, consistent with</p>	<p><b>(a)(2):</b></p>	<p>24</p>	<p>(factor 3 is applicable)</p> <p>This factor is largely irrelevant because the innovative assessment is multiple choice. . . .</p>	<p>...However, the administration of paper and pencil tests for students with disabilities, and the use of other accommodations, especially when the volume of papers is large, requires some consideration of this factor.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>relevant nationally recognized professional and technical standards, to ensure inter-rater reliability and comparability of innovative assessment results consistent with 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4)(ii), which may include evidence of inter-rater reliability; and</p> <p>(ii) Train evaluators to use such strategies, if applicable; <b>(25 points if factor (3) is applicable; 30 points if factor (3) is inapplicable)</b> and</p>				
<p><b>(a)(3) (10 points, if applicable)</b> If the system will initially be administered in a subset of schools or LEAs in a State--</p> <p>(i) The strategies the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, will use to scale the innovative assessment to all schools statewide, with a rationale for selecting those strategies;</p> <p>(ii) The strength of the SEA's or consortium's criteria that will be used to determine LEAs and schools that will initially participate</p>	<p><b>(a)(3):</b></p>	<p>2</p>	<p>(this factor is applicable)</p> <p>The State is aware that it needs to work toward a demographically-representative sample as it scales the innovation, and of the importance of buy-in.</p> <p>The year 3 evaluation can be designed to help identify school readiness for the innovation.</p>	<p>No specific strategies are identified for scaling the innovation statewide.</p> <p>No specific criteria are identified for selecting schools to participate initially or for ongoing selection of schools.</p> <p>No plan is outlined for how the State will maintain quality of implementation in schools selected for participation.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

---

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<b>Total (out of 40) Criteria (a) (auto-total):</b>	3+24+2= <u>29</u>			
<p><b>(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support. (Up to 20 points total)</b>  <b>(b)(1) (5 points)</b> The extent and depth of prior experience that the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, and its LEAs have in developing and implementing the components of the innovative assessment system. An SEA may also describe the prior experience of any external partners that will be participating in or supporting its demonstration authority in implementing those components. In evaluating the extent and depth of prior experience, the Secretary considers—</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">(i) The success and track record of efforts to implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items aligned to the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act in LEAs planning to participate; and</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">(ii) The SEA’s or LEA’s</p>	<b>(b)(1):</b>	4	<p>The State’s experience with the NC-Check-Ins, which represent an innovation like the proposed IADA innovative assessments, supports (b)(1).</p>	<p>To demonstrate prior experience, the State provided an evaluation of a proof of concept which included an evaluation of training. However, less than half of teachers agreed or strongly agreed with “Overall, I would rate this training as excellent.”</p> <p>There were critical recommendations made in the training; it seems important for the State to indicate how it plans to address or is addressing these.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

---

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria points)	Reviewers score for this part	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p><b>(b)(2) (5 points)</b> The extent and depth of SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, and LEA capacity to implement the innovative assessment system considering the availability of technological infrastructure; State and local laws; dedicated and sufficient staff, expertise, and resources; and other relevant factors. An SEA or consortium may also describe how it plans to enhance its capacity by collaborating with external partners that will be participating in or supporting its demonstration authority. In evaluating the extent and depth of capacity, the Secretary considers--</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(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</li> <li>(ii) The strategies the SEA is using, or will use, to mitigate risks, including those identified in its analysis, and support successful implementation</li> </ul>	<p><b>(b)(2):</b></p>	<p>4</p>	<p>The State's experience with online assessment extends to the beginning of the century. It has ample internal and external psychometric support.</p> <p>No specific risks were cited, nor any risk mitigation strategies.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
of the innovative assessment. <b>(5 points)</b>				
<p><b>(b)(3) (10 points)</b>The extent and depth of State and local support for the application for demonstration authority in each SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, as demonstrated by signatures from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Superintendents (or equivalent) of LEAs, including participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority period.</li> <li>(ii) Presidents of local school boards (or equivalent, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority.</li> <li>(iii) Local teacher organizations (including labor organizations, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority.</li> <li>(iv) Other affected stakeholders, such as parent organizations, civil rights</li> </ul>	<b>(b)(3):</b>	3	<p>The application includes letters of support from superintendents and two supporting institutions (SAS Institute Inc and the Department of Education of the University of North Carolina Greensboro School of Education).</p>	<p>The application does not include letters of support from presidents of local school boards, local teacher unions, or representatives of other affected stakeholders.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
organizations, and business organizations. <b>(10 points)</b>				
<b>Total (out of 20) Criteria (b) (auto-total):</b>	<b><u>4+4+3=11</u></b>			
<p><b>(c) Timeline and budget. (Up to 15 points)</b>                      The quality of the SEA's or consortium's timeline and budget for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the timeline and budget, the Secretary considers--</p> <p><b>(c)(1) (5 points).</b> The extent to which the timeline reasonably demonstrates that each SEA will implement the system statewide by the end of the requested demonstration authority period, including a description of--</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) The activities to occur in each year of the requested demonstration authority period;</li> <li>(ii) The parties responsible for each activity; and</li> <li>(iii) If applicable, how a consortium's member SEAs will implement activities at different paces and how the consortium will implement</li> </ul>	<b>(c)(1):</b>	4	The State has provided a reasonable timeline indicating responsible parties for each activity.	Some critical activities are missing from timeline, such as training of teachers in item development and timing of communications (such as score reporting).

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
interdependent activities, so long as each non-affiliate member SEA begins using the innovative assessment in the same school year consistent with 34 CFR part 200.104(b)(2); <b>(5 points)</b> and				
(c)(2) <b>(10 points)</b> . 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. <b>(10 points)</b>	<b>(c)(2):</b>	3	The application includes a rationale for why current levels of funding will be enough to cover most of the cost of the State's transition to the innovative assessment system.	A budget is not provided. So, it cannot be determined whether budget will be sufficient to meet the expected costs at each phase of the SEA's planned expansion of its innovative assessment system.
<b>Total (out of 15) Criteria (c):</b>	<b><u>4+3=7</u></b>			

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses	
<p><b>(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents. (Up to 25 points)</b>                      The quality of the SEA or consortium’s plan to provide supports that can be delivered consistently at scale to educators, students, and parents to enable successful implementation of the innovative assessment system and improve instruction and student outcomes. In determining the quality of supports, the Secretary considers--</p> <p><b>(d)(1) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 9 points if factor (4) is inapplicable).</b> The extent to which the SEA or consortium has developed, provided, and will continue to provide training to LEA and school staff, including teachers, principals, and other school leaders, that will familiarize them with the innovative assessment system and develop teacher capacity to implement instruction that is informed by the innovative assessment system and its results;</p>	(d)(1):	7	<p>(factor 4 is inapplicable)</p> <p>With the NC Check-ins project, the State has demonstrated experience providing training to school staff.</p>	<p>There is little information on when training will take place, how it will be implemented, and how it will be evaluated.</p> <p>Also see comments under (b)(1), which are relevant to designing an effective training plan for the State’s innovative assessment.</p>
<p><b>(d)(2) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 8 points if factor (4) is inapplicable)</b> The strategies the</p>	(d)(2):	4	<p>(factor 4 is inapplicable)</p>	<p>The State needs to provide a more comprehensive plan for meeting</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
SEA or consortium has developed and will use to familiarize students and parents with the innovative assessment system;			The plan includes communicating to students and parents the assessment purpose.	<p>(d)(2), such as how students will become familiar with the new assessment format, and how they will communicate how the interim assessment results are aggregated.</p> <p>State plan should address, for example, how to communicate to students performing poorly on early interim assessments in such a way that those students are not demotivated to try their best on subsequent assessments. This risk is particular to interim assessment systems.</p> <p>Cognitive labs obtain information from students to better design assessments; they are not tools for familiarizing students with an assessment system.</p>
<b>(d)(3) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 8 points if factor (4) is inapplicable)</b> 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	<b>(d)(3):</b>	8	(factor 4 is inapplicable)  A monitoring plan is provided to ensure (d)(3)	

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act, needed to meet the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act; and				
<b>(d)(4) (10 points if applicable).</b> 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 <b>(10 points if applicable)</b>	<b>(d)(4):</b>	N/A	(factor 4 is inapplicable)	
<b>Total (out of 25) Criteria (d):</b>	<b>7+4+8=19</b>			
<b>(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement. (Up to 20 points)</b>	<b>(e)(1):</b>	6	The evaluation is being conducted by an independent third party.	The evaluation plan does not address in enough detail how it will assess

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p>The quality of the SEA's or consortium's plan to annually evaluate its implementation of innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers—</p> <p><b>(e)(1) (12 points)</b> The strength of the proposed evaluation of the innovative assessment system included in the application, including whether the evaluation will be conducted by an independent, experienced third party, and the likelihood that the evaluation will sufficiently determine the system's validity, reliability, and comparability to the statewide assessment system consistent with the requirements of 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4) and (9); and</p>			<p>An outline of the elements of the evaluation is provided.</p>	<p>reliability and comparability to the statewide assessment system, to ascertain if the evaluation as planned will allow for a determination of the validity, reliability, and comparability of the innovative assessments.</p> <p>In general, the evaluation plan requires more detail about how its goals will be achieved.</p> <p>Timing, duration, frequency of evaluation all unclear.</p>
<p><b>(e)(2) (8 points)</b> The SEA's or consortium's plan for continuous improvement of the innovative assessment system, including its process for--</p> <p>(i) Using data, feedback, evaluation results, and other information from</p>	<p><b>(e)(2):</b></p>	<p>7</p>	<p>The State has outlined a reasonable process for meeting continuous improvement goals.</p>	<p>It behooves architects of an interim assessment program to debrief more than once a year.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

---

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
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.				
<b>Total (out of 20) Criteria (e): (auto-total)</b>	<b><u>13</u></b>			
<b>Total (a+b+c+d+e) (auto-total)</b>	<b><u>29+11+7+19+13 = 79</u></b>			

# IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

---

## **Instructions:**

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

## Writing strengths and weaknesses:

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

## Scoring:

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p><b>(a) Consultation. Evidence that the SEA or consortium has developed an innovative assessment system in collaboration with--</b></p> <p>(1) Experts in the planning, development, implementation, and evaluation of innovative assessment systems, which may include external partners; and</p> <p>(2) Affected stakeholders in the State, or in each State in the consortium, including--</p> <p>(i) Those representing the interests of children with disabilities, English learners, and other subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act;</p> <p>(ii) Teachers, principals, and other school leaders;</p> <p>(iii) Local educational agencies (LEAs);</p> <p>(iv) Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State;</p> <p>(v) Students and parents, including parents of children described in paragraph (a)(2)(i) of this section; and</p> <p>(vi) Civil rights organizations.</p>	<p><b>(a)</b></p> <p>___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p><b>(a)(1)</b></p> <p>The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) has been developing its assessments in collaboration with North Carolina State University since the early 1990s. This collaboration will serve as the basis for the development, implementation, and evaluation of the proposed through-grade North Carolina Personalized Assessment Tool (NCPAT) in English Language Arts/Reading and mathematics for grades 3 through 8 to replace the current end-of-grade summative assessments in those grades.</p> <p><b>(a)(2)</b></p> <p>Development of the NCPAT is based on a recommendation from the NC State Board of Education’s Task Force on Summative Assessment. The Task Force is made up of state BoE members, NC General Assembly members, representatives of community colleges and higher education institutions, district superintendents, principals, teacher associations and teachers, parents, and business leaders, as listed on pages 10-11 and 13. Various experts, including the NC Technical Advisors, a standing group of experts on testing and accountability, and staff from the New Hampshire Department of Education involved in piloting that state’s performance-based assessment (PACE), have shared information with the Task Force on the use, the development, and the technical requirements for a balanced assessment system.</p> <p>On December 4, 2018, a webinar was held to gather feedback from the members of the Testing and Growth Advisory Council, a group of superintendents and district-level testing and accountability directors that provide input to the NCDPI. Appendix E summarizes the collective input from external stakeholders and from members of the Testing and Growth Advisory Council.</p> <p><b>(a)(2)(i)(iv)(vi)</b></p> <p>No explicit information is provided regarding the participation of expert/stakeholders/parents representing the interests of children with disabilities and/or English learners. Same for the inclusion of representatives from NC Indian tribes and civil rights organizations.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p><b>(b) Innovative assessment system. A demonstration that the innovative assessment system does or will--</b></p> <p>(1) Meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(2)(B) of the Act, except that an innovative assessment—</p> <p>(i) Need not be the same assessment administered to all public elementary and secondary school students in the State during the demonstration authority period described in 34 CFR 200.104(b)(2) or extension period described in 34 CFR 200.108 and prior to statewide use consistent with 34 CFR 200.107, if the innovative assessment system will be administered initially to all students in participating schools within a participating LEA, provided that the statewide academic assessments under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act are administered to all students in any non-participating LEA or any non-participating school within a participating LEA; and</p> <p>(ii) Need not be administered annually in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in grades 9-12 in the case of reading/language arts and</p>	<p><b>(b)(1)</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p><b>(b)(1)</b></p> <p>All students in non-participating schools will continue to take the North Carolina end-of-grade tests in mathematics (grades 3–8) and English language arts/reading (grades 3–8) in 1) all non-participating schools, as required under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act, and 2) all participating schools for which such assessments will be used in addition to innovative assessments for accountability purposes under section 1111(c) of the Act consistent with paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section or for evaluation purposes consistent with 34 CFR 200.106(e) during the demonstration authority period.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>mathematics assessments, and at least once in grades 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12 in the case of science assessments, so long as the statewide academic assessments under 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act are administered in any required grade and subject under 34 CFR 200.5(a)(1) in which the SEA does not choose to implement an innovative assessment.</p>		
<p>(2)(i) Align with the challenging State academic content standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act, including the depth and breadth of such standards, for the grade in which a student is enrolled; and</p> <p>(ii) May measure a student’s academic proficiency and growth using items above or below the student’s grade level so long as, for purposes of meeting the requirements for reporting and school accountability under sections 1111(c) and 1111(h) of the Act and paragraphs (b)(3) and (b)(7)-(9) of this section, the State measures each student’s academic proficiency based on the challenging State academic standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled;</p>	<p><b>(b)(2)</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>_____Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>_____Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this</p>	<p><b>(b)(2)(i)(ii)</b>                      The state indicates that the proposed innovative assessment will be aligned to and measure the same breadth and depth of the state-adopted academic standards and have such claim validated by an external alignment study. Additionally, the state will use it for purposes for which such assessment is valid and reliable to ensure that all students and each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act in participating schools are held to the same challenging state academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act as all other students, except that students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may be assessed with alternate assessments aligned with alternate academic achievement standards consistent with 34 CFR 200.6 and section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D) of the Act, and receive the instructional support needed to meet such standards.</p> <p>To verify comparability between the current end-of-grade and the NCPAT, the NCPDI will review the English language arts/reading test specifications for the NCPAT (Year 1) for alignment to the test specifications for the current end-of-grade assessments in grades 3–8. The NCPDI will perform a similar review of mathematics test specifications for the NCPAT (Year 1) to ensure breadth and depth of coverage of the state-adopted content standards.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i>	<b>(b)(2)(ii)</b> Not applicable. The proposed innovative assessment is an on-grade level type of assessment.
(3) Express student results or competencies consistent with the challenging State academic achievement standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act and identify which students are not making sufficient progress toward, and attaining, grade-level proficiency on such standards;	<b>(b)(3)</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i>  <input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific</i>	<b>(b)(3)</b> NC proposes to administer the innovative assessment through multiple statewide interim assessments during the school year in order to generate student-level information on achievement on the state-adopted content standards. The information will be based on the current state five academic achievement level standards and accompanying academic level descriptors to allow parents, teachers, principals, and other school leaders to understand and address the specific academic needs of students.

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p><i>parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(4)(i) Generate results, including annual summative determinations as defined in paragraph (b)(7) of this section, that are valid, reliable, and comparable for all students and for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, to the results generated by the State academic assessments described in 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act for such students.</p> <p>Consistent with the SEA’s or consortium’s evaluation plan under 34 CFR 200.106(e), the SEA must plan to annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period in <b>one of the following ways:</b></p> <p>(A) Administering full assessments from both the innovative and statewide assessment systems to all students enrolled in participating schools, such that at least once in any grade span (i.e., 3-5, 6-8, or 9-12) and subject for which there is an</p>	<p><b>(b)(4)</b></p> <p>___Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>__X__Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>___Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p><b>(b)(4)(i)</b></p> <p>The state will report annually the performance of students in participating schools at the state, LEA, and school level, for all students and disaggregated for each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, on the innovative assessment, including academic achievement and participation data required to be reported consistent with section 1111(h) of the Act, except that such data will not reveal any personally identifiable information.</p> <p>The results of the NCPAT in Year 4 will be used in the statewide accountability system to ensure results, including annual summative determinations, that are valid, reliable, and comparable for all students and for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, to the results generated by the State academic assessments described in 34 CFR 200.2(a)(1) and section 1111(b)(2) of the Act for such students.</p> <p>To annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period, the participating schools will administer the NCPAT for specific grade levels in Year 2 and Year 3 using an embedded field test model (the item will show up on both the NCPAT and the summative assessment) for linking purposes. For example, in Year 2 the mathematics NCPAT will be administered at grade 4 only in a participating school with grades 3–5. However, students in all grade levels will participate in the statewide end-of-grade assessments. This will provide comparability data for the grade 4 students who take both assessments. This continues for Year 3 when the innovative assessment is expanded to additional grade levels. As with Year 2, not all grade levels in the grade span at participating schools will participate in the NCPAT, but all students will participate in the statewide end-of-grade assessments. Thus, in Year 4 when the NCPAT data is used for participating schools’ accountability data, there will be</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>innovative assessment, a statewide assessment in the same subject would also be administered to all such students. As part of this determination, the innovative assessment and statewide assessment need not be administered to an individual student in the same school year.</p> <p>(B) Administering full assessments from both the innovative and statewide assessment systems to a demographically representative sample of all students and subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, from among those students enrolled in participating schools, such that at least once in any grade span (i.e., 3-5, 6-8, or 9-12) and subject for which there is an innovative assessment, a statewide assessment in the same subject would also be administered in the same school year to all students included in the sample.</p> <p>(C) Including, as a significant portion of the innovative assessment system in each required grade and subject in which both an innovative and statewide assessment are administered, items or performance tasks from the statewide assessment system that, at a minimum, have been</p>		<p>two years of comparability data for the NCPAT and the statewide end-of-grade assessments to affirm that the resulting academic achievement levels are consistent with those for the statewide end-of-grade summative assessments.</p> <p>Not clear is what specific data will be used to establish comparability of scores between the NCPAT and the end-of-year summative assessment, i.e., aggregating the data from the first two interim assessment administrations, which raises the question of how the procedure will handle results of students who did not pass the first or second assessment, or aggregating results from the third interim assessment with the summative assessment scores.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

---

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, among participating schools and LEAs in the innovative assessment demonstration authority. Consistent with the SEA’s or consortium’s evaluation plan under 34 CFR 200.106(e), the SEA must plan to annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period;</p>		
<p>(5)(i) Provide for the participation of all students, including children with disabilities and English learners;                      (ii) Be accessible to all students by incorporating the principles of universal design for learning, to the extent practicable, consistent with 34 CFR 200.2(b)(2)(ii); and                      (iii) Provide appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act;</p>	<p><b>(b)(5)</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.    <input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i>  <input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during</p>	<p><b>(b)(5)(i)</b>                      Consistent with the NC General Statute §115C-174.12, the state’s proposal includes processes that ensure universal design and accessibility by all students, including children with disabilities and English learners, and provides appropriate accommodations, such as interoperability with and ability to use, assistive technology for students with disabilities (as defined in section 602[3] of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act [20 U.S.C. 1401[3]), and students with disabilities who are provided accommodations under an Act other than the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, necessary to measure academic achievement in a valid and reliable manner.                      The list of accommodations available for English learners and a description of the NCPDI assessment and monitoring of documented accommodations are included.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<p>the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	
<p>(6) For purposes of the State accountability system consistent with section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the Act, annually measure in each participating school progress on the Academic Achievement indicator under section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the Act of at least 95 percent of all students, and 95 percent of students in each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act, who are required to take such assessments consistent with paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section;</p>	<p><b>(b)(6)</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i>   <input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement</i></p>	<p><b>(b)(6)</b>                      The state’s proposal cites the North Carolina State Board of Education policy ACCT-021, which states “all eligible students in membership (i.e., enrolled in a school) at grades 3 through 8 and in high school courses in which an end-of-course assessment is administered shall participate in the state assessment program adopted by the State Board of Education.” For accountability calculations, the denominator for the percent proficient is either the number of students who participate in the assessment or 95% of the student population, whichever is greater.                      During the demonstration period, all eligible students will participate in the assessments aligned to the North Carolina adopted content standards, and the results of the assessments will be included in the state accountability model in the reporting of School Performance Grades, as included and approved in the Every Student Succeeds Act state plan.                      The state needs to clarify how it will meet the participation of 95% of students in each subgroup.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	<i>were not met or addressed by the application).</i>	
<p>7) Generate an annual summative determination of achievement, using the annual data from the innovative assessment, for each student in a participating school in the demonstration authority that describes--</p> <p>(i) The student’s mastery of the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act for the grade in which the student is enrolled; or</p> <p>(ii) In the case of a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed with an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Act, the student’s mastery of those standards;</p>	<p><b>(b)(7)</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p>_____Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p>_____Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p><b>(b)(7)(i)(ii)</b>  The state indicates that the proposed innovative assessment will be aligned to the state-adopted academic standards and have such claim validated by an external alignment study, and use it for purposes for which such assessment is valid and reliable to ensure that all students and each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act in participating schools are held to the same challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act as all other students, except that students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may be assessed with alternate assessments aligned with alternate academic achievement standards consistent with 34 CFR 200.6 and section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D) of the Act, and receive the instructional support needed to meet such standards.</p> <p>All students in the participating schools will take the innovative assessment that is aligned to grade-level content standards and will receive a summative score by combining results from all three NCPAT through-grade assessments administered during the school year. The summative score will be reported using the existing achievement levels from 1 to 5. Each achievement level has an accompanying descriptor that specifies what students know and can do. At the end of Year 5, standard setting will be facilitated by an external vendor. Panels of teachers and content experts will participate in the standard setting process, and the resulting recommended academic achievement standards and descriptors will be presented to the State Board of Education in August 2024.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>(8) Provide disaggregated results by each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, including timely data for teachers, principals and other school leaders, students, and parents consistent with 34 CFR 200.8 and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(x) and (xii) and section 1111(h) of the Act, and provide results to parents in a manner consistent with paragraph (b)(4)(i) of this section and part 200.2(e);</p>	<p><b>(b)(8)</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.   <input type="checkbox"/> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i>  <input type="checkbox"/> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p><b>(b)(8)</b>  As with the statewide end-of-grade assessments, the innovative assessment results will be disaggregated by each subgroup of students as described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act. The disaggregated results for ethnicities, students with disabilities, English learners, economically disadvantaged, migrant status, status as a homeless student, status as a student in foster care, and status as a military-connected student are posted on the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction’s website and included in the NC Report Card.   Additionally, classroom rosters, school reports, district reports, and individual student reports will be provided for each through-grade innovative assessment and for the summative assessment at the end of the school year. Having reports throughout the school year will inform teachers of students’ current performance on the selected subset of content standards. Likewise, the Individual Student Reports for each through-grade assessment and for the year-end summative assessment will provide information that supports parents as they collaborate with their students’ teachers on how to best address instructional needs.</p>
<p>(9) Provide an unbiased, rational, and consistent determination of progress toward the State’s long-term goals for academic achievement under section</p>	<p><b>(b)(9)</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this</p>	<p><b>(b)(9)(i)</b>  The data from the NCPAT in Year 4 and Year 5 will be included in the statewide accountability model and included in the data to determine unbiased, rational, and consistent determination of progress toward the State’s long-term goals for</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
<p>1111(c)(4)(A) of the Act for all students and each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act and a comparable measure of student performance on the Academic Achievement indicator under section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the Act for participating schools relative to non-participating schools so that the SEA may validly and reliably aggregate data from the system for purposes of meeting requirements for--</p> <p>(i) Accountability under sections 1003 and 1111(c) and (d) of the Act, including how the SEA will identify participating and non-participating schools in a consistent manner for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement under section 1111(c)(4)(D) of the Act; and</p> <p>(ii) Reporting on State and LEA report cards under section 1111(h) of the Act.</p>	<p>requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u>  X  </u>Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><u>      </u>Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i></p>	<p>academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(A) of the Act for all students and each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act and a comparable measure of student performance on the Academic Achievement indicator under section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the Act. All students' data will be included in the annual accountability reports and on the NC Report Card throughout the Demonstration Authority period.</p> <p>Not clear is what specific data will be used to establish comparability of scores between the NCPAT and the end-of-year summative assessment, i.e., aggregating the data from the first two interim assessment administrations, which raises the question of how the procedure will handle results of students who did not pass the first or second assessment, or aggregating results from the third interim assessment with the summative assessment scores.</p> <p>The data for participating and non-participating schools will be validly and reliably included in the accountability system so all schools will have a meaningful designation as stated in North Carolina's Every Student Succeeds Act state plan with a reported interim progress target for each year of the Demonstrated Authority period. Eligibility for identification as a comprehensive school of support and improvement or a targeted school of support and improvement will apply for participating schools and non-participating schools as required by section 1111(c)(4)(D) of the Act.</p> <p>The reporting on the NC Report Card and local report cards will comply with section 1111(h) of the Act. The information on the NC Report Card is presented in an understandable and concise manner and is available on the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction's website so all parents and other stakeholders have access.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

---

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Regulatory Requirement	Determination	Explanation
	requirement during the course of the authority period. <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not met or addressed by the application).</i>	
<p><b>(e) Initial implementation in a subset of LEAs or schools. If the innovative assessment system will initially be administered in a subset of LEAs or schools in a State--</b></p> <p>(1) A description of each LEA, and each of its participating schools, that will initially participate, including demographic information and its most recent LEA report card under section 1111(h)(2) of the Act; and</p> <p>(2) An assurance from each participating LEA, for each year that the LEA is participating, that the LEA will comply with all requirements of this section.</p>	<p><b>(e)</b></p> <p><u>  X  </u> Application demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.</p> <p><u>      </u> Application only partially demonstrates a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific parts of this requirement were not or addressed by the application).</i></p> <p><u>      </u> Application does not demonstrate a plan to meet this requirement during the course of the authority period.  <i>(explain what specific</i></p>	<p><b>(e)</b></p> <p>The innovative assessment will be piloted in Year 1 to a small sample of schools from three districts that have volunteered to participate. The first district has 19,155 students enrolled in its 34 schools. There are 19 elementary schools and eight middle schools that may participate in the innovative assessment pilot. The district has been identified as a renewal school district. This identification allows for charter-like flexibility in identifying ways to improve student achievement. The second district has 21 schools serving 8,230 students. Located in western North Carolina, the district has eleven elementary schools and four middle schools that may participate in the innovative assessment pilot. The third district has committed one elementary school (273 students) that is part of an initiative created in 2016 through legislation to improve student outcomes in low-performing schools across North Carolina. Schools in this initiative work in partnership with local communities to design and implement strategies for school improvement, creating innovative conditions for accelerating student growth and achievement.</p> <p>The assurances of participation from each district is provided in Appendix B, and the NC Report Card for each district is provided in Appendix C. Information on the district’s demographics is provided in the Project Narrative.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

---

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

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p><b>(a) Project narrative.</b> The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s plan for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the plan, the Secretary considers--</p> <p><b>(a)(1) ; (5 points if factor (3) is applicable; 10 points if factor (3) is inapplicable)</b> The rationale for developing or selecting the particular innovative assessment system to be implemented under the demonstration authority, including-</p> <p>-</p> <p>(i) The distinct purpose of each assessment that is part of the innovative assessment system and</p>	<p><b>(a)(1):</b></p>	<p>3</p>	<p><b>(a)(1)(i)</b>  Modeled on the existing NC Check-Ins assessments in mathematics and English language arts/reading for grades 3–8, and in response to concerns from teachers and parents regarding both the amount of time students spend on standardized assessments and the usability of data provided from the summative assessment, which is not available in time to affect instruction, the North Carolina Personalized Assessment Tool (NCPAT) addresses these concerns in the form of a through-grade statewide assessment that supports instruction, provides immediate feedback to teachers and</p>	<p>The NCDPI will recruit districts to voluntarily participate in the innovative assessment pilot. This approach may compromise the generalization of findings. Volunteers sometimes have unique characteristics that may prevent accurate generalization of pilot results to the overall state student population. It should be noted that the NCDPI has policies and procedures in place to require participation, if necessary.</p> <p>While standardized multiple-choice assessments can be used to measure most kinds of learning, be refined through item analyses, and be relatively inexpensive to score, they</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>how the system will advance the design and delivery of large-scale, statewide academic assessments in innovative ways; and</p> <p>(ii) The extent to which the innovative assessment system as a whole will promote high-quality instruction, mastery of challenging State academic standards, and improved student outcomes, including for each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act; <b>(5 points if factor (3) is applicable; 10 points if factor (3) is inapplicable)</b></p>			<p>parents, and has an administration time that is shorter in duration than the current tests. With the generation of a summative score for accountability purposes, the NCPAT optimizes the purposes of formative, interim, and summative into one assessment.</p> <p><b>(a)(1)(ii)</b> The NCPAT consists of three or four assessments administered online throughout the school year to all students in order to provide teachers and parents with timely, actionable data to identify individual student strengths and needs and inform instruction. To help in this task, for example, teachers will receive detailed classroom reports about student performance on the content standards following each test administration. This information will enable teachers to adjust and modify instruction throughout the school year. Additionally, an online non-secure item bank will be available as a classroom resource for teachers to check student progress in the content standards not mastered.</p>	<p>do have some limitations, such as teaching to the test. This practice has the potential to give both students and teachers a distorted view of the true nature of learning.</p> <p>Also, multiple-choice items constrain students to single appropriate answers, as opposed to constructed-response items such as short answers, which allow students to demonstrate complex, in-depth understandings, while reducing guessing the correct response.</p>
<b>(a)(2) (25 points if factor (3) is</b>	<b>(a)(2):</b>	20	<b>(a)(2)(i)</b>	Since the state has already developed

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p><b>applicable; 30 points if factor (3) is inapplicable)</b> The plan the SEA or consortium, in consultation with any external partners, if applicable, has to--</p> <p>(i) Develop and use standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, methods, or other strategies for scoring innovative assessments throughout the demonstration authority period, consistent with relevant nationally recognized professional and technical standards, to ensure inter-rater reliability and comparability of innovative assessment results consistent with 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4)(ii), which may include evidence of inter-rater reliability; and</p> <p>(ii) Train evaluators to use such strategies, if applicable; <b>(25 points if factor (3) is applicable; 30 points if factor (3) is inapplicable)</b> and</p>			<p>All the items for the innovative English language arts/reading assessments will be multiple-choice. The items for mathematics will be multiple-choice and numeric entry. To assure accessibility for students with disabilities, there will be a paper-and-pencil mode available as an accommodation on a very limited basis.</p> <p>To ensure quality control and accuracy in the scoring of the assessments, the NCDPI verifies that delivery platform has the items and the associated key correctly loaded. Once the tests are administered, the NCPDI reviews the scoring of a sample of student responses in order to ensure the keys are correct and to affirm an item is valid, both with respect to the content measured and the accuracy and correctness of each answer choice.</p> <p><b>(a)(2)(ii)</b> Not applicable due to the use of multiple choice items and machine scoring.</p>	<p>technology enhanced items, it could be useful to add them to the assessments as a way to improve the measurement of the breadth and depth of the state standards.</p>
<p><b>(a)(3) (10 points, if applicable)</b> If the system will initially be administered in a subset of schools</p>	<p><b>(a)(3):</b></p>	<p>4</p>	<p><b>(a)(3)(i)</b> Several charts show that the innovative pilot will be administered</p>	<p>Although the state emphasizes that the participating schools will reflect the statewide demographics with respect</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>or LEAs in a State--</p> <p>(i) The strategies the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, will use to scale the innovative assessment to all schools statewide, with a rationale for selecting those strategies;</p> <p>(ii) The strength of the SEA’s or consortium’s criteria that will be used to determine LEAs and schools that will initially participate and when to approve additional LEAs and schools, if applicable, to participate during the requested demonstration authority period; and</p> <p>(iii) The SEA’s plan, including each SEA in a consortium, for how it will ensure that, during the demonstration authority period, the inclusion of additional LEAs and schools continues to reflect high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse LEAs and schools, or contributes to progress toward achieving such implementation across 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</p>			<p>initially to a limited sample of students at one elementary grade level for mathematics and one middle school grade level for English language arts/reading. In subsequent years, participation will expand to both mathematics and English language arts/reading and piloted at each grade span: grades 3–5 and grades 6–8. In Year 5 of the demonstration period, statewide implementation in grades 3–8 for mathematics and English language arts/reading will be fulfilled. An external vendor will facilitate a standard setting panel to recommend academic achievement standards and achievement level descriptors for the NCPAT and presented to the State Board of Education in the 2023-2024 school year.</p> <p>For Year 2, three districts have voluntarily committed to participating in the innovative pilot at grade 4 and grade 7. The target population is 4,500 students for each grade level and content area, with the students representing the demographics of the state population including students with disabilities and English learners. Students in</p>	<p>to student subgroups, region, and the mean scale score on the currently administered end-of-grade assessments, the NCDPI will recruit districts to voluntarily participate in the innovative assessment pilot. This approach may compromise the generalization of findings. Volunteers sometimes have unique characteristics that may prevent accurate generalization of pilot results to the overall state student population. It should be noted that the NCDPI has policies and procedures in place to require participation, if necessary. (p. 34). In addition, the demographics of the Year 2 volunteered districts are not representative of the state population.</p> <p>No information is provided regarding the criteria schools need to meet for participation, other than volunteering. No information either about annual benchmarks toward achieving consistent implementation across participating schools.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>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. <b>(10 points, if applicable)</b></p>			<p>Year 2 will also take the statewide end-of-grade assessments in order to provide comparability data. For Year 3 and Year 4, the sample of participating students will increase in number.</p> <p>Appendix B provides the list of letters of support from school districts and charter schools that have committed to participation in the administrations and in the formative activities.</p> <p><b>(a)(3)(ii)</b> If the NCPDI can resolve the effect of issues associated with the use of volunteers on the validity and reliability of results, the proposed timeline can be suitable to conduct analyses and technical review to support the combining of the three through-grade assessments into one summative score for each student prior to the statewide administration. It can also help identify the need for modifications to the assessment and to the online delivery, and whether the data reports provided for each assessment throughout the school year contributes to instructional decisions in the classroom, especially</p>	

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			if they relate to the performance of students with disabilities and English learners.	
<b>Total (out of 40) Criteria (a) (auto-total):</b>	<b><u>27</u></b>			
<p><b>(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support. (Up to 20 points total)</b>  <b>(b)(1) (5 points)</b> The extent and depth of prior experience that the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, and its LEAs have in developing and implementing the components of the innovative assessment system. An SEA may also describe the prior experience of any external partners that will be participating in or supporting its demonstration authority in implementing those components. In evaluating the extent and depth of prior experience, the Secretary considers—</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) The success and track record of efforts to implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items aligned to the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the</p>	<b>(b)(1):</b>	4	<p><b>(b)(1)(i)</b>                      North Carolina has been developing its assessments in collaboration with North Carolina State University since the early 1990s. In this collaboration, assessments have consistently met the requirements of the USDE peer reviews. NCPAT will be developed and implemented with the same documented processes and procedures as those North Carolina adheres to for its statewide summative assessments. This includes processes that ensure universal design and accessibility by all students, including students with disabilities and English learners.</p> <p><b>(b)(1)(ii)(A)</b>                      NC cites a state statute and regulations designed to ensure the participation of children with disabilities and English learners using accommodations and alternate assessments based on appropriate documentation. The NCPDI</p>	No data is provided to support evidence of validity and reliability of the NC Check-Ins.

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>Act in LEAs planning to participate; and</p> <p>(ii) The SEA's or LEA's development or use of--</p> <p>(A) Effective supports and appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR part 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act for administering innovative assessments to all students, including English learners and children with disabilities, which must include professional development for school staff on providing such accommodations;</p> <p>(B) Effective and high-quality supports for school staff to implement innovative assessments and innovative assessment items, including professional development; and</p> <p>(C) Standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, methods, or other strategies for scoring innovative assessments, with documented evidence of the validity, reliability, and comparability of annual</p>			<p>publishes and distributes the Testing Students with Disabilities and Guidelines for Testing Students Identified as English Learners to support the inclusion of all students.</p> <p><b>(b)(1)(ii)(B)</b> North Carolina State University develops and maintains the online testing platform, supporting its use with a Help Desk for teachers and district/school staff. Feedback from users contributes to on-going improvement of the online delivery system. In addition, the NCDPI gathers direct feedback from the Control Configuration Board, a group of testing and accountability coordinators representing the six accountability regions of the state, and works with the NC State University team to identify solutions.</p> <p><b>(b)(1)(ii)(C)</b> According to the state, the NC Check-Ins, the reliability index of the multiple-choice tests that will serve as the foundation of the proposed NCPAT has improved over administrations. The tests are constructed representing width and breadth of the summative blueprints,</p>	

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>summative determinations of achievement, consistent with 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4) and (7). <b>(5 points)</b></p>			<p>and test items are developed by embedding into the field test slot of the summative assessments indicating construct validity of the NC Check-Ins. Initial analysis indicated that there is a positive correlation between the scores in NC Check-Ins and summative end-of-grade assessments indicating possible predictive validity of the NC Check-Ins.</p>	
<p><b>(b)(2) (5 points)</b> 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</p>	<p><b>(b)(2):</b></p>	<p>4</p>	<p><b>(b)(2)(i)</b> Since the 1990s, the North Carolina State University, through a partnership with the Technical Outreach for Public Schools, has developed the NC assessments. The NCDPI states that the development of four editions of statewide assessments, which have consistently met the U.S. Department of Education's peer review, as evidence of the State's capacity to support its proposed demonstration authority. In addition, North Carolina has developed innovative assessments such as the online computer skills test in the early 2000s, a modified assessment in the mid-2000s, and assessments that align to extended content standards, currently being revised for an online administration. This work is supported by NCDPI</p>	<p>No examples were provided regarding specific strategies to address specific risks.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>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. <b>(5 points)</b></p>			<p>internal teams and external teams that have extensive knowledge of test development and the requirements for valid and reliable assessments, such as various institutions of higher learning, the Regional Accountability Coordinators, the North Carolina Technical Advisors, and others. The NCDPI also has a team of Regional Accountability Coordinators who provide training and technical assistance for all aspects of testing and accountability, while the Testing News Network system broadcasts updates and information on North Carolina testing and accountability to designated local staff.</p> <p><b>(b)(2)(ii)</b>                      To minimize risks, the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction proactively engages with experts in testing and accountability to identify the soundest technical approach that will yield valid and reliable results.</p>	
<p><b>(b)(3) (10 points)</b>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</p>	<p><b>(b)(3):</b></p>	<p>3</p>	<p><b>(b)(3)(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)</b>                      The application provides signatures of superintendents of districts participating in the first year of the demonstration authority period, as</p>	<p>No explicit information is provided regarding the participation of expert/stakeholders/parents representing the interests of children with disabilities and/or English</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>demonstrated by signatures from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Superintendents (or equivalent) of LEAs, including participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority period.</li> <li>(ii) Presidents of local school boards (or equivalent, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority.</li> <li>(iii) Local teacher organizations (including labor organizations, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority.</li> <li>(iv) Other affected stakeholders, such as parent organizations, civil rights organizations, and business organizations. <b>(10 points)</b></li> </ul>		<p>well as the signatures of the director of an education-related business enterprise and a college professor.</p>	<p>learners and civil rights organizations.</p>
<b>Total (out of 20) Criteria (b) (auto-total):</b>	<b><u>11</u></b>		

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p><b>(c) Timeline and budget. (Up to 15 points)</b>                      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—  <b>(c)(1) (5 points).</b> The extent to which the timeline reasonably demonstrates that each SEA will implement the system statewide by the end of the requested demonstration authority period, including a description of--</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) The activities to occur in each year of the requested demonstration authority period;</li> <li>(ii) The parties responsible for each activity; and</li> <li>(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</li> </ul>	<p><b>(c)(1):</b></p>	<p>5</p>	<p><b>(c)(1)(i)</b>                      The NCDPI will develop a through-grade assessment for grades 3–8 in mathematics and English language arts/reading over 5 years. The participating schools will administer the NCPAT for specific grade levels in Year 2 and Year 3. For example, in Year 2 the mathematics NCPAT will be administered at grade 4 only in a participating school with grades 3–5. However, students in all grade levels will participate in the statewide end-of-grade assessments. This will provide comparability data for the grade 4 students who take both assessments. This continues for Year 3 when the innovative assessment is expanded to additional grade levels. As with Year 2, not all grade levels in the grade span at participating schools will participate in the NCPAT, but all students will participate in the statewide end-of-grade assessments. Thus, in Year 4 when the NCPAT data is used for participating schools’ accountability data, there will be two years of comparability data for the NCPAT and the statewide end-of-grade assessments to affirm high expectations for all students are</p>	

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>in the same school year consistent with 34 CFR part 200.104(b)(2); <b>(5 points)</b> and</p>			<p>maintained and the resulting academic achievement levels are consistent with those for the statewide end-of-grade summative assessments. This timeline will ensure appropriate analyses and technical review to support the combining of the three through-grade assessments into one summative score for each student prior to the statewide administration. It will also allow the development and design to be revised as needed to meet the technical requirements.</p> <p><b>(c)(1)(ii)</b>                      The NCDPI, with its partnership with the Technical Outreach for Public Schools at North State University, will ensure the test development follows the test development process specified in North Carolina State Board of Education policy (Appendix G). This process is operationalized in flow charts developed by Technical Outreach for Public Schools and approved by the NCDPI (Appendix H), and includes the use of panels of English language arts/reading and mathematics teachers to provide feedback on the test specifications</p>	

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			<p>Throughout the demonstration period, analyses will be considered that would provide technical strength to the assessments, particularly as related to their use in the statewide accountability system for achievement and growth.</p> <p>Several charts provide the tasks and deliverables for each year of the demonstration period. As North Carolina State University is the NCDPI's development partner, many of the tasks are the shared responsibility of both; however, the NCDPI is ultimately responsible for the fulfillment of this work.</p>	
<p>(c)(2) (10 points). The adequacy of the project budget for the duration of the requested demonstration authority period, including Federal, State, local, and non-public sources of funds to support and sustain, as applicable, the activities in the timeline under paragraph (c)(1) of this section, including--</p>	<p>(c)(2):</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>(c)(2)(i) The NCPDI does not expect a significant increase in funding to develop the NCPAT. The primary work of the NCDPI's contract with North Carolina State University is the development of statewide assessments, of which funding is consistently provided from the North</p>	<p>The budget only provides a general estimate of what the cost will be, without any itemization.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>(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. <b>(10 points)</b></p>			<p>Carolina General Assembly and the federally-funded State Assessment Grant. The annual state budget of \$12 million plus the annual federal State Assessment Grant of approximately \$9 million will meet most of the cost demands for the transition to a through-grade assessment system.</p> <p>The major work tasks cited in the North Carolina State University contract include item development and online assessment delivery, so a contract amendment is not needed. However, throughout the demonstration period, the NCDPI will monitor cost projections, and possibly include in the 2021–22 and 2022–23 biennial budget a request for additional funding.</p> <p>All collaborative partners cited in this application are on-going relationships and do not require an increase in funding. The use of an external evaluator represents an additional cost for the Office of Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Services project through the University of North Carolina at Greensboro; however, current resources in the State Assessment Grant will fund this</p>	

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			work, so it is not necessary to request additional funds.	
<b>Total (out of 15) Criteria (c):</b>	<b>10</b>			
<p><b>(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents. (Up to 25 points)</b>                      The quality of the SEA or consortium’s plan to provide supports that can be delivered consistently at scale to educators, students, and parents to enable successful implementation of the innovative assessment system and improve instruction and student outcomes. In determining the quality of supports, the Secretary considers—</p> <p><b>(d)(1) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 9 points if factor (4) is inapplicable).</b> The extent to which the SEA or consortium has developed, provided, and will continue to provide training to LEA and school staff, including teachers, principals, and other school leaders, that will familiarize them with the innovative assessment system and develop teacher capacity to implement instruction that is informed by the innovative assessment system and its results;</p>	<b>(d)(1):</b>	7	<p><b>(d)(1)</b>                      The NCDPI states that the associated webinars, trainings, and surveys have ensured teachers, parents, and students have the necessary information to not only administer the assessments but also to appropriately use the data, particularly the score reports.</p> <p>North Carolina relies on its Regional Accountability Coordinators to share information on testing and accountability per a train-the-trainer model. With NC Check-Ins, the NCDPI went beyond this training structure to directly deliver trainings. The reception has been positive with a recent NC Check-Ins webinar far exceeding other webinars with respect to the number of clicks to listen to the recording.</p>	No evidence is provided to support the claim that the existing supports to administer assessments and interpret score data (i.e., webinars, trainings, surveys) will enable successful implementation of the innovative system.
<b>(d)(2) (5 points if factor (4) is</b>	<b>(d)(2):</b>	8	<b>(d)(2)</b>	.

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback-Weaknesses
<p><b>applicable; 8 points if factor (4) is inapplicable)</b> The strategies the SEA or consortium has developed and will use to familiarize students and parents with the innovative assessment system;</p>			<p>The NCDPI will collaborate with the Division of Communications to ensure information is shared with parents throughout the demonstration period. Through the parent portal in PowerSchool, informational messages and surveys to gather feedback can be sent to parents. A recent delivery of a survey on testing yielded over 40,000 responses from parents. To gather feedback from students, the NCDPI will conduct cognitive labs during each year of the demonstration period beginning with Year 2. These sessions will focus on the usability of the system, the accessibility of the items, and the value of having the through-grade model as opposed to a summative assessment at the end of the year.</p>	
<p><b>(d)(3) (5 points if factor (4) is applicable; 8 points if factor (4) is inapplicable)</b> 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</p>	<p><b>(d)(3):</b></p>	<p>7</p>	<p><b>(d)(3)</b> The NCDPI requires students with an Individualized Education Program (IEP) and/or an English learner (EL) plan to receive appropriate accommodations as specified in the IEP or the EL plan and as used routinely in the classroom. This is communicated extensively in all assessment administration guides, the district test coordinators' handbook,</p>	<p>It is not clear whether the accommodations listed are for the end-of-year summative state assessment or for the NCPAT.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act, needed to meet the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act; and			assessment briefs, the <i>Testing Students with Disabilities</i> document, and the <i>Guidelines for Testing Students Identified as English Learners</i> document. For each test administration, training on the delivery of accommodations is provided and required prior to the administration.	
<b>(d)(4) (10 points if applicable).</b> 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	<b>(d)(4):</b>		<b>(d)(4)</b> The innovative assessment does not include any items locally developed or scored locally.	

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
effective professional development to aid in these efforts <b>(10 points if applicable)</b>				
<b>Total (out of 25) Criteria (d):</b>	<b><u>22</u></b>			
<p><b>(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement. (Up to 20 points)</b>                      The quality of the SEA’s or consortium’s plan to annually evaluate its implementation of innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers—</p> <p><b>(e)(1) (12 points)</b> The strength of the proposed evaluation of the innovative assessment system included in the application, including whether the evaluation will be conducted by an independent, experienced third party, and the likelihood that the evaluation will sufficiently determine the system’s validity, reliability, and comparability to the statewide assessment system consistent with the requirements of 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4) and (9); and</p>	<b>(e)(1):</b>	6	<p><b>(e)(1)</b>                      For the innovative assessment, the NCDPI will amend its current contract with the University of North Carolina at Greensboro to conduct an evaluation. The evaluation will include several reviews, including training materials and professional development activities, the delivery of accommodations, the online delivery system and its accessibility for all students and all subgroups of students, the appropriateness and usability of the Individual Student Reports for parents, the usability of all score reports and the extent to which they are used at the classroom level to make decisions on instructional delivery, and review of the standard setting process, the validity evidence for the assessment, and the reliability statistics.</p>	<p>The evaluation plan needs a breakdown of activities, such as the results of the study on the comparability of the NCPAT to the state assessment.</p> <p>Need clarification on whether the evaluation will be done annually or prior to Year 3 or at the final year of the pilot.</p>
<p><b>(e)(2) (8 points)</b> The SEA’s or consortium’s plan for continuous</p>	<b>(e)(2):</b>	8	<p><b>(e)(2)</b>                      Throughout the demonstration period,</p>	<p>No details are provided on how the data collected will be used to improve</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
<p>improvement of the innovative assessment system, including its process for--</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(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</li> <li>(ii) Evaluating and monitoring implementation of the innovative assessment system in participating LEAs and schools annually.</li> </ul>			<p>the NCDPI will do formal on-site observations and monitoring of the operation of the NCPAT at the classroom level. (Appendix J).</p> <p>Throughout the demonstration period, the NCDPI will review data, feedback, evaluation results, and other information to improve the innovative assessment. At the school-level, this is done formally through on-site observations and monitoring by the NCDPI and regional staff (Appendix J). Following each year of the demonstration period, the NCDPI will convene the Test Development Section, the Testing Policy and Operations Section, the North Carolina Technical Advisors for their input on the development and the implementation in order to improve the internal processes and to make needed changes to the test design, administration, reports, and communication to educators, students, and parents, and the inclusion of all students and subgroups. Likewise, input will be sought from periodic updates to the State Board of Education and the Testing and Growth Advisory on the need for professional development</p>	<p>the quality of the innovative assessments.</p>

## IADA Application Technical Review Form Application A: North Carolina

---

Application Selection Criteria	Reviewers score for this part		Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Strengths	Reviewer Comments/Feedback- Weaknesses
			and training for teachers.	
<b>Total (out of 20) Criteria (e): (auto-total)</b>	<b><u>14</u></b>			
<b>Total (out of 120) (a+b+c+d+e) (auto-total)</b>	<b><u>84</u></b>			