



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Johnny Key
Commissioner
Arkansas Department of Education
Four Capitol Mall
Little Rock, AR 72201

August 13, 2019

Dear Commissioner Key:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (the Department's) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). I appreciate the efforts of the Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) to prepare for the English language proficiency (ELP) peer review that occurred in April 2019. Specifically, ADE submitted evidence regarding the English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century (ELPA21).

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and its implementing regulations require a State to ensure that its local educational agencies (LEAs) provide an annual ELP assessment of all English learners (ELs) in grades K-12 in schools served by the State (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(G); 34 CFR § 200.6(h)). Specifically, the ESEA requires a State to develop a uniform statewide ELP assessment to measure the ELP of all ELs in the State, including ELs with disabilities, and to provide an alternate ELP assessment (AELPA) for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who cannot participate in the regular ELP assessment even with accommodations (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(G); 34 CFR § 200.6(h)(1), (5)). The ESEA and its implementing regulations require that a State's ELP assessments, including the AELPA, be aligned with the State's ELP standards, provide valid and reliable measures of the State's ELP standards, and be of adequate technical quality (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(G); 34 CFR §§ 200.2(b)(2), (b)(4), (b)(5), 200.6(h)(2)).

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated ADE's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that this component of your assessment system met some, but not all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of the ESEA. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- General ELP assessment (ELPA21): **Partially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by ESSA.**

An assessment that partially meets requirements does not meet a number of the requirements of the statute and regulations and ADE will need to provide substantial additional information to demonstrate it meets the requirements. The Department realizes that this was the first time your State was required to provide its ELP assessment for peer review and recognizes that it may take some time to address all of the required items. The specific list of items required for ADE to submit is enclosed with this letter.

400 MARYLAND AVE., SW, WASHINGTON, DC 20202
<http://www.ed.gov/>

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

I also note that ADE did not submit evidence for an AELPA for ELs with significant cognitive disabilities who are unable to take the regular ELP assessment. Within 30 days, ADE must provide a plan and timeline outlining when it will submit all required documentation for ELPA21 peer review and the development and administration of an AELPA, including when this required assessment will be submitted for peer review. Resubmission should occur once all necessary evidence is complete (rather than in multiple submissions). The Department is placing a condition on ADE's Title I, Part A grant award. The condition shall remain until ADE's ELP and alternate ELP assessments have been determined to meet all requirements. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action.

Additionally, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) will monitor progress on matters pertaining to requirements in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) related to the participation of students with disabilities in Title I assessments. In particular, OSERS will monitor progress against critical elements 1.4, 4.2, 5.1 and 5.3. Insufficient progress to address such matters may lead OSERS to place a condition on ADE's Federal fiscal year 2020 IDEA Part B grant award.

The full peer review notes from the review are enclosed. These recommendations to the Department formed the basis of our determination. Please note that the peers' recommendations may differ from the Department's feedback; we encourage you to read the full peer notes for additional suggestions and recommendations for improving your assessment system beyond what is noted in the Department's feedback. Department staff will reach out to your assessment director in the next few days to discuss the peer notes and the Department's determination and to answer any questions you have.

Thank you for your ongoing commitment to improving educational outcomes for all students. I look forward to our continued partnership as we move ahead with this critical work. I appreciate the work you are doing to improve your schools and provide a high-quality education for your students.

If you have any questions, please contact my staff at: ESEA.Assessment@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan
Assistant Secretary for
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Hope Warsham, Director of Assessment

Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed to Meet the Requirements for Arkansas’ Use of the ELPA21 as an English Language Proficiency Assessment

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
1.3 – Required ELP Assessments	For the State’s English Language Proficiency (ELP) assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State includes English learners (ELs) with significant cognitive disabilities in the statewide ELP assessment, either through the general ELP assessment or an alternate ELP assessment (AELPA).
1.4 – Policies for Including All ELs in ELP Assessments	For the State’s ELP assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As noted above in critical element 1.3, evidence that the State includes ELs with significant cognitive disabilities in the statewide ELP assessment, either through the general ELP assessment or an AELPA.
2.1 – Test Design and Development	For ELPA21: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of ELPA21 test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results such as unredacted blueprints and test form construction guides or evidence that includes but is not limited to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Information on how many standards each test form is assessing and how many standards are not assessed by form and grade or grade band. ○ The proportion of hand-scored items by grade-band domain versus the proportion of machine-scored items. ○ A rationale for assessing/not assessing standards. ○ Documentation and a description of how the test blueprints support the intended interpretation and uses of the results. • Evidence of processes to ensure that the ELPA21 assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s ELP standards and reflects appropriate inclusion of the range of complexity found in the standards (e.g., strong, independent evidence of alignment).
2.2 – Item Development	For ELPA21: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that ELPA21 uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student ELP based on the State’s ELP standards in terms of content and language processes (e.g., evidence that ensures that future item development will address gaps identified in the alignment study, specifically the relative lack of items in terms of language and content processes, the lack of items that measure certain standards, and the production of more difficult items for some test forms).
2.3 – Test Administration	For ELPA21: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) has established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration (e.g., evidence of the actual plans; and evidence that local educational agency staff have been made aware of these plans).
2.5 – Test Security	For ELPA21: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that ADE has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>of test results, specifically practices or procedures for maintaining the security of test materials during ELPA21 test development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of remediation in the event of security incidents involving ELPA21 (e.g., summaries of test security incident resolutions).
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of procedures to protect the integrity and confidentiality of personally identifiable information (PII) about any individual student in reporting (e.g., rules for statistical aggregation that demonstrate the protection of PII in test reporting).
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between ELPA21 and the ELP standards the assessment is designed to measure in terms of language knowledge and skills and the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards across all proficiency levels, domains, and modalities identified therein (e.g., unredacted blueprints and test form construction guides; strong evidence of alignment; checklists for reviewing items; item development plans; field test plans). • Documentation of alignment between the State’s ELP standards and the language demands implied by, or explicitly stated in, the State’s academic content standards (e.g., evidence to support the use of the ELPA21 for exit decisions in EL programs).
3.2 – Validity Based on Linguistic Processes	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that ELPA21 taps the intended language processes appropriate for each grade level/grade-band as represented in the State’s ELP standards (e.g., results of an independent external alignment study after previous identified gaps have been addressed; or cognitive labs to demonstrate that test items assess the intended linguistic processes).
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s ELP standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based (e.g., evidence that there are sufficient numbers of high difficulty items on all domains of the lower grade band tests and on the writing, listening and speaking domains in grade 6-8 and 9-12).
4.1 – Reliability	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reliability evidence, specifically evidence of conditional standard error of measurement of ELPA21 (e.g., for students of higher abilities).
4.2 – Fairness and accessibility	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that ELPA21 has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all EL students and fair across student groups, including ELs with disabilities, in the design, development, and analysis (e.g., evidence of item writer training materials that address accessibility; and evidence of processes in the development of accommodated forms of the tests that ensure accessibility for ELs with disabilities).

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that ELPA21 provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including performance for EL students with high and low levels of English language proficiency and with different proficiency profiles across the domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing (e.g., item maps showing difficulty and student ability across the performance continuum in each domain and overall).
4.4 – Scoring	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for the ELPA21 that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s ELP standards (e.g., detailed information regarding item-level scoring procedures, hand-scoring criteria, and inter-scorer reliability reports). • For ELs who have a disability that precludes assessment in one or more of the required domains, a description of how the State ensures it will ensure that the student is assessed in the remaining domain(s)/component(s) in which it is possible to assess the student, and a description of how this assessment will occur.
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the paper and Braille versions of the ELPA21: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments. ○ Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of the ELPA21, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of the assessment (e.g., evidence that the 2013 plan for quality assurance has been implemented).
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For ELs who have a disability that precludes assessment in one or more of the required domains, a description of how the State ensures it will ensure that the student is assessed in the remaining domain(s)/component(s) in which it is possible to assess the student, and a description of how this assessment will occur. Evidence submitted in response to critical element 4.4 will also apply to this critical element.
5.3 – Accommodations	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that ADE makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its ELP assessments are accessible to ELs with disabilities, specifically ELs with significant cognitive disabilities.
6.4 – Reporting	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State reports ELPA21 results for all ELs assessed, specifically that and the reporting facilitates timely interpretations and uses

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public (e.g., provide a reporting schedule).

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

April State ELP Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS4
Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of ELP Standards for All English Learners 4
Critical Element 1.2 – Coherent and Progressive ELP Standards that Correspond to the State’s Academic Content Standards 5
Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments..... 7
Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments .. 8
Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments..... 9

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS.....10
Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development 10
Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development 12
Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration..... 13
Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration 16
Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security..... 18
Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 22

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY25
Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content25
Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Linguistic Processes..... 27
Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 28
Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables..... 29

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER.....30
Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability 30
Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility 32
Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum 33
Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 34
Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 36
Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment..... 37
Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 38

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS.....38
Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 38
Critical Element 5.2 – DOES NOT APPLY to ELP Assessment Peer Review41
Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations 42
Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

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

..... 47

SECTION 6: ELP ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING.....52

Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of ELP Achievement Standards for All Students..... 52

Critical Element 6.2 – ELP Achievement Standards Setting 53

Critical Element 6.3 –Aligned ELP Achievement Standards 54

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting 55

SECTION 7: DOES NOT APPLY TO ELP ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW58

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For English language proficiency (ELP) standards:</i> The State formally adopted K-12 ELP standards for all ELs in public schools in the State.</p>	<p><u>(ST. 1.1) State’s Response:</u> On January 27-28, 2014, a committee of English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers, administrators, and university professors representing the state of Arkansas met to discuss and review the appropriateness of the English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards for usage by Arkansas. The committee examined the alignment of these standards to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and the resources available at the time and projected for future release to support school districts in the development of curricula. The Curriculum and Instruction Unit on the Division of Learning Services at the Arkansas Department of Education recommended the adoption of the ELP Standards, to be implemented in the 2014-2015 school year with full implementation in the 2015-2016 school year. A motion to adopt was moved by Ms. Reith and was seconded by Dr. Barth. The motion carried unanimously at the March 20, 2014, State Board of Education meeting.</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SE 1.1 ELP Standards Adoption - Board of Ed minutes - pp. 7-8 • SE 1.1 Arkansas ELP Standards 08 09 2018 RV.pdf 	<p><u>Peers’ Comments:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AR provides adequate evidence to support the formal adoption of the ELP standards for K-12 curriculum and instruction in public schools. 2. However, while implied by reference to the “full implementation” (SE 1.1. ELP Standards Adoption – Board of Ed minutes - p. 7) of the ELP standards, the reviewers were unable to locate in either evidentiary document an explicit statement that AR’s ELP standards apply to all ELs in the schools served by that SEA.
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>For ELP standards: The ELP standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing; • address the different proficiency levels of ELs; and • align to the State academic content standards (see definition¹). The ELP standards must contain language proficiency expectations that reflect the language needed for ELs to acquire and demonstrate their achievement of the knowledge and skills identified in the State’s academic content standards appropriate to each grade-level/grade-band in at least reading/language arts, mathematics, and science. 	<p><u>(ST.1.2.1) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>The Alternate Organization of the ELP Standards shows the domains (listening, speaking, reading, writing) specific to each standard and the related modality (receptive, productive, interactive).</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. • SE 1.1 Arkansas_UP_Standards 08 09 2018 RV - p. 18 <p><u>ST.1.2.2 State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>Each grade band (K,1, 2-3, 4-5,6-8,9-12) has five proficiency levels (1-5, 1=lowest -5+highest) indicating a progression in the student’s ability in the standard.</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. 	<p><u>Peers’ Comments:</u></p> <p><u>CE 1.2.1</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AR elaborates in their State response with an explanation that the Alternate Organization of the ELP Standards shows the domains (listening, speaking, reading, writing) specific to each standard and the related modality (receptive, productive, interactive). This is documented in the supplementary evidence provided by the State. <p><u>CE 1.2.2</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AR elaborates in their State response with an explanation that each grade band has five proficiency levels, indicating a progression a student’s ability in the standard. <p><u>CE 1.2.3</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AR elaborates by noting the creation by ADE of a concordance of the ELP Standards and the content standards that is included in the AR ELP Standards document. 2. Although the external independent reviews of the State’s ELP standards was addressed by the ELPA21 Consortium, it would have enhanced this response by including evidence of reviews by educators in AR (see Guidance, p. 31). This detail is, in fact, included in other evidence (see, for example, SE 1.4.1. Testing Policies and Procedures Manual 2019, p. 5).

¹ see page 24 of “*A State’s Guide to the U.S. Department of Education’s Assessment Peer Review Process*”, September 24, 2018 available at: www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SF 1.1 Arkansas ELT Standards 08 09 2018 RV - p. 16 (paragraph 2) & pp. 19-42 <p><u>(ST.1.2.3) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. The Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) created a concordance of the ELP Standards and the content standards. This concordance, along with the Standards Relationships and Convergences (created by Understanding Language - Stanford University) are included in the Arkansas ELP Standards document. <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. • SE 1.1 Arkansas ELP Standards 08 09 2018 RV - pp. 48-223 • SE 1.1 Arkansas ELP Standards_08 09_2018_RV - pp. 44-47 • SE 1.2.3 Standards Relationships and Convergences 	
Section 1.2 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s assessment system includes an annual general and alternate ELP assessment (aligned with State ELP standards) administered to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All ELs in grades K-12. 	<p><u>(ST.1.3) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>The ELPA21 is administered annually to all K- 12 English Learners in the spring of each year. Currently, Arkansas does not have an alternate UP assessment: however, the state is participating in the ELPA21 efforts to produce an alternate ELP assessment and will deliver it when it is ready.</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. SE 1.3 Testing Calendar Memo SE 1.3 Alt-F,LPA Development Timeline - Chart Outline 	<p>Evidence clearly states that all ELs must participate in an annual ELP assessment. However, evidence also clearly states the State does not have an AELPA for ELs with significant cognitive disabilities. Evidence 1.3-alt does provide a timeline for developing an AELPA.</p> <p>While the State has documented its efforts to test all Els, it has not submitted an alternate ELP assessment (AELPA) for ELs with significant cognitive disabilities for this peer review.</p>
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> evidence that the State includes ELs with significant cognitive disabilities in Statewide ELP assessment, either through the general ELP assessment or an alternate ELP assessment (AELPA). 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State has policies that require the inclusion <i>of all public elementary and secondary ELs in the State’s ELP assessment</i>, including ELs with disabilities. 	<p>(ST.1.4.1) State's Response: AR Annotated Code 6-15-2907 states that the statewide student assessment system shall include assessment of English proficiency of all English learners. Subsequent policy and guidance documents in the State's Evidence reinforce this requirement. ADE Office of Student Assessment regularly communicates with district test coordinators (DTCs) and provides training to reinforce EL inclusion in state assessments.</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SE 1.4.1 ELPA21 code for testing.pdf SE 1.4.1 Including ELs with Disabilities in assessment SE 1.4.1 Policy and Requirements Webinar November 9 - slide 19 SE 1.4.1 Testing Policies and Procedures Manual 2019 181108 03.pdf - pp. 2-6. 10 SE 1.4.1 2018 Final ADE Guidelines for Assessment Accessibility - pp. 3-6. 11-13 SE 1.4.1 ELPA21 AA Manual in LiveBinder SE 1.4.1 ELPA21 2018 19 AA Manual.pdf 	<p>Evidence clearly indicates that ELs are to be assessed with the ELP assessment, and reinforces the guidance given to LEAs in CE 1.3. Evidence clearly states that all students, including all ELs must participate in statewide assessment, including the ELP assessment.</p> <p>Other evidences reinforce AR’s policies regarding the inclusion of all ELs in ELP assessment. As noted above in 1.3, the State does not an AELPA.</p>
<p>Section 1.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>X As also noted in critical element 1.3, the following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> evidence that the State includes ELs with significant cognitive disabilities in Statewide ELP assessment, either through the general ELP assessment or an alternate ELP assessment (AELPA). 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State has developed or amended challenging <i>ELP</i> standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education). • Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas). • Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State. • Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents. 	<p>In critical 1.1, the State documented their adoption of ELP standards prior to December 2015.</p>	<p>Because the State adopted their ELP standards prior to the passage of the ESSA, this critical element does not apply to the State’s ELP submission.</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required because this critical element does not apply to this peer review, given the date of the State’s adoption of ELP standards.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <i>the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards</i>, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <i>the State’s ELP standards</i>, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. • Processes to ensure that the ELP assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <i>the State’s ELP standards</i> and reflects appropriate inclusion of the range of complexity found in the standards. • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and intended uses and interpretations of results. <p>If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting.</p>	<p>ELPA21 provides evidence for CE 2.1</p>	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be <i>entirely</i> administered through a portfolio.		
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See ELPA 21 consortium peer notes 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess student English language proficiency based on the <i>State’s ELP standards</i> in terms of content and language processes. 	ELPA21 provides evidence for CE 2.2	
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See ELPA 21 consortium peer notes 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p><u>(ST.2.3.1) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional 'information. <p>The ADE Assessment Office produces newsletters that it sends to each District Test Coordinator (DTC); these newsletters include information, including administration procedures for assessments and accommodations, across all state-required assessments, including ELPA21. In addition to this, each assessment, including ELPA21, has ADE-produced informational/training webinars that it provides to the DTCs and any other testing personnel who may wish to view the information. Finally, ELPA21, in addition to all state-required assessments, has system-specific training modules and manuals.</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. • SE 1.4.1 Testing Policies and Procedures Manual 2019 181108_03.pdf- pp. 1-5, 7, 10 • SE 2.3.1 #1 Newsletter 18 19.pdf- ELPA21 section (general information for beginning of school year) • SE 2.3.1 #8 DTC Weekly Newsletter 2018_19.pdf - ELPA21 section (specific information for summative administration) • SE 2.3.1 ELPA21 for ESL Personnel webinar.pdf 	<p><u>Peers' Comments:</u></p> <p><u>CE 2.3.1</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AR provides evidence to support the standardized testing conditions by following the ELP21 and AIR test administration manuals, and online testing requirements in technology. 2. AR provides additional information about test administration, including ELPA21 manuals, newsletters to District Test Coordinators (DTCs) for up-to-date information, training webinars for all personnel involved in testing activities, and state-specific training modules. <p><u>CE 2.3.2</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AR provides additional details to explain the ADE requirements that DTCs should train all district personnel of administering the ELPA21. 2. While evidence makes clear that AR has established procedures for test administration training for all personnel involved, reviewers would have liked to have seen documentation beyond the District Level Affidavit that such procedures were followed. <p><u>CE 2.3.3</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Following the requirements from ELPA21, AR installed or updated a secure browser on testing devices at district level, as well as provided instructions for online testing. SE 2.3.1 Arkansas-ELP21-Online-Summative-Test-Administration-Manual (p. 41) provides detailed information (e.g., ELPA21 Help Desk and ELPA21 Portal) for technical issues during administration.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SE 2.3.1 Test-Delivery-System-TDS-Overview-without-audio.pdf • SE 2.3.1 Arkansas-ELPA21-Online-Summative-Test-Administration-Manual.pdf • SE 2.3.1 DEI-Paper-Test-Administration-without-audio.pdf • SE 1.4.1 ELPA21 2018 19 AA Manual.pdf • SE 2.3.1 2019_District_Level_Affidavit.pdf <p><u>(ST.2.3.2) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>ADE requires all DTCs to train the appropriate district personnel to administer all state-required assessments, including ELPA21. This training includes has to appropriately administer assessments with both Special Education and ESL accommodations.</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <p>In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SE 2.3.2 Duties of a DTC Final.pdf • SE 1.4.1 2018 Final ADE Guidelines for Assessment Accessibility.pdf - pp. 3, 5, 7-8, 12-13 • SE 2.3.1 ELPA21 for ESL Personnel webinar.pdf - slide 19 • SE 2.3.1 Arkansas-ELPA21-Online-Summative-Test-Administration-Manual.pdf I • SE 2.3.1 2019_District_Level_Affidavit.pdf 	<p>3. Reviewers would like to see more details on state-specific contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</p>
--	--	--

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

	<p><u>(ST.2.3.3) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>ADE and the ELPA21 assessment system require that a secure browser be installed on each testing device to allow for lock-down of the device for testing. District technology personnel install/update the secure browser as appropriate. Additionally, test administrators (TAs) have written instructions on how to administer the online assessment.</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. • SE 2.3.3 AR_Tech_Specs_Manual.pdt. • SE 2.3.1 Arkansas-ELPA21 -Online-Summative-Test-Administration-Manual.pdf - pp. 1-2, 21-29, 41 	
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AR should provide additional evidence to support the state-specific contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general ELP assessments and the AELPA.</p>	<p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p> <p><u>(ST.2.4) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>ADE is committed to ensuring that standardized testing procedures are implemented with fidelity. ELPA21 testing is monitored annually. Monitors are ADE staff members who are trained by the Office of Student Assessment. Monitored districts are chosen based on one of the following: the district had a major testing infraction the prior year's administration; there has been a report of possible testing impropriety; or the school is randomly-selected from among those that have not been monitored in recent years. All monitor visits are unannounced, and monitors are required to submit a detailed report following the visit. Districts are required to submit testing schedules to the ADE prior to the opening of the ELPA21 window and are allowed to adjust the calendar only in case of an emergency and as approved by ADE. ADE addresses founded improprieties via communication with the district superintendent.</p> <p>Currently, Arkansas does not have an alternate form of ELPA, as mentioned in Critical Element 1.3.</p>	<p>The evidence submitted by the State describe a thorough program of monitoring of the ELP assessment by the State. The evidence supports that the State ensures that test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across schools and districts.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

	<p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. • SE 2.4 2019 ELPA21 Monitor Training.pdf • SE 2.4 Test Monitor Checklist Spring 2019 ELPA21.pdf • SE 2.4 Example Monitoring Training Sign-in.pdf • SE 2.4 Example Monitoring Notification email.pdf • SE 2.4 2018_19 Summative Security Agreement_final10_1.pdf • SE 2.4 Sample 45 letter 	
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. • Application of test security procedures to the general ELP assessments and the AELPA. 	<p><u>(ST.2.5.1) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>Every year. ADE trains the DTCs on incidents that are considered testing irregularities, on how to plan to help prevent them, and on what to do if one occurs. This training is across all state-required assessments and includes ELPA21.</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. • SE 1.4.1 Testing Policies and Procedures Manual 2019 181108_03.pd1' - pp. 5 & 7 (8) • SE 2.5.1 Test Security Monitoring and Irregularities.pdf - slides 28 – 36 • SE 2.5.1 District-School Testing Impropriety Report Form_Fillable <p><u>(ST.2.5.2) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>ADE provides the reporting form template that all districts must use when reporting testing improprieties and irregularities. ADE includes this template in its resources made available to DTCs. In the Arkansas Department of Education - Rules Governing the Arkansas Educational Support and Accountability Act (AESAA), Superintendents or DTCs are required to submit all testing improprieties and irregularities.</p>	<p><u>Peers' Comments:</u></p> <p><u>CE 2.5.1</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AR provides additional information to address the State’s policy and procedures for test security (e.g., SE 1.4.1 Testing Policies and Procedures Manual, p. 5, training district test coordinators on test irregularities, and SE 2.5.1 Test Security Monitoring and Irregularities for violations). 2. The reviewers were unable to find the description of security features for the storage/relaying of test materials among the evidentiary documents listed for this CE, although it does appear in the Summative Test Administration Manual for Online Testing for ELPA21 (and would have been helpful to have been included in this section). <p><u>CE 2.5.2</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AR provides limited information/evidence to support the process for detection of test irregularities, and the consequences of those test irregularities and incidents. 2. The focus of these evidentiary documents seems to be on irregularities instigated by student(s), leading to the invalidation of student test results. The reviewers were unable to find any evidence of detection of irregularities for which others besides student(s) were responsible. 3. The reviewers were unable to find any documentation of test security incidents from the most recent test administration(s) with types and frequencies, and/or examples how they were addressed. Provided documents focused on policy (what should be done) rather than actual practice (what was done) related to identifying, tracking, and

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

	<p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. • SE2.5.1 District-School Testing Impropriety Report Form_Fillable • SE 2.5.2 Testing Impropriety Form location in LiveBinder resource.pdf • SE 2.5.2 ade 348 AESAA_Act_930_FINAL_Rules_Eff_09.01.2018.pdf - Section 5.22 <p><u>(ST.2.5.3) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>Once ADE receives a completed reporting form from a district, Assessment personnel evaluate the evidence and contact the district via email or official letter depending upon the severity of the violation.</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. • SE 2.5.3 Sample email wordings for different situations • SE 2.5.3 Sample Statement letter • SE 2.4 Sample 45 letter <p><u>(ST.2.5.4) State's Response:</u></p>	<p>resolving test irregularities. Such information would have enhanced the state’s response.</p> <p><u>CE 2.5.3</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In addition to the documents and information submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR provides additional information to address test security at the state level with examples of communications regarding test security incidents. 2. Documentation related to remediation following a test security incident might also have helpfully included information regarding follow-up actions and consequences. <p><u>CE 2.5.4</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Code of Ethics document succinctly outlines the procedures for hearings and judgments related to ethics violations by school personnel, thus addressing the topic of “investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.” However, the reviewers would like to see more state-specific information/evidence on reportable violations by school personnel (communications along chain of events, relationship between infractions and consequences, etc.) and the annual summary on test security. <p><u>CE 2.5.5</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AR provides documents of test security; however, limited information/evidence can be found about the applications of the State’s policy and the requirements from test administration manual at the state and school/district levels. For example, the reviewers were unable to locate among the State’s evidentiary documents the test security form that is to be signed by all personnel involved prior to test administration.
--	---	---

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>Once ADE receives a completed reporting form from a district, Assessment personnel evaluate the evidence and contact the district via email or official letter depending upon the severity of the violation. Violations deemed to be a breach of the Code of Ethics for Arkansas Educators are referred to the AR Professional Licensure Standards Board for further investigation.</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. • SE 2.5.3 Sample email wordings for different situations • SE 2.5.4 Code_of_Ethics___Final_effective__8-31-18 Sections 5.11-5.12. 5.41. & 7.00 <p><u>(ST.2.5.5) State's Response:</u></p> <p>In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information.</p> <p>The ADE Office of Assessment provides training on test security, including ELPA21, to all District Test Coordinators (DTCs). DTCs are responsible for training all district personnel as outlined in the Arkansas Department of Education - Rules Governing the Arkansas Educational Support and Accountability Act (AESAA).</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p>	
--	--	--

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. • SE 2.5.1 Test Security Monitoring and Irregularities.pdf - slides 3, 5, 13-15. 1 7- 18, 20, 26-27, 30-36 • SE 2.5.2 ade 348 AESAA_Act_930_FINAL_Rules_Eff_09.01.201 	
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AR should provide additional information/evidence to support the implementation of the State’s policy to prevent test irregularities and the appropriate procedures to detect and investigate test irregularities to ensure the integrity of test results. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results; To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p><u>(ST.2.6.1) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>Arkansas has legislation, policies, and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information. specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage, and in use of results; To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. SE 1.4.1 Testing Policies and Procedures Manual 2019 181108_03.pdf – p. 7 SE 2.6.1 AR School Laws Annotated.pdf SE 2.6.1 ADE_NextGen-SIS-Data Conference.pdf.powerpoint 	<p><u>Peers' Comments</u></p> <p>CE 2.6.1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The AR School Laws Annotated serves as evidence to support the security of testing materials and protection of student data and identifications. The Legislative Audit (SE 2.6.1) provides detailed the requirements and guidelines for information collection and storage. AR identifies the legislation, policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information (reiterating the language of the three bullets under CE 2.6). Additional evidence should be provided for the implementation of those policies, in addition to the agreement. <p><u>CE 2.6.2</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> AR provides evidence to support policies and procedures to secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality at the state, district and school levels. <p><u>CE 2.6.3</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> AR provides evidence to protect personally identifiable information. Although AR defines the minimum number of students (N=10) necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups, reviewers are expecting evidence about suppression rules in addition to the simple cell size and additional information to address related State's policies and procedures with rationales in reporting in order to provide protection of individual students' identities at the aggregate and disaggregate reports of test results.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SE 2.6.1 ADE-NextGen-SIS-Data Conference.pdf, pp.307, sections 1.1-1.6 • SE 2.6.1 IT_Security_Policy_2015.pdf • SE 2.6.1 sisan1516.pdf – pp. 1-3 <p><u>(ST. 2.6.2) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>Arkansas has legislation, policies, and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage, and in use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. • SE 1.4.1 Testing Policies and Procedures Manual 2019 181108_03.pdf – p. 7 • SE 2.6.1 AR School Laws Annotated.pdf 	
--	---	--

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SE 2.6.1 ADE_NextGen-SIS-Data Conference.pdf.powerpoint • SE 2.6.1 ADE-NextGen-SIS-Data Conference.pdf, pp.307, sections 1.1-1.6 • SE 2.6.1 IT_Security_Policy_2015.pdf • SE 2.6.1 sisman1516.pdf – pp. 1-3 • SE 2.6.2 Understanding User Roles and Permissions – 2018.pdf <p><u>(ST.2.6.3) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. According to Arkansas' ESEA Flexibility Accountability Addendum, AR redacts Personally Identifiable Information (PII) for populations of N-value <10. <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SE 2.6.3 ESEA_Flexibility_Accountability_Addendum.pdf – p. 17, last cell 	
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AR should provide additional evidence to support the State’s policy and procedures with rationale to protect personally identifiable information about any individual student and student group in reporting. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><i>The State’s ELP assessments</i> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s ELP standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s ELP assessment and the ELP standards the assessment is designed to measure in terms of language knowledge and skills, the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards, across all proficiency levels, domains, and modalities identified therein; • Documentation of alignment (as defined) between the State’s ELP standards and the language demands implied by, or explicitly stated in, the State’s academic content standards; • If the State administers an AELPA aligned with alternate ELP achievement standards, the assessment shows adequate linkage to the State’s ELP standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and that the breadth of content and linguistic complexity 	<p>Evidence is provided by the ELPA21 Consortium.</p>	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

determined in test design is appropriate for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.		
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
See ELPA 21 consortium peer notes		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Linguistic Processes

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap <i>the intended language processes</i> appropriate for each grade level/grade-band as represented in the State’s ELP standards.	Evidence is provided by the ELPA21 Consortium.	
Section 3.2 Summary Statement		
See ELPA 21 consortium peer notes		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s <i>ELP standards</i> on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.	Evidence is provided by the ELPA21 Consortium.	
Section 3.3 Summary Statement		
See ELPA 21 consortium peer notes		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p><u>(ST.3.4) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. AR conducted a comparison study between performance on ELPA21 (1 = emerging, 2 = progressing, 3 = proficient) and the State's content assessment (ACT Aspire) for grades 3-10. The comparison shows that students scoring proficient on ELPA21 are performing at an equivalent level or above with their peers on the ACT Aspire. <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. SE 3.4 Guiding ELPA Information.pdf - slides 10-17 (ELA) & 18-25 (math) 	<p><u>Peers' Comments:</u></p> <p><u>CE 3.4</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> AR provides additional information for CE 3.4 based on a comparison of proficiency rates on academic assessments for ELs at three EL proficiency levels and their non-EL peers in order to show a relationship between EL proficiency level and proficiency on academic content assessments. Validity evidence based on relations to other variables in CE 3.4 is about the correlations between test scores on ELP21 with other tests that measure the same content or variables for convergent validity evidence and with other tests that measure different content or variables for discriminant validity evidence from the same group of students. One reviewer was concerned about the study design, such as matched student samples and sample size, testing time, and methodology for analyses. The appropriateness of such analysis with the approach and related interpretations of the results is questionable. One reviewer acknowledged ARs effort. Reviewers anticipate that validity evidence will be provided by the ELPA21 Consortium when more data becomes available.
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population (<i>for ELP assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable</i>); • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately 	<p>Evidence is provided by the ELPA21 Consortium.</p>	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
precise estimates of <i>an EL's English proficiency</i> .		
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
See ELPA 21 consortium peer notes		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For all State ELP assessments,</i> assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition²).</p> <p><i>For ELP assessments,</i> the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all EL students and fair across student groups, including ELs with disabilities, in their design, development, and analysis.</p>	<p>Evidence is provided by the ELPA21 Consortium.</p>	
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See ELPA 21 consortium peer notes</p>		

² see page 28 of “*A State’s Guide to the U.S. Department of Education’s Assessment Peer Review Process*”, September 24, 2018 available at: www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for <i>ELP assessments</i> , including performance for EL students with high and low levels of English language proficiency and with different proficiency profiles across the domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing.	Evidence is provided by the ELPA21 Consortium.	
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p style="text-align: center;">See ELPA 21 consortium peer notes</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments (and <i>for ELP assessments, any applicable domain or component sub-tests</i>) that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s <i>ELP standards</i>.</p> <p><i>For ELP assessments</i>, if an English learner has a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains/components (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) such that there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected domain(s)/component(s), the State must provide a description of how it will ensure that the student is assessed in the remaining domain(s)/component(s) in which it is possible to assess the student, and a description of how this will occur.³</p>	<p>4.4a: Evidence is provided by the ELPA21 Consortium.</p> <p><u>(ST.4.4.b) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>If a district believes a student has a disability that precludes him/her from participating in a domain (listening, speaking, reading, writing) of the ELPA21, the district will contact ADE to discuss the student's circumstance. Should it be determined through consultation that the student's disability does warrant an exemption (for example, if a student is 100% deaf), the district will complete the Special Accommodation Request Form to request an exemption from the appropriate domain of ELPA21.</p> <p>After the Special Accommodation Request Form is received and approved, ADE enters the information into the secure Accommodations Request Spreadsheet and returns the approved form to the district. The ADE subsequently codes the ELPA21 system to exempt the student from the appropriate domain.</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p>	<p><u>Peers' Comments:</u></p> <p><u>CE 4.4b</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> AR provides additional information to explain district policy/practice regarding any student with a disability that it believes precludes him/her from participating in one or more domains of the ELPA21 assessment. AR includes as evidence the form used to request an exemption from the appropriate domain, as well as a sample Special Accommodation Request Spreadsheet. Although this supplementary information serves to illustrate AR’s attention to extenuating circumstances related to administration to students with disabilities, it is not clear to the reviewers how the Special Accommodation Request Form addresses waivers (rather than accommodations) based on disabling condition. Neither document provides sufficient evidence to support the State’s policy and procedures that will ensure that the student is assessed in the remaining domain(s)/component(s) in which it is possible to assess the student or a description of how that will occur. The Peer Review notes on the evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium suggest that more information may be requested from participating states regarding domain exceptions. Peer Reviewers recognize that relevant information on waivers is included.

³ See full reference in regulation, 34 CFR § 200.6(h)(4)(ii) (online at https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=07e168e9e7a6c5931b4549cc15547ee9&mc=true&node=se34.1.200_16&rgn=div8)

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. • SE 4.4.b Special_Accommodation_Request_Form_2019_1 81220 • SE 4.4.b Sample Special Accommodation Request Spreadsheet • SE 4.4.b Special_Accommodation_Request_Form_2019_1 81220 • SE4.4b Sample Special Accommodation Request Spreadsheet 	
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AR should provide evidence to clarify where and how information to request a domain exemption is documented for an EL with a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains since no appropriate accommodations for the affected component(s), and how the approval of such a request is noted in order to ensure that the student is assessed in the remaining domains in which it is possible to assess the student. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers multiple forms of <i>ELP assessments</i> within or across grade-spans, ELP levels, or school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s <i>ELP standards</i> and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across settings.</p>	<p>Evidence is provided by the ELPA21 Consortium.</p>	
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See ELPA 21 consortium peer notes</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>Evidence is provided by the ELPA21 Consortium.</p>	
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See ELPA 21 consortium peer notes</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance

Critical Element		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website. 	<p>Evidence is provided by the ELPA21 Consortium for CE 4.7.1</p> <p><u>(ST 4.7.2) State’s Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>The Score Interpretation Guide and Summative Technical Report (prepared by AIR for ELPA21), available on ELPA21 LiveBinder and on the Assessment website.</p> <p><u>State’s Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SE 4.7.2 ELPA21 Score Interpretation Guide.pdf SE 4.7.2 ELPA21 2017-18 Summative.pdf AIR file 	<p><u>Peers’ Comments:</u></p> <p><u>CE 4.7.2</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> AR provides the Technical Report by AIR for the 2018 ELPA21 administration. Peers could not locate any technical documents on the State’s website. However, AR indicates that documentations of technical quality can be accessed by the public upon request.
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students⁴ with disabilities in the State’s</p>	<p><u>(ST.5.1) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. 	<p><u>Peers’ Comments:</u></p> <p><u>CE 5.1</u></p>

⁴ For ELP peer review, this refers to ELs with disabilities.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For ELP assessments, policies that require the inclusion of an EL with a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) such that there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected component (the State must assess the student’s English language proficiency based on the remaining components in which it is possible to assess the student). 	<p>ADE annually trains all District Test Coordinators on the inclusion of all ELs (including those with disabilities) on all state-required assessments: this includes ELPA21. The DTCs are also trained on providing the appropriate accommodations as they are included on the students' IEPs and 504 plans.</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. • SE 1.4.1 Including ELs with Disabilities in assessment • SE 1.4.1 Policy and Requirements Webinar November 9 – slide 19 • SE 1.4.1 Testing Policies and Procedures Manual 2019 DRAFT_181108_03.pdf – pp. 2-6, 10 • SE 1.4.1 2018 Final ADE Guidelines for Assessment Accessibility – pp. 3-5, 11-13 • SE 1.4.1 ELPA21 AA Manual in LiveBinder • SE 1.4.1 ELPA21 2018 AA Manual.pdf <p><u>(ST.5.1.1) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>If a student has a disability that precludes him/her from participating in a domain (listening, speaking, reading, writing) of the ELPA21, then the district will contact ADE for further guidance. ADE will make a determination based upon the student's abilities/disabilities as to whether or not he/she may be</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AR indicates that SE 1.4.1 ELPA21 2018 AA Manual submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium provides clear information on accommodations for ELs (including those with a disability) that apply for all students participating in ELPA21. 2. SE 1.4.1 Testing Policies and Procedures Manual 2019, (p. 10) provides useful information in setting forth AR’s inclusion policies/practices that “All students identified as English Learners (EL) enrolled in grades K-12, whether receiving ESL services or having declined services, are required to take the English language proficiency (ELP) summative assessment, ELPA21. 3. AR provides training on provision of appropriate accommodations based on students’ IEPs and 504 plans. SE 1.4.1 Final ADE Guidelines for Assessment Accessibility, pp. 11-13 provides useful distinctions between language- and disability-related supports and accommodations. <p><u>CE5.1.1</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In addition to the evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR provides additional information of the State’s policy to preclude ELs with disabilities in one or more of the required domains. However, reviewers noted that the Special Accommodation Request Form does not make clear that it is to be used for exemption requests (rather, it appears to relate to accommodations rather than exemptions). It would be helpful to provide further background information that makes clear that all DTCs and TAs are made aware of this specific use of the form.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>exempt from the related domain. The Special Accommodation Request Form is used to submit exemption requests to ADE.</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. • SE 5.1.1 #9 DTC Weekly Newsletter 2018_19.pdf – ELPA21 section, bullet 1 • SE 4.4b Special Accommodation_Request_Form_2019_181220 • SE 4.4b Sample Special Accommodation Request Spreadsh 	
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required ore</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AR should provide evidence to clarify where and how information to request a domain exemption is documented for an EL with a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains since no appropriate accommodations for the affected component(s), and how the approval of such a request is noted in order to ensure that the student is assessed in the remaining domains in which it is possible to assess the student. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs; Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment. 	<p><u>(ST.5.3.1) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>ADE annually provides guidance on providing appropriate accommodations for ELs and on how to correctly apply those accommodations to the ELPA21 assessment</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. SE 5.3.1 Sample Initial LPAC Review Form.pdf SE 5.3.1 SAIEP-printable.pdf – Sample IEP, pp. 203, 10 SE 1.4.1 2018 Final ADE Guidelines for Assessment Accessibility – pp. 3-6, 11-13 (Accommodations and Accessibility Supports) SE 1.4.1 Testing Policies and Procedures Manual 2019 DRAFT_181108_03.pdf –pp. 2-6, 10. SE 1.4.1 ELPA21 AA Manual in LiveBinder SE 1.4.1 ELPA21 2018 19 AA Manual.pdf <p><u>(ST.5.3.2.1) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>Arkansas uses the ELPA21 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual produced by the ELPA21 Organization and which outlines the available accessibility features and accommodations on the</p>	<p><u>Peers' Comments:</u></p> <p><u>CE 5.3.1</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> AR provides additional information regarding guidance that ADE makes available annually on the accommodations for ELs and how to apply those to the ELPA21 assessment. Peers recommend making it easier for educators to document assessment-specific accommodations on the IEPs. The sample LPAC and IEP forms included as evidentiary documents were useful to demonstrate that AK addressed CE5.3.1. <p><u>CE 5.3.2.1</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> AR indicates that ADE followed the ELPA21 2018-19 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual to outline available accessibility features and accommodations and permit all allowable accommodations to be used when appropriate. <p><u>CE 5.3.2.2</u></p> <p>AR provides the same response and evidence as 5.3.2.1 above.</p> <p><u>CE 5.3.2.3</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> AR provides additional information in the form of the Final ADE Guidelines for Assessment Accessibility and notes that the Office of Student Assessment and ESOL provided support to districts in making decisions about appropriate accommodations during testing, based on guidelines shared with districts and referenced during training. <p><u>CE 5.3.3</u></p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>ELPA21 assessment. AR permits all allowable accommodations to be used when appropriate.</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. SE 1.4.1 ELPA21 2018 19 AA Manual.pdf – pp. 1-4 <p><u>ST.5.3.2.2) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>Arkansas uses the ELPA21 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual produced by the ELPA21 Organization and which outlines the available accessibility features and accommodations on the ELPA21 assessment. AR permits all allowable accommodations to be used when appropriate.</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. SE 1.4.1 ELPA21 2018 19 AA Manual.pdf – pp. 1-4 <p><u>(ST.5.3.2.3) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>The Offices of Student Assessment and ESOL provide support to districts in making decisions about appropriate accommodations to provide students</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> AR provides additional information in reference to the ELPA21 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual, noting that AR permits all allowable accommodations to be used when appropriate (same response as to 5.3.2.1). The State goes on to reiterate that if a student has a disability that precludes participation in any domain(s), the district will contact ADE for further guidance, and ADE will determine whether exemption will be authorized. As evidence, the same forms used to document exemption requests (see 5.1) are used—in this case with more clarity—for exceptional requests for accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. <p><u>CE 5.3.4</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> AR provides additional information in the form of several documents; while most appear redundant in terms of evidence, SE 4.7.2 ELPA21 Score Interpretation Guide (created for AR) provides a section on Exempted Test Rules that explains how scale scores and performance levels are handled for exempted domain(s) and makes clear that “the student will not be ‘penalized’ by treating exempted domains as if the student had gotten all the items wrong.” Although this is something not explicitly related to this Critical Element, fairness to students exempted from one or more domains can be regarded as related to “benefits from participation in the assessment.”

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>during testing. Guidelines for choosing accommodations are shared with all districts and referenced during trainings throughout the year.</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. • SE 1.4.1 2018 Final ADA Guidelines for Assessment Accessibility – pp. 3-8, 12-13. <p><u>(ST.5.3.3) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>Arkansas uses the ELPA21 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual produced by the ELPA21 Organization and which outlines the available accessibility features and accommodations on the ELPA21 assessment. AR permits all allowable accommodations to be used when appropriate. If a student has a disability that domain (listening, speaking, reading, writing) of the ELPA21, then the district will contact ADE for further guidance. ADE will make a determination based upon the student's abilities/disabilities as to whether or not he/she may be exempt from the related domain. The Special Accommodation Request Form is used to submit exemption requests to ADE.</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p>	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. • SE 4.4.b Special_Accommodation_Request_Form_2019_181220 • SE 4.4b Sample Special Accommodation Request Spreadsheet <p><u>(ST.5.3.4) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>Districts are allowed to utilize the Special Accommodation Request Form if they believe a student requires an accommodation in addition to those specified in the AA Manual (for example, a visually-challenged student being allowed to access a Promethean Board because neither large-print paper nor computer enlargement are sufficient).</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SE 4.4.b_2019_181220 • SE 4.4b Sample Special Accommodation Request Spreadsheet • SE5.3.4 Sample ISR with domain exemption.pdf • SE 4.7.2 ELPA21 Score Interpretation Guide.pdf – p. 19 (Exempted Test Rules) 	
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AR should provide additional evidence to support the documentation of appropriate-accommodation(s) used to meet the student’s special needs.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures; • Monitored for administrations of all required ELP assessments, and AELPA. 	<p><u>(ST.5.4.1) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>Annually, ADE trains test monitors on appropriately monitoring testing sessions and requesting any supporting evidence. This training is applied to monitoring ELPA21 with there being a training specific to ELPA21 and the monitoring checklist.</p> <p>ADE is committed to ensuring that standardized testing procedures are implemented with fidelity. ELPA21 testing is monitored annually. Monitors are ADE staff members who are trained by the Office of Student Assessment. Monitored districts are chosen based on one of the following: the district had a major testing infraction the prior year's administration; there has been a report of possible testing impropriety; or the school is randomly-selected from among those that have not been monitored in recent years. All monitor visits are unannounced, and monitors are required to submit a detailed report following the visit. Districts are required to submit testing schedules to the ADE prior to the opening of the <u>ELPA21 window and are allowed to adjust the calendar only in case of an emergency and as approved by ADE</u>. ADE addresses founded improprieties via communication with the district superintendent.</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. • SE 5.4.2 Test Monitoring Checklist Spring 2019 	<p><u>Peers' Comments:</u></p> <p><u>CE 5.4.1</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AR provides additional information about the training for test monitors that addresses which is specific to the ELPA21 monitoring checklist. 2. AR established a monitoring procedure for the ADE staff members to observe testing at selected schools/districts based on the criteria: 1) the district had a major testing infraction during the prior year’s administration; 2) there had been a report of a possible testing impropriety; or 3) the school is randomly selected from those that have not been monitored in recent years. However, in addition to items 13 and 14 on the Monitoring Checklist, there was no evidence of attention to determine that the administration is consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations. 3. No summary of results of monitoring was supplied by AR. <p><u>CE 5.4.2</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AR provides the same information as used for CE 5.4.1. Additional evidence is needed about monitoring the use of accommodations during testing. <p><u>CE 5.4.3</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AR makes clear that Test Monitors must have access to a copy of the accommodations included in students’ IEPs or 504s (documentation that these are regularly provided in instruction and utilized on state assessments). The need for consistency between accommodations utilized in instruction and assessment is made clear in the evidentiary documents (Final ADE Guidelines for Assessment Accessibility and the LPA 21 2018 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual).

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>ELPA21.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SE 5.4.2 2019 ELPA21 Monitor Training.pdf <p><u>(ST.5.4.2) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>Included in the ADE's annual ELPA21 Test Monitoring training are the specifications of monitoring an accommodated session and the appropriate supporting documentation.</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. • SE 5.4.2 Test Monitoring Checklist Spring 2019 ELPA21.pdf • SE 5.4.12 2019 ELPA21 Monitor Training.pdf <p><u>(ST.5.4.3) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>The Test Monitor Checklist requires the building to provide a copy of the accommodations included in the student's IEP or 504. The ADE Guidelines for Assessment Accessibility require that accommodations utilized on a student's state assessments are documented on the student's IEP or 504 and regularly provided in the instructional environment. For students who do not have an IEP or 504, allowable accommodations outlined on an LPAC may be provided.</p>	<p><u>CE 5.4.4</u></p> <p>1. AR provides information about establishing all LPAC-granted accommodations that require signatures from at least a building administrator, a classroom teacher, and an ESOL designee. For an EL receiving special education services, a SPED teacher is also included in decision-making and his/her signature should be included.</p> <p><u>CE 5.4.5</u></p> <p>1. AR indicates that the ADE trained observers to monitor ELPA21 sessions and collect supporting evidence in utilizing ELPA21-specific information.</p> <p><u>CE 5.4.6</u></p> <p>1. AR provides the same response and evidence as used for CE 5.4.5.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. • SE 5.3.1 Sample Initial LPAC Review Form.pdf • SE 1.4.1 2018 Final ADA Guidelines for Assessment Accessibility – pp. 3-6, 11-13 (Accommodations and Accessibility Supports) • SE 1.4.1 ELPA21 2018 19 AA Manual.pdf <p><u>(ST.5.4.4) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>All LPAC-granted accommodations require signatures from at least a building administrator, a classroom teacher, and an ESOL designee. If the student is an EL who is also receiving Special Education services, then the SPED teacher would also be included in the LPAC decision-making process and should sign the LPAC form.</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. • SE 5.3.1 Sample Initial LPAC Review Form.pdf <p><u>(ST.5.4.5) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>Annually, ADE trains the test monitors on how to appropriately monitor testing sessions and</p>	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>request any supporting evidence. This training is applied to monitoring ELPA21 with ELPA21-specific information being included in the training and the monitoring checklist.</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. • SE 5.4.2 Test Monitoring Checklist Spring 2019 ELPA21.pdf • SE 5.4.2 2019 ELPA21 Monitor Training.pdf <p><u>(ST.5.4.6) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>Annually, ADE trains the test monitors on how to appropriately monitor testing sessions and request any supporting evidence. This training is applied to monitoring ELPA21 with there being a training specific to ELPA21 and the monitoring checklist.</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. • SE 5.4.2 Test Monitoring Checklist Spring 2019 ELPA21.pdf • SE 5.4.2 2019 ELPA21 Monitor Training.pdf 	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 5.4 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

SECTION 6: ELP ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>For ELP standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State adopted ELP achievement standards that address the different proficiency levels of ELs; If the State has developed alternate ELP achievement standards, it has adopted them only for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who cannot participate in the regular ELP assessment even with appropriate accommodations. 	<p><u>(ST.6.1.1) State's Response:</u></p> <p>The State Board approved the Arkansas Department of Education - Rules Governing the Arkansas Educational Support and Accountability Act (AESAA) which direct the Department to "... establish student performance levels that indicate the English Learners level of English Language Proficiency." ADE, as a member of the ELPA21 Consortium, uses the achievement standards recommended by ELPA21 to meet this requirement.</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SE 2.5.2 ade_348_AESAA_Act_930_FINAL_Rules_Eff._09.01.2018.pdf – Section 5.11.2 	<p><u>Peers' Comments:</u></p> <p><u>CE 6.1</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> AR provides a response and evidence to support that the State Board approved the ADE Rules Governing the Arkansas Educational Support and Accountability Act (AESAA) which direct ADE to establish student performance levels to indicate ELs' levels of English Language Proficiency. AR uses the achievement standards recommended by ELPA21. One reviewer wondered if the adoption of the ELPA21 assessments indicated the State's adoption of the performance standards.
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element 6.2 – ELP Achievement Standards Setting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ELP achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate ELP achievement standards</i>, such that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cut scores are developed for every grade/grade band, content domain/language domain, and/or composite for which proficiency-level scores are reported. 	<p>Evidence is provided by the ELPA21 Consortium</p>	

Section 6.2 Summary Statement

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element 6.3 –Aligned ELP Achievement Standards

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For ELP achievement standards:</i> The State has ensured that ELP assessment results are expressed in terms that are clearly aligned with the State’s ELP standards, and its ELP performance-level descriptors.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate ELP achievement standards for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate ELP achievement standards should be linked to the State’s grade-level/grade-band ELP standards, and should reflect professional judgment of the highest ELP achievement standards possible for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>Evidence is provided by the ELPA21 Consortium for CE 6.3 and CE 6.3.1</p> <p><u>(ST.6.3.2) State's Response:</u> Currently, Arkansas does not have an alternate ELP assessment: however, the state is participating in the ELPA21 efforts to produce an alternate ELP assessment.</p> <p><u>State's Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SE 6.1.2 CCSSO English Language Proficiency Standards for ELs with Significant • SE 6.1.2 CCSSO English Language Proficiency Standards for ELs with Significant Cognitive Disabilities_Final Word Version January 2019.pdf 	
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on <i>English language proficiency for all ELs including the number and percentage of ELs attaining ELP</i>.</p> <p>For the <i>ELP assessment</i>, the State provides coherent and timely information about each student’s attainment of the State’s ELP standards to parents that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports the <i>ELs’ English proficiency</i> in terms of the State’s grade level/grade-band ELP standards (including performance-level descriptors); • Are provided in an understandable and uniform format; • Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian; 	<p>(ST.6.4.1) State's Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>Arkansas publishes its assessment results each year on the state website and in the ELPA21 Liveninder. These are not password-protected and are accessible to the public.</p> <p>State's Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. • SE 6.4.1 ADE Assessment website – see “Test Results & Resources” tile (blue) • SE 6.4.1 LiveBinder ELPA21 Scores • SE 6.4.1 Example of Emerging_Progressing_Proficient <p>(ST.6.4.2.1) State's Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>As soon as the students" scores are available and the state has reviewed them, the District Test Coordinator (DTC) is informed that they may download their students" scores from the vendor's Online Reporting System (ORS). Each district also receives a printed version that is required to be provided to parents/guardians.</p> <p>State's Evidence:</p>	<p>Peers’ Comments:</p> <p>CE 6.4.1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AR provides additional information on the State’s report of assessment results to the public on the website and in the ELPA21 LiveBinder. AR notes that these are not password-protected and are accessible to parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public. 2. One evidentiary document, SE 6.4.1 LiveBinder ELPA21 Scores identifies the availability of parent-guardian reports in the following language: Arabic (m, f), Lao, Marshallese, Spanish (m,f) and Vietnamese. One reviewer was curious, just as a side-note, as to the appropriateness of these languages for AR. <p>CE 6.4.2.1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AR indicates that they provide additional information in reporting, however, it is not clear to the reviewers what is the content of these reports and if performance level descriptors are included. Specific screen shots as examples and a brief summary about the state level report would be more useful. 2. AR did not provide a schedule for timely reporting <p>CE 6.4.2.2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AR includes the same evidence as for CE 6.4.2.1. It is indicated that additional information from AR is about the summative Individual Student Reports (ISRs), which districts are encouraged to utilize in discussions with students and their parents/guardians. 2. AR may consider using graphic reporting of test scores within a range based on the Standard Error of Measurement (e.g., +/- one SEM) with a footnote of explanations to provide parents/guardians with more

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. SE 6.4.2.1 #19 DTC Weekly Newsletter 2017_18.pdf – ELPA21 score information in red SE 4.3 Example ISR.pdf <p><u>(ST.6.4.2.2) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>All ELPA21 summative Individual Student Reports (ISRs) are provided to districts in a format that is easily understandable. Districts are encouraged to utilize these ISRs in discussions with parents/guardians/students. The ISR includes the proficiency status, the performance levels specific to each domain (listening, speaking, reading, writing), and Domain Descriptors related to each performance level corresponding to the appropriate domain.</p> <p>State's Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. SE 4.3 Example ISR.pdf <p><u>(ST.6.4.2.3) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>Student ISRs are printable from the vendor's Online Reporting System (ORS) in the following languages:</p>	<p>visualized information for a better understanding of test scores.</p> <p>CE 6.4.2.3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> AR provides parents/guardians with an individual student report that the student performance on the domain and the composite scores, proficiency level, and the performance descriptors to help parents/guardians understand the student's performance. AR provides an online reporting system in various languages, including the top three home-languages spoken in AR: English, Spanish, and Marshallese. <p>CE 6.4.4</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> AR indicates that any parent who needs an alternate format score report (e.g., Braille, large print, translation) may request one from the district. The district can, if necessary, contact the ADE Office of Student Assessment for assistance in preparing/providing the alternate format. The information provided about the standard error of measurement (SEM) may not be clear and understandable to parents/guardians. Perhaps, a graphic of test score within a range, such as +/- one SEM with a footnote would facilitate for better understanding. Although the domain of the achievement level descriptors is included in the report, interpretive information about the score comparisons and the English language proficiency levels should be provided for better understanding of student performance.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Arabic, Chinese, English, Marshallese, Russian, Spanish, and Vietnamese. The top three languages spoken in AR are English, Spanish, and Marshallese.</p> <p>State's Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. • SE 6.4.3 ISR print languages <p><u>(ST.6.4.2.4) State's Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. <p>Any parent who needs an alternate format (Braille, large print, or translated) may make a request of the district; the district, in turn, may provide the alternate format or may contact the A DE Office of Student Assessment for assistance with the process.</p> <p>State's Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the response/evidence submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium, AR is providing additional information. • SE 6.4.2.4 Alternative Format Assessment Results.pdf 	
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AR should provide the schedule for timely reporting of test results. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Arkansas

SECTION 7: DOES NOT APPLY TO ELP ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW

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

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

April State ELP Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS4
Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of ELP Standards for All English Learners 4
Critical Element 1.2 – Coherent and Progressive ELP Standards that Correspond to the State’s Academic Content Standards 5
Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments..... 7
Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments .. 8
Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments..... 9

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS.....10
Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development 10
Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development 12
Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration..... 13
Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration 16
Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security..... 18
Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 22

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY25
Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content25
Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Linguistic Processes..... 27
Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 28
Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables..... 29

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER.....30
Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability 30
Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility 32
Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum 33
Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 34
Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 36
Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment..... 37
Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 38

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS.....38
Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 38
Critical Element 5.2 – DOES NOT APPLY to ELP Assessment Peer Review41
Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations 42
Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

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

..... 47

SECTION 6: ELP ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING.....52

Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of ELP Achievement Standards for All Students..... 52

Critical Element 6.2 – ELP Achievement Standards Setting 53

Critical Element 6.3 –Aligned ELP Achievement Standards 54

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting 55

SECTION 7: DOES NOT APPLY TO ELP ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW58

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For English language proficiency (ELP) standards:</i></p> <p>The State formally adopted K-12 ELP standards for all ELs in public schools in the State.</p>		<p>N/A: See state-specific evidence</p>
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>N/A: See state-specific evidence.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>For ELP standards: The ELP standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing; • address the different proficiency levels of ELs; and <p>align to the State academic content standards (see definition⁵). The ELP standards must contain language proficiency expectations that reflect the language needed for ELs to acquire and demonstrate their achievement of the knowledge and skills identified in the State’s academic content standards appropriate to each grade-level/grade-band in at least reading/language arts, mathematics, and science.</p>	<p>EL 1.2.1 <i>Council of Chief State School Officers English Language Proficiency Standards Development (2013)</i>, pp. 4, 12-19.</p> <p>EL 1.2.2 <i>English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards (2014)</i>, pp. 31-210.</p> <p>EL 1.2.3 <i>Framework for English Language Proficiency Development Standards Corresponding to the Common Core State Standards and the Next Generation Science Standards (CCSSO, 2012)</i>.</p>	<p>ELPA21 provided evidence about the development of the ELP standards that show that they are derived from the four domains and address different proficiency levels of ELs.</p> <p>The evidence provides support for alignment between the ELP standards and the academic content practices (EL 1.2.2, p. 32-34) rather than between the ELP standards and academic content standards.</p> <p>For States that have adopted the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics and ELA/Literacy and Next Generation Science Standards, peers believe that sufficient evidence is provided that academic content practices correspond to the ELP standards.</p> <p>States that have adopted different standards than Common Core and Next Generation would need to provide additional alignment evidence.</p>
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>If a member State has adopted standards other than Common Core and Next Generation, they will need to provide additional alignment evidence. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required (for States with common core reading/language arts and mathematics; and next generation science content standards)</p>		

⁵ see page 24 of “*A State’s Guide to the U.S. Department of Education’s Assessment Peer Review Process*”, September 24, 2018 available at: www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s assessment system includes an <i>annual general and alternate ELP assessment</i> (aligned with State ELP standards) administered to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All ELs in grades K-12. 	<p><u>ELPA21’s Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EL 1.3.1 <i>White Paper: Developing an Alternate ELPA21 for English Learners with the Most Significant Cognitive Disabilities</i> EL 1.3.2 <i>Alt-ELPA21 Theory of Action</i> EL 1.3.3 <i>Alt-ELPA Participation Guidelines</i> EL 1.3.4 <i>Accessibility and Accommodations Wish List</i> EL 1.3.5 <i>Addendum to the ELPA21 Peer Review Submission – January 2019: Alternate ELPA21 (Alt-ELPA21)</i> EL 1.3.6 <i>Classroom Perspectives Report</i> EL 1.3.7 <i>ICQ - Report</i> EL 1.3.8 <i>Standards Prioritization Evaluation</i> EL 1.3.9 <i>Talking Points for State Leaders: Alternate English Language Proficiency Standards and Assessments</i> EL 1.3.10 <i>Final CCSSO ELP Standards for ELWSCDs Agenda May 2018</i> EL 1.3.11 <i>ELP Standards for ELWSCD Meeting Participant List</i> EL 1.3.12 <i>Work group 3 ELWSCD language and CCR_CCSSO Project 040618</i> 	<p>The ELPA21 Consortium provides an annual general ELP assessment, ready to be delivered to ELs in grades K-12, to member states. States will provide evidence of their use of the assessment.</p> <p>Currently, the ELPA21 Consortium is laying the groundwork for the Alternate ELPA21 (Alt-ELPA21) so that member states may include the assessment in their statewide assessment programs.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

Section 1.3 Summary Statement

N/A: for consortium review, but evidence may support individual State submissions for ELPA-21. Consortium acknowledges that AELPA is currently not an operational assessment.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State has policies that require the inclusion <i>of all public elementary and secondary ELs in the State’s ELP assessment</i>, including ELs with disabilities. 	Reviewed by Department Staff Only	Reviewed by Department Staff Only
Section 1.4 Summary Statement		
N/A: for consortium review		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State has developed or amended challenging <i>ELP</i> standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education). • Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas). • Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State. • Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents. 	<p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>	<p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>N/A for consortium review</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <i>the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards</i>, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <i>the State’s ELP standards</i>, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. • Processes to ensure that the ELP assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <i>the State’s ELP standards</i> and reflects appropriate inclusion of the range of complexity found in the standards. • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and intended uses and interpretations of results. • If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement of purposes and intended interpretations and uses: EL2.1.2 (ELPA21 Theory of Action, p. 3 and p. 10) • Technically sound test blueprints that measure depth and breadth of ELP standards: EL2.1.2.1, <i>ELPA21 Assessment Framework - Summative School Year 2015-2016</i>, p. 7-13 EL2.1.2.3a-h <i>Field Test Slots All Form 1A ELPA21 ONLINE Summative Test Form (2017), Kindergarten - grade 12</i> EL2.1.2.4 <i>Blueprint Drafts Phase 3 (2016)</i> • Tailored to knowledge and skills in the ELP standards and includes the range of complexity: EL2.1.3.1 <i>Independent Evaluation of the English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century [ELPA21] Item Pool Alignment</i> EL 2.1.3.1.1 <i>ELPA21 Internal Memo: ELPA21 2019-2020 Activities</i> (This document is a bullet-point to-do list to address deficiencies in the alignment.) • Computer-adaptive assessments: N/A • Portfolio assessment: N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement of purposes and intended interpretations and uses: Peers found the evidence for the statement of purposes and intended interpretations and uses to be sufficient. • Technically sound test blueprints that measure depth and breadth of ELP standards: Peers reviewed the test blueprint evidence but noted that it was so heavily redacted that it was virtually impossible to determine the extent to which it results in the development of assessments that are technically sound and measure the depth and breadth of ELP standards. Test blueprint, EL 2.1.2.1, Table 5.1 – it is not clear how tasks/points are distributed across standards within a domain. Information is redacted and makes interpretation of tables nearly impossible. Test form planner documents, EL.2.1.2.3a-h heavily redacted so that interpretation is made virtually impossible. EL.2.1.2.4, Blueprint – document heavily redacted. It’s not possible to evaluate. • Tailored to knowledge and skills in the ELP standards and includes the range of complexity: The consortium describes an alignment study that they refer to as “independent” and “external” (EL 2.1.3.1) but it was conducted by CRESST staff.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

<p>student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting. If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be <i>entirely</i> administered through a portfolio.</p>		<p>Although it is stated that the staff working on the alignment were not part of the test development, it is certainly not external and an in-house alignment study gives reviewers pause about its independence. The study highlights insufficient alignment in a number of areas. A quote from this document (p. 74) "...showed moderate to large amounts of under-representation for Standards 2, 5, and 6. The only exception was for Standard 2 for Grade Band 4–5, which had adequate coverage. Standard 2 also showed large proportions of potential false negative ratings, both within and across grade bands. Not surprisingly, based on the blueprint results, this was particularly problematic for Grade Band 4–5 as well as the two secondary grade bands.</p> <p>EL 2.1.3.1.1 is a memo indicating how some of the deficiencies reported will be corrected in 2019 and 2020, although no specific timeline is listed, and peers request evidence that the changes remedy the deficiencies. Peers also recommend that future alignment studies be conducted by an external group rather than CRESST.</p> <p>The evidence submitted and in particular the alignment study itself does not provide evidence that shows that each assessment form supports the assertion that each test form contains items that are well aligned to the breadth and depth of the ELP standards, across all proficiency levels, domains, and modalities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computer-adaptive assessments: N/A • Portfolio assessment: N/A
--	--	--

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

Section 2.1 Summary Statement

x The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Provide test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of *the State's ELP standards*, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. This could take the form of *unredacted* blueprints or, in the case the consortium does not want to provide unredacted documents, evidence that includes but is not limited to the following:
 - *Information on how many standards each test form is assessing and how many standards are not assessed by form and grade or grade band.*
 - *The proportion of hand-scored items by grade-band domain versus the proportion of machine-scored items.*
 - *Rationale for assessing/not assessing standards.*
 - *Description of cognitive complexity of the ELP standards as designed/measured on the assessments.*
 - *Documentation and description of how the test blueprints support the intended interpretation and uses of the results as expressed in ELPA21's mission, vision and score reporting specifications (see above).*
- Peers request the results of a new, truly external and independent, alignment study once the changes in EL 2.1.3.1.1 have been implemented. Peers noted that there are additional areas of misalignment indicated in the study that are not addressed in EL 2.1.3.1.1 that should also be rectified. The existing alignment study is also by item pool rather than by form and peers suggest that the alignment evidence submitted in the future be by test form.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess student English language proficiency based on the <i>State’s ELP standards</i> in terms of content and language processes. 	<p>EL 2.1.2.1 <i>ELPA21 Assessment Framework - Summative School Year 2015-2016</i> (pp. 19-25) EL 2.2.1 <i>ELPA21 Item Development Plan Version 2.0 (2014)</i> EL 2.2.2a-f <i>ELPA21 Task and Item Specifications, Kindergarten through Grades 9-12 (2016)</i> EL 2.2.3 <i>ELPA21 Item Writer Training Plan (2014)</i> EL 2.2.4 <i>Editorial Review Plan (2014)</i> EL 2.2.5 <i>Editorial Style Guide (2019)</i> EL 2.2.6 <i>Item Development Process Report (2015)</i> EL 2.2.7 <i>Item Cognitive Laboratory Report (2015)</i> – related to technology-enhanced items only EL 2.2.8 <i>Spring 2015 ELPA21 Field Test Technical Report (2016)</i>, pp. 13-16. EL 2.2.9 <i>Item Analysis and Calibration (2017)</i></p>	<p>Peers found item development procedures sufficient; however, in light of the alignment study results described in critical element 2.1 above, peers have concerns about selection and inclusion of more difficult items, lack of items in terms of language and content processes, and lack of items measuring certain standards.</p>
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence showing how the consortium will address the lack of difficult items, items measuring certain standards, and items on some language and content processes (e.g., there were no interactive items in some grade bands, and all grade bands had under-representation of items testing the interactive modality.) Analyses also revealed that alignment “met or exceeded the Grade Band 4–5 blueprint specifications for only nine of the 17 traits.” (EL 2.1.3.1, p. 50). Peers recommend that the consortium identify the cause(s) of these issues and determine whether their item writing process needs to be modified accordingly. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities; If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EL 2.3.1.1a-f <i>Assessment Guides, Kindergarten through Grades 9-12</i> EL 2.3.1.2 <i>Accessibility and Accommodations Manual (2018-19)</i> EL 2.3.1.3 <i>Quick Start Checklists (2016)</i> EL 2.3.1.4 <i>Test Coordinator's Manual (2016)</i> EL 2.3.1.5a-f <i>Directions for Administration, Paper and Pencil, Kindergarten through Grades 9-12</i> EL 2.5.1.2a-f <i>Directions for Administration, Braille Version, Kindergarten through Grades 9-12</i> EL 2.5.1.3a-b <i>Directions for Administration ELPA21 Summative Writing Supplement (Spring 2018, Kindergarten and Grade 1)</i> EL 2.5.1.4 <i>ELPA21 Spring 2018 Summative Test Administration Manual (TAM) for Online Testing (2018)</i> Procedures to ensure that appropriate teachers and personnel can administer the assessments and use appropriate accommodations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EL 2.3.2.1 <i>Training Webinar Plan (2016)</i> EL 2.3.2.2 <i>Accessibility Features and Accommodations (2016)</i> EL 2.3.2.3 <i>Administration Site Overview (2016)</i> EL 2.3.2.4 <i>Student Testing Experience (2016)</i> EL 2.3.2.5 <i>Student Testing Session (2016)</i> EL 2.3.2.6 <i>Testing Lab Management (2016)</i> EL 2.3.2.7 <i>Platform Overview (2016)</i> EL 2.3.2.8 <i>Troubleshooting (2016)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations: <p>ELPA 21 established clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations. Peers commend the consortium for the detailed documentation for all versions of the assessment. The participating states are responsible for communicating these procedures to educators.</p> <p>However, see comments on section 5.3.</p> Procedures to ensure that appropriate teachers and personnel can administer the assessments and use appropriate accommodations: <p>ELPA 21 presented sufficient evidence demonstrating that teachers (including teachers of SWDs and ELs) and other appropriate personnel can be provided with a variety of training materials necessary to administer the ELP assessment including the use of appropriate accommodations. The participating states are responsible for providing such training to appropriate personnel; state-specific evidence will be needed to complement the consortium evidence in this regard.</p> Defined requirements and contingency plans for technology-based assessments: <p>ELPA 21 created documents addressing technology requirements (hardware, headsets) as well as a</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

	<p>EL 2.3.2.9 <i>Workstation Preparation (2016)</i> EL 2.3.2.10 <i>Interactive Demos Access Instructions (2016)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defined requirements and contingency plans for technology-based assessments: <p>EL 2.3.3.1 <i>Operational Hardware Specifications</i> EL 2.3.3.2 <i>Operational Headset Specifications</i> EL 2.3.2.8 <i>Troubleshooting (2016)</i> EL 2.5.1.4 <i>ELPA21 Spring 2018 Summative Test Administration Manual (TAM) for Online Testing (2018), pp. 7, 24, and 41.</i></p>	<p>document addressing possible technology challenges (troubleshooting). In addition, the TAM for online testing addresses the possible issues that may arise during the online testing session.</p>
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required No additional evidence is required from the consortium. However, State-specific evidence should be reviewed regarding 1) how test administration procedures are communicated to educators and 2) how appropriate personnel are trained to administer the test.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general ELP assessments and the AELPA.	EL 2.4.1 <i>ELPA21 2017-18 Summative Alerts</i>	The online administration of ELPA21 is monitored by the testing vendor, which receives and processes alerts of test irregularities. The state in which the irregularity occurs, the date of the occurrence, item identification, grade level, language domain, and student identification number, as well as the recorded response the reflects the irregularity are noted.
Section 2.4 Summary Statement		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A for consortium review. This evidence can support a State specific submission for use of the ELPA21, but in and of itself is not sufficient to meet the requirements for this critical element. States will need to supplement this evidence. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; Detection of test irregularities; Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. Application of test security procedures to the general ELP assessments and the AELPA. 	<p>EL 2.5.1.1 <i>ELPA21 Implementation Manual (2017-18)</i>, pp. 14-27, 35-36, 40-41, 44, Appendices A, B, C, and D. EL 2.3.1.5a-f <i>Directions for Administration, Paper and Pencil, Kindergarten through Grades 9-12 (2017-18)</i> EL 2.5.1.2a-f <i>Directions for Administration, Braille Version, Kindergarten through Grades 9-12 (2017-18)</i> EL 2.5.1.3a-b <i>Directions for Administration ELPA21 Summative Writing Supplement, Kindergarten and Grade 1 (Spring 2018)</i> EL 2.3.1.2 <i>Accessibility and Accommodations Manual (2018-19)</i>, Appendix E. EL 2.5.1.4 <i>ELPA21 Spring 2018 Summative Test Administration Manual (TAM) for Online Testing</i>, pp. 2, 36. EL 2.5.1.5 <i>Data Sharing Agreement (2017)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prevention of assessment irregularities: Submitted documents focus on prevention of assessment irregularities during test administration. There is a lack of evidence/description of how security of test materials is maintained during test development. States will need to provide evidence of the use/application of the ELPA21-prepared documents and guidelines or alternate processes for the prevention of assessment irregularities during test administration. Detection of test irregularities: Peers could not locate a description or recommendation for the application of data forensics for the detection of test irregularities. Routine data analytics to detect test irregularities should be conducted. This is possibly conducted at the State level and State-specific evidence should be reviewed. Remediation following test security incidents: For the remediation following any test security incidents, examples of actions following a breach should be provided. Peers did not see evidence of the availability of breach forms. Also, if an item is breached, are tests rescored without that item? It would be helpful to provide documentation of how breaches are handled at the consortium level. <p>ELPA 21 states that test security is a matter to be supervised by each member State. However, there are instances where test security breaches can cross state borders. As such, there appears to be the need for consortium-wide oversight of some matters. For example, if there is a breach in one state, it could be expected that the consortium assists in evaluating whether the assessment</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

		<p>item should be deactivated (or some other action taken) for all states. Consortium-wide data analyses after test administration can also assist in ensuring that a possible irregularity or breach of an item, did not impact test results.</p> <p>It was not clear to peers whether all scoring is centralized or is State-specific. State-provided scoring evidence should be reviewed with test security in mind.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigation of irregularities: This is left to the States; no consortium-provided documentation was provided. State-specific evidence will need to be reviewed. N/A: there is not currently an AELPA in place.
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>x</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The consortium should provide evidence of test security during the test development process. Member States will need to provide evidence regarding scoring and test security, data forensics that may be conducted, and processes for investigating and remedying irregularities. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect integrity of test-related data in test administration: EL 2.5.1.1 ELPA21 Implementation Manual (2017-18), pp. 14-27, 35-36, 40-41, 44, Appendices A, B, C, and D. • Secure student-level assessment data: EL 2.5.1.1 ELPA21 Implementation Manual (2017-18), pp. 17-27, Appendix A EL 2.5.1.4 ELPA21 Spring 2018 Summative Test Administration Manual (TAM) for Online Testing, p. 1. EL 2.5.1.5 Data Sharing Agreement (2017) • Protect personally identifiable information: The consortium’s narrative states, “Additionally, states are able to configure their reports of ELPA21 scores to suppress and/or de-identify data to protect students' PII as required by state policies.” Minimum N sizes are determined by the State. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect integrity of test-related data in test administration: ELPA21 provided evidence of sample procedures for protecting data integrity to member States; State-specific evidence should be reviewed. • Secure student-level assessment data: ELPA21 provided some guidance on student-level data security to member States; State-specific evidence should be reviewed as well, to determine to what extent this guidance is transmitted to districts and schools and followed. • Protect personally identifiable information: State-specific evidence regarding individual student data and minimum N sizes should be reviewed.
Section 2.6 Summary Statement		
<p><u> </u> No additional evidence is required from the consortium; however, State-specific evidence should be reviewed regarding all of the points of this critical element.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><i>The State’s ELP assessments</i> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s ELP standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s ELP assessment and the ELP standards the assessment is designed to measure in terms of language knowledge and skills, the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards, across all proficiency levels, domains, and modalities identified therein; • Documentation of alignment (as defined) between the State’s ELP standards and the language demands implied by, or explicitly stated in, the State’s academic content standards; • If the State administers an AELPA aligned with alternate ELP achievement standards, the assessment shows adequate linkage to the State’s ELP standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and that the breadth of content and linguistic complexity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EL 1.3.5 <i>Addendum to the ELPA21 Peer Review Submission – January 2019: Alternate ELPA21 (Alt-ELPA21)</i> • EL 2.1.2 <i>ELPA21 Theory of Action (2014)</i>, pp. 5, 10 • EL 3.1.1 <i>A Quality Assurance Plan for ELPA21</i> • EL 2.1.2.1 <i>ELPA21 Assessment Framework-Summative School Year 2015-2016</i> • EL 2.1.2.1 <i>ELPA21 Assessment Framework-Summative School Year 2015-2016</i>, pp. 7-13, 16, 24-25 • EL 2.1.3.1 <i>Independent Evaluation of the English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century (ELPA21) Item Pool Alignment (2019)</i>, • EL 2.2.2 a-f <i>ELPA21 Task and Item Specification Guidelines</i> • EL 2.2.3 <i>Item Writer Training Plan</i> • EL 2.2.6 <i>Item Development Process Report</i>, pp. 49-50, Appendix A • EL 2.1.3.1.1 <i>ELPA21 Internal Memo: ELPA21 2019-2020 Activities (2019)</i> • N/A: There is no AELPA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See comments in section 2.1 above. <p>EL 2.2.1, p. 3 references an appendix that peers could not locate: “See Appendix A for the Checklist for Reviewing Items.”</p> <p>The ELPA narrative indicates that EL 2.2.1 “shows item development and field test plan to ensure coverage of, and alignment to, ELP Standards (p. 8)” but p. 8 is a table of deliverables rather than an item development and field test plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peers could not locate validity evidence supporting the use of the assessment results for arguably its most important use: an exit from the EL program. <p>The quality assurance plan (EL 3.1.1) is just that, a plan. Has it been implemented? Documentation to this effect should be provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A: There is no AELPA.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

determined in test design is appropriate for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.		
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
<u>x</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• See required additional evidence in section 2.1.• Checklist for Reviewing Items and Item Development and Field Test Plan referenced in submission but not located by Peers.• Documentation that the assessment results support exit decisions for the EL program.• Documentation that the quality assurance plan (EL 3.1.1) has been implemented.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Linguistic Processes

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap <i>the intended language processes</i> appropriate for each grade level/grade-band as represented in the State’s ELP standards.</p>	<p>EL 2.1.3.1, <i>Independent Evaluation of the English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century (ELPA21) Item Pool Alignment</i></p> <p>EL 2.1.3.1.1, <i>ELPA 21 Internal Memo: ELPA21 2019-2020 Activities</i></p>	<p>See comments in critical element 2.1 above. The alignment study (EL 2.1.3.1) clearly shows that the assessments do not tap some intended language processes successfully, and EL 2.1.3.1.1 indicates some steps the consortium plans to take to address these deficiencies. Deficiencies listed not only in 2.1.3.1.1 but also more broadly in 2.1.3.1 need to be addressed. An independent and external alignment study after changes have been made or more complete cognitive labs (other than just of the technology-enhanced items in EL 2.2.7) could address this critical element.</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results of an independent and external alignment study after deficiencies are addressed or more complete cognitive labs (not limited to the technology-enhanced items in EL 2.2.7). 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s <i>ELP standards</i> on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>EL 3.3.1, <i>ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report, Part 1</i> EL 3.3.2, <i>ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 2_Nebraska Example</i></p>	<p>EL 3.3.1 (p. 32) states, “The pooled analysis results are included in Section 11 in the appendix for pooled analysis. It shows that the student abilities are generally higher than the test difficulties in all domain tests, except the grades 6–8 and grades 9–12 reading tests where the test difficulties well match student abilities.” This issue must be addressed.</p> <p>Peers also could not locate Table S24.1 (referenced in EL 3.3.1).</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peers request that the consortium address the issues raised above (e.g., by developing more difficult items in domains and grade levels where those are lacking) and provide data of their quality in a subsequent technical report. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>EL 3.4.1 <i>ELPA21 Summative Assessment Validity Evidence Regarding Relationships of Test Results with Other Variables (2019), pp. 2-14</i></p>	<p>EL 3.4.1 provides some evidence of a relationship between ELPA scores and teacher ratings as well as between assessment scores of EL and English only students.</p> <p>The data from the teacher rating study indicates a mismatch between proficiency levels on the ELP and teacher ratings. EL 3.4.1, p.13: “Across all grade bands, teachers judged a higher proportion of students to be proficient. The differences between teachers and ELPA21 are particularly large in the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands”.</p> <p>A quote from the ELPA 21 submission (p. 51): “ELPA21’s first operational administration was the spring of 2016, with item calibrations finalized in the spring of 2017. Therefore, there are few data available to examine the relationship between the scores on ELPA21 with other assessments. In addition, there are not data yet available to investigate the relationship between ELPA21 scores and college entrance and performance outcomes.”</p> <p>Peers request evidence showing the relationship between ELP scores and other measures (e.g., content tests, college entrance exams, etc.)</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the consortium provided some limited evidence about the relationship between ELP scores and teacher ratings, peers request additional evidence showing the relationship between ELP scores and other measures (e.g., content tests, college entrance exams, etc.) The consortium’s submission indicates that research was underway at the time of submission (p. 52 of the narrative states, “Research that has studied how ELPA21 scores relate to other variables with similar constructs, growth on the same construct, and how one score scale can predict outcomes on other assessments is in progress across consortium member states.” Peers request the results of such research. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population (<i>for ELP assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable</i>); • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability: EL 3.3.1 ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 1, p. 17. EL 3.3.2 ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 2_Nebraska Example, Section 6 Figures S6.1 – S6.10, Section 7 Figures S7.1 – S7.6, Section 8 Figures S8.1, S8.2. • Overall and conditional SEMs: EL 3.3.1 ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 1, p. 18. EL 3.3.2 ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 2, Section 6 Figures S6.1 – S6.10, Section 7 Figures S7.1 – S7.6. • Consistency and accuracy estimates: EL 3.3.1 ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 1, pp.18-20. EL 3.3.2 ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 2_Nebraska Example, Section 8 Figures S8.1, S8.2. • N/A: ELPA21 is not computer-adaptive. 	<p>General note: The consortium references EL 3.3.2 “Nebraska Example”. It is unclear the extent to which the sample data from Nebraska is representative of the consortium as a whole.</p> <p>Peers noted that many of the figures in the Technical Report rely on color distinctions that render them not universally accessible (e.g., EL 3.3.2, p. 100). The consortium might want to consider adding text and tables or redesigning figures to address this accessibility concern.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability: Reliability information is provided for the online assessment, which is the majority of the administrations, by domain. It is unclear whether Braille and paper versions are based on the same items. Data on the reliability of those alternate forms is not provided. <p>Although marginal reliabilities are generally in the acceptable range, there are some instances in the EL 3.3.2 report that are lower (e.g., grade 1 listening, p. 100).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall and conditional SEMs are included by domain (EL 3.3.2, p. 111-116) <p>Peers noted that there is more measurement error among higher ability students based on the CSEMs. Peers believe this is likely a result of the lack of a sufficient number of difficult items. See comments in critical element 2.1.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>precise estimates of <i>an EL's English proficiency</i>.</p>		<p>A quote from EL 3.3.1 (p. 27), "Classification accuracy (CA) analysis investigates how precisely students are classified into each performance level. By definition, classification consistency (CC) analysis investigates how consistently students are classified into each performance level across two independent administrations of equivalent forms. Since obtaining test scores from two independent administrations is not feasible due to issues such as logistics and cost constraints, the CC index is computed with the assumption that the same test is independently administered twice to the same group of students. For information on classification accuracy and consistency see p. 27-30."</p> <p>Peers recommend that the consortium conduct a study to get classification consistency data based on two independent administrations of equivalent forms.</p> <p>Regarding the CCs provided, they seem low (dropping below .7 and at times, below .5 or .6). Classification accuracy and consistency is in general lower for cuts 3 and 4 than for cuts 1 and 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A: ELPA21 is not computer-adaptive.
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to comments in critical element 2.1 related to test development, especially related to students at higher proficiency levels and its potential impact on CSEMs. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For all State ELP assessments,</i> assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition⁶).</p> <p><i>For ELP assessments,</i> the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all EL students and fair across student groups, including ELs with disabilities, in their design, development, and analysis.</p>	<p>EL 3.1.1, <i>A Quality Assurance Plan for ELPA21: Gathering the Evidence to Evaluate Validity, Reliability, Fairness, and Utility</i> (2013)</p> <p>EL 2.1.2 <i>ELPA21 Theory of Action</i> (2014), p. 5.</p> <p>EL 2.1.2.1 <i>ELPA21 Assessment Framework-Summative School Year 2015-2016</i>, pp. 14-15.</p> <p>EL2.2.1 <i>Item Development Plan</i> (2014), pp. 1-4.</p> <p>EL 2.3.1.2 <i>Accessibility and Accommodations Manual (2018-2019)</i></p>	<p>Peers identified evidence of steps to ensure the accessibility of the online assessment. However, peers could only locate a statement regarding item writer training and Universal Design (EL 2.2.1, p. 1-4), not the contents of such training. Peers request item writer training materials to better be able to determine how central this is in the test design.</p> <p>Regarding fairness, peers note that DIF statistics are provided for the online assessment, but could not locate them for Braille and paper versions. This is probably the result of small N sizes for those versions, but this should be indicated clearly.</p> <p>Peers noted that there is relatively less documentation of the development of Braille and paper versions of the test, as well as the extent to which accommodations do (or do not) make the test accessible.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>_x The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peers request item writer training materials to better be able to determine how central UDL is in the test design. • Further documentation that specifically addresses the fairness and accessibility of the ELP assessment for ELs with disabilities. 		

⁶ see page 28 of “*A State’s Guide to the U.S. Department of Education’s Assessment Peer Review Process*”, September 24, 2018 available at: www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for ELP assessments, including performance for EL students with high and low levels of English language proficiency and with different proficiency profiles across the domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing.</p>	<p>EL 2.2.8 <i>Spring 2015 ELPA21 Field Test Technical Report (2016)</i>, Table 3.3, p. 16; pp. 19-25. EL 3.1.1.2 <i>ELPA21 Standard Setting Technical Report (2016)</i> EL 3.1.1.3a-f <i>Standard Setting Workshop Materials (IOIBs)</i> EL 2.1.1.1 <i>2017-18 Summative Score Reporting Specifications</i> EL 3.3.1 <i>ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 1</i> EL 3.3.2 <i>ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 2_Nebraska Example</i></p>	<p>Peers could not locate item maps showing item difficulty and student ability across the continuum in each domain and overall. The CSEMs (addressed in critical element 4.1) would suggest that there is not adequate precision, at least at higher levels of student proficiency.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Item maps showing item difficulty and student ability across the continuum in each domain and overall (by grade/grade span). 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers multiple forms of <i>ELP assessments</i> within or across grade-spans, ELP levels, or school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s <i>ELP standards</i> and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across settings.</p>	<p>The consortium’s narrative indicates that the three forms (A, B, and C) of the online assessment are “nearly identical” because they use the same items in different orders. EL 2.2.9 <i>Item Analysis and Calibration (2017)</i> EL 4.5.2 <i>ELPA21 Internal Memo: IRT Calibration Implications (2019)</i>.</p>	<p>EL 4.5.2, p. 1: “The total of 2113 items were concurrently calibrated...”</p> <p>In spite of concurrent calibration procedures, some peers thought that item ordering could potentially affect student ability estimates.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>EL 2.1.2.1 <i>ELPA21 Assessment Framework - Summative School Year 2015-2016</i> (p. 15) EL 2.1.2.3 a-f <i>Field Test Slots All Form 1A ELPA21 ONLINE Summative Test Form (2017)</i> EL 2.2.2a-f <i>ELPA21 Task and Item Specifications (2016)</i> EL 2.2.6 <i>Item Development Process Report (2015)</i>, pp. 53-56 EL 2.2.9 <i>Item Analysis and Calibration (2017)</i> EL 3.3.3 <i>ELPA21 AAA TMT Review of Items Showing Differential Item Functioning for English Language Learners with Disabilities</i> EL 4.6.1 <i>ELPA21 Summative and Screener PP Style Guide TB 020218</i> EL 4.6.2 <i>Examples of Paper-based Representation of Online Items</i> EL 4.6.3 a-f <i>ELPA21 Paper and Pencil Summative Test Form Planners (2017)</i> EL 4.6.4 <i>A Data-informed, Judgment-based Procedure for Linking Cut Scores on Alternative Assessment Formats</i> EL 4.6.5 a-f <i>ELPA21 Braille Summative Test Form Planners (2017)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peers could not locate sufficient evidence about the design and development process of paper and Braille forms to determine whether they support comparable interpretations of results across versions. <p>Evidence could include data such as whether the same blueprint is used, what number of items from the online version must be modified for paper/Braille versions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peers could not locate adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. This could be achieved with further details about the test design and development of the Braille and paper/pencil versions.
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Details about the design and development process of paper and Braille forms to justify the comparability of different versions. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The consortium’s narrative indicates, “At its inception, ELPA21 developed a quality assurance plan that outlined the required steps to evaluate the technical quality of its assessment system including test development, implementation, interpretation, and use of results (EL 3.1.1 A Quality Assurance Plan for ELPA21 (2013)). This plan serves as a conceptual framework for identifying, collecting, and evaluating evidence concerning the fairness of testing procedures, the reliability of test scores, and the validity of test-based interpretations. The development of a continuous quality assurance plan would follow the general approach of EL 3.1.1.” (p. 83). Consortium-provided evidence in this section was not relevant: EL 4.7.2.1 Alt-ELPA A Path Forward (ASES-ELL SCASS) October 2017 EL 4.7.2.2 Fairness in Testing ELs and ELSWDs_MC EL 4.7.2.3 Fairness in Testing ELs and ELSWDs_NS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peers could not locate evidence that the plan outlined in EL 3.1.1 has been implemented, although the timeline (p. 19) indicates that the plan should have been implemented in 2016. Consultation with the governing bodies as outlined in the consortium’s narrative is appropriate, but it does not constitute a systematic plan. Although the consortium provided some evidence in this section of presentations to CCSSO and some public documents on the ELPA21 website, it is not evidence of technical quality. State-provided evidence should be reviewed for this portion of critical element.
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The consortium should provide a systematic quality control plan or data showing that a plan like the one in EL 3.1.1 has in fact been implemented. State-specific evidence should be reviewed to determine whether information about technical quality of the test is made public, including on the State’s website. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students⁸ with disabilities in the State’s assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For ELP assessments, policies that require the inclusion of an EL with a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) such that there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected component (the State must assess the student’s English language proficiency based on the remaining components in which it is possible to assess the student). 		<p>N/A: State-specific (although the consortium provided some additional evidence)</p>
<p>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>No additional evidence is required for the consortium.</p>		

⁸ For ELP peer review, this refers to ELs with disabilities.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note: This critical element does not apply to ELP assessments, as the requirements only apply to the inclusion of ELs in academic assessments. 		N/A
Section 5.2 Summary Statement		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs; • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. • Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EL 2.3.1.2 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual (2018-19), pp. 2-3, 6-15, Figure 1, Appendices C-E • EL 2.3.1.2 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual (2018-19), p. 9, Appendix B • EL 2.2.8 Spring 2015 ELPA21 Field Test Technical Report (2016), pp. 13-16. • EL 3.3.3 (Redacted) <i>ELPA21 AAA TMT Review of Items Showing Differential Item Functioning for English Language Learners with Disabilities</i> • According to the consortium’s narrative (p. 93), exceptional requests are handled by the States. • From the consortium’s narrative: “ELPA21 acknowledges that each member state, consistent with its state policy and practice, is responsible for ensuring accommodations for all assessments do not deny students the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.” (p. 93). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peers believe that the consortium has made available an appropriate list of accommodations for ELs on the ELPA21. • Some peers believe that insufficient evidence was provided showing the effectiveness of accommodations and that the accommodations “allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.” <p>EL 2.3.1.2 indicates that some accommodations may not be used consistently across member States, rendering comparisons of ELPA21 scores problematic. Specifically, some vendors allow unlimited replays in the Listening domain (p. 14) and unlimited re-recordings in the Speaking domain (p. 13) as a normal part of test administration, while for others it is an accommodation. Peers suggest that the consortium have a standardized policy that would help ensure consistency. Also, some vendors allow all universal features to be disabled (p. i) whereas others do not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State-provided evidence should be reviewed regarding exceptional requests. <p>The consortium does not currently play a role in reviewing or allowing exceptional requests. Peers recommend that the consortium have a mechanism by which any exceptional accommodations that occur multiple times can be discussed at the consortium level and be added to the standard list of accommodations as deemed appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State-provided evidence should be reviewed regarding the extent to which accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students the opportunities to

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peers request that the consortium consider providing a standardized policy that would help ensure consistency regarding the use of re-plays and re-recordings as part of the normal test administration or as an accommodation. • State-provided evidence should be reviewed regarding exceptional requests. • State-provided evidence should be reviewed regarding the extent to which accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students the opportunities to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures; • Monitored for administrations of all required ELP assessments, and AELPA. 	<p>Although the responsibility for monitoring test administration for special populations falls largely to the member States, the consortium provided some evidence in this critical element (but this is just general documentation produced by ELPA21 to ensure consistent administration procedures across States):</p> <p>EL 2.3.1.1a-f <i>Assessment Guides (2016)</i> EL 2.3.1.4 <i>Test Coordinator's Manual (2016)</i> EL 2.3.2.5 <i>Student Testing Session (2016)</i> EL 2.3.2.9 <i>Workstation Preparation (2016)</i> EL 2.3.1.2 <i>Accessibility and Accommodations Manual (2018-2019)</i>, p. 3, Appendices C, D, E. EL 2.3.2.2 <i>Accessibility Features and Accommodations (2016)</i></p>	<p>State-provided evidence regarding monitoring test administration for special populations should be reviewed.</p>
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

SECTION 6: ELP ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For ELP standards:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State adopted ELP achievement standards that address the different proficiency levels of ELs; • If the State has developed alternate ELP achievement standards, it has adopted them only for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who cannot participate in the regular ELP assessment even with appropriate accommodations. 		<p>N/A: State-specific</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>N/A: State-specific evidence should be reviewed for this critical element.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

Critical Element 6.2 – ELP Achievement Standards Setting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ELP achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate ELP achievement standards</i>, such that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cut scores are developed for every grade/grade band, content domain/language domain, and/or composite for which proficiency-level scores are reported. 	<p>EL 3.1.1.2 ELPA21 Standard Setting Technical Report</p> <p>N/A: There are no alternate ELP achievement standards at this time.</p>	<p>The bookmark standard setting method was used and panelists had appropriate diversity and expertise.</p> <p>Cut scores were developed for every grade/grade band and language domain for which proficiency-level scores are reported.</p> <p>As peers noted in section 4.1, some evidence (e.g., CSEMs) suggests that some cut scores may have been set too high, especially at cuts 3 and 4. Peers request that the consortium evaluate the cut scores.</p>
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate the cut scores, particularly at cuts 3 and 4. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

Critical Element 6.3 –Aligned ELP Achievement Standards

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>For ELP achievement standards: The State has ensured that ELP assessment results are expressed in terms that are clearly aligned with the State’s ELP standards, and its ELP performance-level descriptors.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate ELP achievement standards for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate ELP achievement standards should be linked to the State’s grade-level/grade-band ELP standards, and should reflect professional judgment of the highest ELP achievement standards possible for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>EL 1.2.2 <i>English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards</i>, p. 10 EL 2.1.1.1 <i>ELPA21 2017-18 Summative Score Reporting Specifications</i>, pp.13-18 EL 2.2.6 <i>Item Development Process Report</i>, p.20 EL 3.1.1.1 <i>ELP Standards at a Glance</i>, p. 1 EL 3.1.1.2 <i>ELPA21 Standard Setting Technical Report</i>, pp. 11-20, 26-27, 73-75, 79 EL 3.2.3 <i>Achievement Level Descriptors K-12</i>.</p> <p>The State has not adopted alternate ELP achievement standards for ELs with the most significant cognitive disabilities. According to the timeline in EL 1.3.1 (p. 23), the Alt ELP standards were being created between January and December 2018 and will be “acknowledged” by States in 2019, and implemented in 2020.</p>	<p>Peers found the consortium-provided evidence shows that ELPA21 assessment results are clearly aligned with the consortium’s ELP standards.</p>
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on English language proficiency for all ELs including the number and percentage of ELs attaining ELP.</p> <p>For the ELP assessment, the State provides coherent and timely information about each student’s attainment of the State’s ELP standards to parents that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports the ELs’ English proficiency in terms of the State’s grade level/grade-band ELP standards (including performance-level descriptors); • Are provided in an understandable and uniform format; • Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian; 	<p>Primary responsibility for score reporting falls to the member States, but the consortium provided some documentation of “guidance for member states to provide to vendors for incorporating ELPA21 into state scoring, reporting, and data systems.” (EL 2.1.1.1, p. 6)</p> <p>EL 2.1.1.1 <i>ELPA21 2017-18 Summative Score Reporting Specifications</i>, pp. 22 -27. EL 3.3.1 <i>ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 1</i> EL 6.4.1 <i>Issue Brief Reporting_4-9-14 (v2)</i>, pp. 1, 2, 4.</p> <p>EL 2.1.1.2 <i>Summative Score Reporting Specifications</i>, pp. 22-25 EL 3.3.1 <i>ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 1</i>, p. 28 EL 6.4.1 <i>Issue Brief Reporting_4-9-14 (v2)</i>, pp. 4-7</p> <p>EL 4.7.1.13 was not cited in this section but it discusses ongoing research that ELPA is doing to make score reports more useful and informative for teachers and parents.</p> <p>EL 4.7.1.12 <i>Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Notes</i> was not cited in this critical element either, but peers found that it contained relevant information since there were recommendations for improving score reports (p. 21).</p>	<p>Sample score reports were not provided in the consortium submission. Therefore, State-provided evidence should be reviewed for all aspects of this critical element.</p> <p>Peers recommend that the consortium develop score report templates in consultation with member States and taking into consideration evidence from its ongoing research (EL 4.7.1.13) and TAC (EL 4.7.1.12).</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent. 		
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required from the consortium. However, State-provided evidence should be reviewed for all aspects of this critical element.		

SECTION 7: DOES NOT APPLY TO ELP ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW

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