



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Ryan Wise  
Director  
Iowa Department of Education  
Grimes State Office Building  
400 E 14th Street  
Des Moines, IA 50319-0146

July 9, 2019

Dear Director Wise:

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 Iowa Department of Education (IDE) to prepare for the English language proficiency (ELP) peer review that occurred in April 2019. Specifically, IDE submitted evidence regarding the English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21<sup>st</sup> 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 IDE'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 IDE 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

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.*

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 IDE to submit is enclosed with this letter.

I also note that IDE did not submit evidence for an alternate ELP assessment for ELs with significant cognitive disabilities who are unable to take the regular ELP assessment. Within 30 days, IDE 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 alternate ELP assessment, 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 IDE's Title I, Part A grant award. The condition shall remain until IDE'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, 5.3 and 5.4. Insufficient progress to address such matters may lead OSERS to place a condition on IDE'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](mailto:ESEA.Assessment@ed.gov)

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan  
Assistant Secretary for  
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Erika Cook, Chief, Bureau of Leading, Teaching, Learning Services

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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<b>1.3 – Required ELP Assessments</b>	For the State’s English Language Proficiency (ELP) assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
<b>1.4 – Policies for Including All ELs in ELP Assessments</b>	For the State’s ELP assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b>	For ELPA21: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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"> <li>○ Information on how many standards each test form is assessing and how many standards are not assessed by form and grade or grade band.</li> <li>○ The proportion of hand-scored items by grade-band domain versus the proportion of machine-scored items.</li> <li>○ A rationale for assessing/not assessing standards.</li> <li>○ Documentation and a description of how the test blueprints support the intended interpretation and uses of the results.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
<b>2.2 – Item Development</b>	For ELPA21: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
<b>2.3 – Test Administration</b>	For ELPA21: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that Iowa Department of Education (IDE) has established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration (e.g., evidence of the actual plans; and evidence</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	that local educational agency (LEA) staff have been made aware of these plans).
<b>2.5 – Test Security</b>	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that IDE has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results, specifically practices or procedures for maintaining the security of test materials during ELPA21 test development.</li> <li>• Evidence of policies for remediation in the event of security incidents involving ELPA21.</li> </ul>
<b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b>	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b>	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Linguistic Processes</b>	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b>	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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 grades 6-8 and 9-12).</li> </ul>
<b>4.1 – Reliability</b>	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reliability evidence, specifically evidence of conditional standard error of measurement of ELPA21 (e.g., for students of higher abilities).</li> </ul>

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Additional Evidence Needed</b>
<b>4.2 – Fairness and accessibility</b>	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
<b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b>	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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 ELP 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).</li> </ul>
<b>4.4 – Scoring</b>	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
<b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b>	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the paper and Braille versions of the ELPA21: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments.</li> <li>○ Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b>	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
<b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b>	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear evidence of 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 (e.g., clarify if a domain exception for writing is allowed; and if so, please provide clear policy that describes this).</li> </ul>
<b>5.3 – Accommodations</b>	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that IDE makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its ELP assessments are accessible to ELs with disabilities, specifically ELs with significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b>	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State monitors test administration 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 consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice and consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act , placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the American with Disabilities Act, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions.</li> </ul>
<b>6.4 – Reporting</b>	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State reports ELPA21 results for all ELs assessed, specifically that and the reporting facilitates timely interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public (e.g., provide a reporting schedule).</li> <li>• Evidence that the State reports to the public its ELPA21 results on ELP for all ELs, including the number and percentage of ELs attaining ELP.</li> </ul>

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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR IOWA

Contents

**SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS 4**

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 ..... 17  
Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security ..... 18  
Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 22

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY 25**

Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content 25  
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 31**

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability ..... 31  
Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility ..... 33  
Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum ..... 34  
Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 35  
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 39**

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 39  
Critical Element 5.2 – DOES NOT APPLY to ELP Assessment Peer Review 41  
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.

..... 45

**SECTION 6: ELP ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING 50**

**Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of ELP Achievement Standards for All Students ..... 50**  
**Critical Element 6.2 – ELP Achievement Standards Setting ..... 52**  
**Critical Element 6.3 – Aligned ELP Achievement Standards ..... 53**  
**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting ..... 55**

**SECTION 7: DOES NOT APPLY TO ELP ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW 58**

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 IOWA**

**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><b><i>For English language proficiency (ELP) standards:</i></b>                      The State formally adopted K-12 ELP standards for all ELs in public schools in the State.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.1.1.1.</b> <i>Iowa State Board of Education Agenda Executive Summary 1.23.14 (2014)</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.1.1.2</b> <i>Iowa State Board of Education Minutes 1.23.14 (2014)</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.1.1.3</b> <i>October 2014 Title III Federal Monitoring Citations and Responses Memo from Dr. David Tilly (2014)</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.1.1.4</b> <i>AEA PD Online Directions (2018)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Module 1</b> - <i>Introduction</i>;</li> <li>○ <b>Module 2</b> - <i>Task Analysis</i>;</li> <li>○ <b>Module 3</b> - <i>ELP Standards</i>;</li> <li>○ <b>Module 4</b> - <i>Performance Level Descriptors</i>;</li> <li>○ <b>Module 5</b> - <i>Formative Assessment</i>; and</li> <li>○ <b>Module 6</b> - <i>Reflection</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>ST.1.1.5</b> <i>ELL Module Data January 2019</i></li> </ul>	<p>Iowa provides adequate evidence of the formal adoption by the Iowa Board of Education of the English Language Proficiency standards developed by CCSSO in collaboration with WestEd and Stanford University. This is demonstrated in <b>ST.1.1.1:</b> Iowa State Board of Education Executive Summary 1.23.14 (2014) and <b>ST.1.1.2:</b> Iowa State Board of Education Minutes 1.23.14 ELP (2014).</p> <p>In addition to evidence of the adoption of ELP standards for all ELs in public schools in the state, Iowa provides information that details the plan to ensure that all staff responsible for Language Instruction Education Program (LIEP) teachers, as well paraprofessionals, instructional coaches, and other responsible for LIEP services or who support such services are trained on the new ELP standards (<b>ST.1.1.3</b>).</p> <p>In their submission Notes, Iowa provides data to document training on implementing ELP standards (also addressed in <b>ST.1.1.5</b>).</p>
<p><b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>X 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 IOWA

**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><b>For ELP standards:</b> The ELP standards: 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 definition<sup>1</sup>). 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><u>CE 1.2.1</u>: No additional evidence</p> <p><u>CE 1.2.2</u>: No additional evidence</p> <p><u>CE 1.2</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.1.2.1</b> <i>English Language Proficiency Standards (2014)</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.1.1.4</b> <i>AEA PD Online Directions (2018)</i></li> </ul>	<p><u>CE 1.2.1</u> The IDE stipulates that the response and evidence submitted by the ELPA21 to address CE 1.2.1 makes clear that the ELP Standards assessed in ELPA21 derive from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing. The IDE further stipulates that the state complies fully with all those elements of the ELPA21 presentation on CE 1.2.1.</p> <p><u>CE 1.2.2</u> The IDE stipulates that the response and evidence submitted by the ELPA21 to address CE 1.2.2 makes clear that the ELP Standards address the different proficiency levels of ELs. The IDE further stipulates that the State complies fully with all those elements of the ELPA21 presentation on CE 1.2.2 and provides no additional evidence.</p> <p><u>CE 1.2.3</u> The IDE stipulates that the response and evidence submitted by the ELPA21 to address CE 1.2.3 makes clear that the ELP Standards assessed in ELPA21 align with the Common Core Standards in ELA, literacy, and mathematics and the NextGen Science Standards. IDE further stipulates that the State complies with all elements of the ELPA21 presentation. While reviewers accepted Iowa’s stipulation that the State complies with all elements of the ELPA21 presentation, they would have liked to have seen some evidence that explicitly demonstrated Iowa’s adoption of</p>

<sup>1</sup> 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](http://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 IOWA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		<p>the Common Core and NextGen Science Standards and that any additions/deletions were not substantive ones.</p> <p>Iowa provides additional information in their submission to elaborate on the training required of teachers to understand connections between the ELA Standards and academic content area standards and/or practices (ST.1.2.1, ST.1.1.4).</p>
<b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<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: [list additional evidence needed w/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 IOWA**

**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 <b>annual general and alternate ELP assessment</b> (aligned with State ELP standards) administered to:                      All ELs in grades K-12.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ST.1.3.1 Title III EL Guidance (2018)</li> <li>• ST.1.3.2 White Paper: Developing an Alternate ELPA21 for English Learners with the Most Significant Cognitive Disabilities (2018)</li> <li>• ST.1.1.4 AEA PD Online Directions (2018)</li> <li>• ST.1.1.5 ELL Module Data January 2019</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence 1.3.1 clearly states that all ELs must participate in an annual ELP assessment.</p> <p>However, Evidence 1.3.2. clearly states the State does not have an AELPA for ELs with significant cognitive disabilities. Evidence 1.3.2 does provide a timeline for developing an AELPA.</p> <p>Evidence 1.1.4 indicates training provided to LEAs for providing accommodations to ELs with significant cognitive disabilities. Evidence 1.1.5 documents LEA staff have completed this training.</p> <p>While the State has documented its efforts to test all ELs, including those with significant cognitive disabilities, it has not submitted an alternate ELP assessment (AELPA) for ELs with significant cognitive disabilities for this peer review.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:                      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).</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 IOWA**

**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
<p>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>	<p>For CE 1.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ST.1.4.1 Office of Civil Rights email to superintendents and principals (2015)</li> <li>• ST.1.3.1 Title III Guidance (2018)</li> <li>• ST.1.4.2 (2018-19) CASA Assurances</li> <li>• ST.1.4.3 Iowa Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual (2019)</li> <li>• ST.1.4.4 ELPA21 Accessibility Manual (2018-19)</li> <li>• ST.1.1.4 AEA PD Online Directions (2018)</li> <li>• ST.1.4.5 ELPA21 Parent Brochure (2018)</li> <li>• ST.1.4.6 Appendix for Iowa – 2018 Summary</li> <li>• ST.1.4.7 2015-16 Iowa ELPA21 Annual Report</li> <li>• ST.1.4.8 2016-17 Iowa ELPA21 Annual Report</li> <li>• ST.1.1.5 ELL Module Data January 2019</li> <li>• ST.1.4.9 January 2018 School Leader Update</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence 1.4.2 provides LEA assurances that all ELs are assessed with the ELP assessment, and reinforces the guidance given to LEAs in 1.3.1. Evidence 1.4.3 clearly states that all students, including all ELs must participate in statewide assessment, including the ELP assessment.</p> <p>Other evidences reinforce Iowa’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><b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>X As also noted in critical element 1.3, the following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: 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).</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 IOWA

### **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)).

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<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"> <li>State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education).</li> <li>Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas).</li> <li>Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State.</li> <li>Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents.</li> </ul>	<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><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required because this critical element does not apply.</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 IOWA

**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> <p>Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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> <p>If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it</p>	<p>Iowa offers no new evidence.</p>	<p>The IDE stipulates that the response submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium in response to CE 2.1 constitutes a clear and comprehensive account of their summative test design and development process.</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 IOWA

<p style="margin: 0;">makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting.</p> <p style="margin: 0;">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>		
<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p style="margin: 0;">_X_ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p style="margin: 0;">___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: [list additional evidence needed w/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 IOWA**

**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> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Assess student English language proficiency based on the <i>State's ELP standards</i> in terms of content and language processes.</p>	<p>Iowa offers no new evidence.</p>	<p>The IDE stipulates that the response submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium in response to CE2.2 constitutes a clear and comprehensive account of their reasonable and technically sound item development procedures for an assessment of students' English language proficiency based on the State's ELP standards.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b></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: [list additional evidence needed w/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 IOWA**

**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> <p>Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</p> <p>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;</p> <p>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</p>	<p><u>CE 2.3.1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.2.3.1</b> <i>Iowa ELPA21 Portal</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.3.2</b> <i>ELPA21 Summative Iowa Test Administrators Manual</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.1.4.4</b> <i>ELPA21 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual (2018-19)</i></li> <li>• <b>ST. 2.3.4</b> <i>ELPA21 Assessment Support Google</i></li> <li>• <b>ST. 2.3.5</b> <i>Iowa ELPA21 Administration Policies</i></li> <li>• <b>ST. 2.3.6</b> <i>Iowa ELPA21 Assessment Supports</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.3.7</b> <i>Iowa ELPA21 Website</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.1.4.9</b> <i>January 2018 School Leader Update</i></li> </ul> <p><u>CE 2.3.2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.1.1.4</b> <i>AEA PD Online Directions (2018)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Module:</b> <i>ELPA21 Technology Coordinator Training 2018-2019</i></li> <li>○ <b>Module:</b> <i>ELPA21 Test Coordinator Training 2018-2019</i></li> <li>○ <b>Module:</b> <i>ELPA21 Administering the 2018-2019 Summative Training</i></li> <li>○ <b>Module:</b> <i>ELPA21 Accessibility and Accommodations 2018-2019 (training)</i></li> <li>○ <b>Module:</b> <i>ELPA21 Assessing ELs with Significant Cognitive Disabilities/Alternate Forms of Communication (training)</i></li> <li>○ <b>Module:</b> <i>ELPA21 Administering Paper Tests for an Accommodation 2018-2019(training)</i></li> <li>○ <b>Module:</b> <i>ELPA21 Administering K-3 Paper Tests for Religious Exemptions 2018-2019(training)</i></li> <li>○ <b>Module:</b> <i>ELPA21 Administering 4-8 Paper Tests for Religious Exemptions 2018-2019 (training)</i></li> <li>○ <b>Module:</b> <i>Accessing, Interpreting, and Using ELPA21 Results 2018-2019 (training)</i></li> <li>○ <b>Module:</b> <i>Gearing Up for ELPA21 Assessment Module 2018-2019 (training)</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><u>CE 2.3.1</u></p> <p>The IDE stipulates that the response submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium in response to CE 2.3.1 constitutes a comprehensive account of their clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of assessments, including those administrations with accommodations. The IDE further stipulates that the State complies fully with all those elements of the ELPA21 presentation on CE2.3.1.</p> <p>Iowa does, however, provide additional evidence of means of ensuring that educators are adequately apprised of the standardized procedures for administration of assessments, including administration with accommodations, including communication of this information through multiple sources (e.g., <b>ST.2.3.1, ST.2.3.2, ST.1.4.4, ST.2.3.4, ST.2.3.5, ST.2.3.6</b>). IDE hosts a website (see <b>ST.2.3.7</b>) for communicating policies and procedures to the general public and, via links to others sites, to Iowa educators, and also produces a monthly online newsletter (see <b>ST.1.4.9</b>) for school administrators that includes updates on ELPA21.</p> <p><u>CE 2.3.2</u></p> <p>The IDE stipulates that the response submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium in response to CE 2.3.2 constitutes a comprehensive account of the 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</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 IOWA

<p>possible technology challenges during test administration.</p>	<p><u>CE 2.3.3</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST 2.3.8</b> <i>State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.1.1.5</b> <i>ELL Module Data January 2019</i></li> </ul>	<p>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.</p> <p>The IDE further stipulates that the State complies fully with all those elements of the ELPA21 presentation on CE 2.3.2, and provides additional state-specific evidence of how the State ensures that Iowa licensed educators receive adequate training to effectively administer ELPA21 (including to students with disabilities)—primarily through their creation of a series of ten training modules (accessed through <b>ST.1.1.4</b>). These modules are clear and detailed and each target different audiences and topics. The submission makes clear which modules are required for all educators and which for those in specific roles.</p> <p><u>CE 2.3.3</u></p> <p>The IDE stipulates that the response submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium in response to CE2.3.3 constitutes a comprehensive account that 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. The IDE further stipulates that the State complies fully with all those elements of the ELPA21 presentation on CE2.3.3.</p> <p>Iowa provides additional information regarding training and guidance for technology-based test administrations that supplements the ELPA21 specifications documents (<b>S.T.2.3.8</b> and Module: <i>ELPA21 Technology Coordinator Training 2018-2019</i>).</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 IOWA**

		<p>Since Iowa maintains a technology coordinators listserv to communicate information on any technology changes to the system as needed, this resource may also serve as a means of addressing any technology challenges that may arise during test administration. Iowa indicates in their narrative that the training module for technology coordinators includes tools and information related to managing technology-based risks prior to and during test administration, However, reviewers wish to note that because they are not expected to review in full such resources as training modules, it would be useful for the state to provide documentation (e.g., screen shots, pdfs, summaries OR a reference to a specific location/timeframe in the case of a video) that makes clear that a given training module or program addresses the specifics identified in a given Critical Element. In this case, the description of <b>Module: ELPA21 Technology Coordinator Training 2018-2019</b> does not reference contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration and reviewers were unable to find such information when they searched through this module.</p> <p>Overall, there was insufficient evidence to document that Iowa has established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges that may not be addressed by consortium resources.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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 IOWA

For CE 2.3.3: Documentation that demonstrates that Iowa has established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration that develop at the local level.

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 IOWA**

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<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>For CE 2.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ST 2.4.1 State Monitoring Checklist for Test Security and Ethics</li> <li>• ST.2.3.8 State of Iowa Test Security Manual</li> <li>• ST 2.4.2 Iowa BEDS ELPA21 Survey Questions</li> <li>• ST.2.4.3 IA TIDE User Guide</li> <li>• ST.2.4.4 ELPA21 Monitoring Schedule (2019)</li> <li>• ST.2.4.5 State Observer Monitoring Checklist for Test Security and Ethics</li> </ul>	<p>The evidence submitted by the State (especially 2.3.8, 2.4.1, 2.4.4 and 2.4.5) describe a thorough program of monitoring of the ELP assessment by districts, the State, and the testing vendor. The evidence supports that the State ensures that test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across schools and districts.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</b></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 IOWA**

**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> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">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;</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Detection of test irregularities; Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Application of test security procedures to the general ELP assessments and the AELPA.</p>	<p><u>CE 2.5.1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST 2.5.1</b> <i>BOEE Code of Professional Conduct and Ethics</i></li> <li>• <b>ST. 2.3.5</b> <i>Iowa ELPA21 Administration Policies</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.3.8</b> <i>State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.5.2</b> <i>Assurance for Proper and Ethical Test Administration</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.5.3</b> <i>Test Administrator and Test Coordinators Test Security/Confidentiality Agreement</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.5.4</b> <i>ELPA21 Test Security/Confidentiality Agreement for Human Readers, Scribes, Signers, and Translators</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.5.5</b> <i>Chain-of-Custody for Paper Testing</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.5.6</b> <i>Chain-of-Custody for Computer-Based Testing</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.5.7</b> <i>Guidance for Social Media ELPA21 Assessment Monitoring</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.4.1</b> <i>State Monitoring Checklist for Test Security and Ethics</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.5.8</b> <i>Incident Reporting, Investigation, and Remediation Flow Chart</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.5.9</b> <i>Testing Incident Report Form</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.5.10</b> <i>Test Security Podcast</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.1.1.4</b> <i>AEA PD Online Directions (2018)</i></li> </ul> <p><u>CE 2.5.2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.2.5.11</b> <i>ELPA21 Implementation Manual (2017-18)</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.3.8</b> <i>State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.5.10</b> <i>Test Security Podcast</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.4.1</b> <i>State Monitoring Checklist for Test Security and Ethics</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.5.8</b> <i>Incident Reporting, Investigation, and Remediation Flow Chart</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.5.9</b> <i>Testing Incident Report Form</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.3.8</b> <i>State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i></li> </ul>	<p><u>CE 2.5 (Overall)</u></p> <p>The IDE stipulates that the response submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium in response to CE 2.5 constitutes a comprehensive account of the guidance provided to the State regarding the prevention of test irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administrative 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.</p> <p>Iowa has provided state-specific evidence for each of the factors for this Critical Element.</p> <p><u>CE 2.5.1</u></p> <p>IDE further stipulates that the State has implemented and documented policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities identified in this CE. These include a policy regarding violations related to misrepresentation or falsification of student evaluation information (<b>ST.2.5.1</b>). <b>ST. 2.3.5</b> provides abundant detail regarding policies related to ELP assessment.</p> <p>Iowa provides ample evidence to address the provision of procedural guidelines and descriptions of best practices through their reference to, and lengthy quotation from, the State of Iowa Test Security Manual (<b>ST.2.3.8</b> and various appendices therein, which include sample documents and checklists of use at district level).</p> <p>IDE’s battery of training modules referenced previously in other sections of these notes include a number that address</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 IOWA**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.1.1.4</b> <i>AEA PD Online Directions (2018)</i></li> </ul> <p><u>CE.2.5.3</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.2.3.8</b> <i>State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.5.10</b> <i>Test Security Podcast</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.5.9</b> <i>Testing Incident Report Form</i></li> </ul> <p><u>CE 2.5.4</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.2.3.8</b> <i>State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i></li> </ul> <p><u>CE 2.5.5</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.2.3.8</b> <i>State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.5.10</b> <i>Test Security Podcast</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.5.2</b> <i>Assurance for Proper and Ethical Test Administration</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.5.3</b> <i>Test Administrator and Test Coordinators Test Security/Confidentiality Agreement</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.5.3.4</b> <i>ELPA21 Test Security/Confidentiality Agreement for Human Readers, Scribes, and Translators (in Appendix D of ST.2.3.8 State of Iowa Test Security Manual)</i></li> </ul>	<p>test security, as does their annual test security podcast (<b>ST.2.5.10</b>)</p> <p>Particularly noteworthy to this reviewer were the following evidentiary items:</p> <p><b>ST.2.5.5.</b> The State has, among its students, those who must take a paper-and-pencil version of the assessment, and this document makes clear that test security considerations extend to those administrations by documenting chain-of-custody.</p> <p><b>ST.2.5.7.</b> Given the wide impact of social media, IDE has also addressed the need for guidance related to social media as a source of potential security breaches.</p> <p><b>ST.2.5.8.</b> This Test Security Incident Flowchart demonstrates that the State has considered the implications and impact of security breaches beyond classroom, district, or state—to the consortia of states participating in ELPA21.</p> <p>Reviewers also regarded as evidence <b>ST.2.5.2</b>, although it was not identified by the State as evidence for this Critical element.</p> <p><u>CE2.5.2.</u> The IDE stipulates that the response submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium in response to CE 2.5.2 constitutes a comprehensive account of the guidance provided to the State regarding the prevention of test irregularities. IDE describes its utilization of ELPA21 resources, and provides further evidence in the form of the State of Iowa Test Security Manual (<b>ST.2.3.8</b>). IDE indicates that districts must maintain a record of any testing improprieties, irregularities, and breaches, reporting the latter two immediately to IDE. The submission includes copies of relevant documents (<b>ST.2.5.8</b>, Appendix J and <b>ST.2.5.9</b>).</p> <p>Iowa identifies other documents and resources (e.g., training modules) that provide examples of breaches, improprieties and irregularities, ensuring that those involved in testing have ample opportunities to become</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 IOWA

		<p>familiar with policies and practices related to detection of those events.</p> <p>IDE has not provided any information on how they may routinely collect information and conduct post-administration data forensics (e.g., unusual score gains or losses, similarity analyses, unusual timing patterns, etc.). It would have enhance the submission for IDE to include such information (see <i>Guidance</i>, p. 44)</p> <p>While not required, it would have enhanced the submission to include a summary of test security incidents from the most recent year of administration (see <i>Guidance</i>, p. 44).</p> <p><u>CE 2.5.3</u> The IDE stipulates that the response submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium in response to CE 2.5.3 constitutes a comprehensive account of the guidance provided to the State regarding remediation following test security incidents involving administration of ELPA21.</p> <p>To address this Critical Element more fully, Iowa clearly describes processes for remediation of low-risk improprieties (handled at local level), irregularities (handled through state and local collaboration), and breaches (handled through state and ELPA21 Consortium collaboration).</p> <p>Reviewers were unable to find any reference to communication strategies for alerting the Consortium to test security incidents that potentially have wider impact than school, district, or state. This is a need that was highlighted by reviewers of the ELPA21 submission.</p> <p><u>CE 2.5.4</u> IDE indicates that both assessment personnel and legal staff respond to any irregularity or breach and follow a course of action determined to address allegations and remediate the breach (<b>ST.2.3.8</b>, Appendices J and K).</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 IOWA**

		<p>Reviewers found <b>ST.2.5.8</b> useful in illustration procedures, but would have liked to have seen Iowa’s decision rules for investigating potential test irregularities.</p> <p><u>CE 2.5.5</u></p> <p>IDE indicates that test security procedures are applied to the ELPA21 as per <b>ST.2.3.8</b>. Test administrators and coordinators receive annual required training that revisits the topic of test security. IDE identifies various confidentiality agreement forms that must be signed by different types of personnel involved in the administration of ELPA21.</p>
<b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b>		
<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: See ELPA21 peer review regarding the need for States to provide evidence of policies and practices for dealing with breaches that may have Consortium-wide impact.</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 IOWA**

**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"> <li>To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results;</li> <li>To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<p><u>CE 2.6.1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.2.3.1</b> <i>Iowa ELPA21 Portal</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.6.1</b> <i>Iowa EdPortal</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.4.5</b> <i>IA TIDE User Guide (2018-19)</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.6.2</b> <i>2018-2019 Iowa ELPA21 Systems User Roles and Access Chart</i></li> </ul> <p><u>CE 2.6.2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.2.6.3</b> <i>EdInsight</i></li> </ul> <p><u>CE 2.6.3</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.2.6.4</b> <i>Every Student Succeeds Act in Iowa (May 3, 2018)</i></li> </ul>	<p><u>CE 2.6</u> (Overall)</p> <p>The IDE stipulates that the response submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium in response to CE 2.6 constitutes a comprehensive account of the policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information. The State utilizes resources provided by the ELPA21 Consortium and adheres to their Data Security Plan and Data Sharing agreement (see ELPA21 response).</p> <p><u>CE 2.6.1</u></p> <p>Iowa provides supplementary information to address this CE. IDE further stipulates that to protect the integrity of test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results, the State meets or exceeds industry standards through the secure Iowa Education Portal (EdPortal; <b>ST.2.6.1</b>; evidentiary document is the site homepage); this is distinct from the State’s portal that provides information to the public (<b>ST.2.3.1</b>; evidence shows landing pages on this portal;). Through EdPortal, authorized users (identified by District-level EdPortal administrators) may access the AIR ELPA21 secure testing portal Test Information and Distribution Engine (TIDE). Authorized users can access procedures for managing their secure account through a user guide created by AIR (<b>ST.2.4.5</b>). TIDE allows authorized users to access all parts of the testing process, execute administrative functions, and generate individual, building, district, and state reports. Authorized users receive training on how to access and utilize the system.</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 IOWA**

		<p>The User Roles and Access Chart (<b>ST.2.6.2</b>) created by AIR for the State provides clear information on which users may access specific data. However, reviewers were unable to locate specific information on user roles and access criteria for EdPortal.</p> <p><u>CE.2.6.2</u> Iowa makes clear that it ensures security of student-level assessment data and protects student privacy and confidentiality, in accordance with FERPA.</p> <p>Iowa describes the state’s data warehouse, EdInsight, and notes the interoperability of systems: AIR TIDE, EdInsight, and Web IEP). School and district-level training is provided on use of EdInsight.</p> <p>Again, information on user roles and access criteria is needed.</p> <p><u>CE 2.6.3</u> Iowa documents the policy requiring protection of student information (Iowa Administrative Code 282-25.3 (6) Standard VI and references ST.2.6.4 (p.34) where the Iowa ESSA Plan indicates that the State will use a minimum N size of 10 for reporting data for all students and subgroups of students.</p> <p>However, beyond identifying the minimum N size, Iowa should provide SDL (statistical disclosure limitation) rules for aggregation and score reporting.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b> No additional evidence is required or</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 IOWA

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

For CE 2.6.1: Specific information on user roles and access criteria for EdPortal

For CE 2.6.2: Specific information on user roles and access criteria for EdInsight

For CE 2.6.3: Provide SDL (statistical disclosure limitation) rules for aggregation and score 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 IOWA

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:                      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 determined in test design is appropriate for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>Iowa offers no new evidence.</p>	<p>The IDE stipulates that the response submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium in response to CE3.1 constitutes a clear and comprehensive account of the assessment’s overall validity, including validity based on content.</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 IOWA

<b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or		
<input type="checkbox"/> 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 IOWA**

**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.	Iowa offers no new evidence.	The IDE stipulates that the response submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium in response to CE 3.2 constitutes a clear and comprehensive account of the assessment’s validity based on linguistic processes.
<b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<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: [list additional evidence needed w/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 IOWA**

**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>Iowa offers no new evidence.</p>	<p>The IDE stipulates that the response submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium in response to CE 3.3 constitutes a clear and comprehensive account of the assessment’s validity based on internal structure.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></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: [list additional evidence needed w/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 IOWA**

**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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.3.4.1</b> <i>ELP Years in Program vs. Proficiency on ELPA21 &amp; IA</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.3.4.2</b> <i>ELPA21 Domain Performance Levels vs. Iowa Assessment Achievement Levels</i></li> <li>• <b>ST. 3.4.3</b> <i>ELPA21 Overall Proficiency Level vs. Iowa Assessment Reading, Mathematics, Science</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.3.4.4</b> <i>Intercorrelations Among ELPA21 PL, IA PL, &amp; Years in EL Program</i></li> </ul>	<p>The IDE stipulates that the response submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium in response to CE 3.4 constitutes a clear and comprehensive account of the assessment’s validity based on relations to other variables. To supplement the ELPA21 Consortium submission, however, Iowa provides additional evidence of the relationship between the State’s ELPA21 scores and other variables. These include:</p> <p>A table that summarizes the number of years students have been in an EL program, the grades in which at least half met proficiency on ELPA21, and the overall proficiency rate for students for that many years in an EL program. Data are displayed for DLM and Iowa Assessments (<b>ST.3.4.1</b>). The submission provides clear and plausible interpretations of this data.</p> <p>A table (<b>ST.3.4.2</b>) that shows, for each ELPA21 domain achievement level, the number and percent of students at the different levels of the general reading subtest of the Iowa Assessments. The submission includes a concise summary of that data.</p> <p>A table (<b>ST.3.4.3</b>) that shows the counts and percentages of students at each ELPA21 composite level compared to achievement levels on general academic assessment in mathematics, reading, and science. The submission includes a brief summary and conclusion that while proficiency on ELPA21 increases likelihood of engaging in academic content, it does not guarantee proficiency in that content.</p> <p>A table (<b>ST.3.4.4</b>) that shows intercorrelations among ELPA21 performance levels, the state’s general academic assessment proficiency levels,</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 IOWA**

		<p>and years in an EL program (by grade level). IDE concludes that correlations among the ELPA21 variables is strong, positive, and statistically significant, providing evidence that “the constructed measured by the ELPA21 are closely centered around a meaning of English language proficiency.”</p> <p>Overall, these data analyses provide evidence of the relationship between the State’s EL students’ ELPA21 scores and their scores on other state assessments. One reviewer questioned whether the State’s methodology sufficiently/appropriately addressed the validity argument.</p> <p><i>NOTE: One peer reviewer observed that the naming convention for ST.3.4.2 differs in columns 2 and 3 of the submission, and that formatting of the document made it very difficult to follow.</i></p>
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></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: [list additional evidence needed w/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 IOWA

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:                      Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population (<i>for ELP assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable</i>);                      Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable;                      Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results;                      For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of <i>an EL’s English proficiency</i>.</p>	<p>Iowa offers no new evidence.</p>	<p>The IDE stipulates that the response submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium in response to CE 4.1 constitutes a clear and comprehensive account of the summative assessment’s reliability.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required or</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 IOWA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>_____ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:                      [list additional evidence needed w/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 IOWA**

**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 definition<sup>2</sup>).</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>Iowa offers no new evidence.</p>	<p>The IDE stipulates that the response submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium in response to CE 4.2 constitutes a clear and comprehensive account of the summative assessment’s fairness and accessibility.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></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: [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</p>		

---

<sup>2</sup> 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](http://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 IOWA**

**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for <i>ELP assessments</i>, including performance for EL students with high and low levels of English language proficiency and with different proficiency profiles across the domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing.</p>	<p>Iowa offers no new evidence.</p>	<p>The IDE stipulates that the response submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium in response to CE 4.3 constitutes a clear and comprehensive account of the summative assessment’s full performance continuum.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></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: [list additional evidence needed w/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 IOWA**

**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.<sup>3</sup></p>	<p>Iowa offers no new evidence.</p>	<p>The IDE stipulates that the response submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium in response to CE 4.4 constitutes a clear and comprehensive account of the assessment’s scoring.</p> <p>The peer review notes for the ELPA21 Consortium submission suggest that more information may be required from participating states regarding domain exceptions. Peer reviewers recognize that relevant information on waivers is included under another CE (5.1.2).</p> <p>Evidentiary documents provided elsewhere by Iowa (e.g., ST 2.3.5) make clear that the State has a policy that requires inclusion of students who may need a waiver for one or more domains.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></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: [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</p>		

<sup>3</sup> 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](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 IOWA**

**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>Iowa offers no new evidence.</p>	<p>The IDE stipulates that the response submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium in response to CE 4.5 constitutes a clear and comprehensive account of the summative assessment’s multiple assessment forms.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></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: [list additional evidence needed w/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 IOWA**

**Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<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> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">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>	<p>Iowa offers no new evidence.</p>	<p>The IDE stipulates that the response submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium in response to CE 4.6 constitutes a clear and comprehensive account of the summative assessment’s multiple versions.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></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: [list additional evidence needed w/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 IOWA**

**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: 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>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>4.7.1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.4.1</b> <i>Iowa ELPA21 Website</i></li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>4.7.2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.4.2</b> <i>Iowa ELPA21 TAC Agenda 2017</i></li> </ul>	<p>The IDE stipulates that the response submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium in response to CE 4.7 constitutes a clear and comprehensive account of the summative assessment’s technical analysis and ongoing maintenance.</p> <p><u>4.7.1</u> Although CE 4.7 is customarily addressed through coordinated evidence for all states participating in a given assessment, Iowa provides supplementary evidence in the form of their annual technical reports. These may be accessed through the Department’s ELPA21 website (see <b>ST.4.1</b>).</p> <p><u>4.7.2</u> Members of the public may request technical reports. Information about technical quality, including technical reports, is reviewed in a public meeting by the State’s ELPA21 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC; see <b>ST.4.2</b>). Reviewers suggest that sharing of technical reports with the public might also be accomplished through posting on the State’s website.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></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: [list additional evidence needed w/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 IOWA

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 students<sup>4</sup> 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> <p><i>For ELP assessments</i>, 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.5.1.1</b> <i>Iowa Administrative Code 281-12.8(1) h. (2)1</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.5.1.2</b> <i>Iowa’s Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.1.4.3</b> <i>Iowa Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.5.1.3</b> <i>Determining Supports for Learning and Performance (page 41, Appendix A, and Appendix B) Draft 1/19</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.5.1.4</b> <i>IEP X ELL X ELPA21 2017_18 Excel file</i></li> </ul> <p><u>CE 5.1.1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.2.3.5</b> <i>Iowa ELPA21 Administrative Policies</i></li> </ul>	<p>IDE indicates that for all state assessments including ELP assessments, Iowa’s state code (updated with the advent of ESSA in 2018 to establish that that all students enrolled in public schools will participate in the state’s assessment system [<b>ST.5.1.1</b>, p. 25]), applies. However, the reviewer was unable to locate in the State’s submission any evidentiary documents that make application to ELP assessments explicit, either for ELs with or without disabilities.</p> <p>Iowa indicates that the state’s guidance (<b>ST.5.1.2</b>) for educators on IEP or placement teams who determine if a student should participate in a general or alternate assessment applies to the ELP assessment. The <i>Iowa Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual</i> (<b>ST.1.4.3</b>, pp. 7-8) outlines policy and guidelines related to accessibility supports for all students, including ELs with/without disabilities, and Appendices A (pp. 61-65) and B (pp. 65-70) of <b>ST.5.1.3</b> contain more specific information about supports and accommodations available on each of the State’s assessments to help IEP and placement teams make determinations on participation in a regular or alternate assessment. <b>ST. 5.4.1</b> shows high participation rates for ELs with disabilities.</p> <p><u>CE 5.1.1</u></p> <p>IDE indicates that their policy for domain exceptions for ELPA21 is included in <i>Iowa ELPA21 Administrative Policies</i> (<b>ST.2.3.5</b>). The State’s policy requires that an EL with a disability for which there are no appropriate accommodation, and thus precludes assessment in one or</p>

<sup>4</sup> 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 IOWA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		<p>more required domains, be assessed for the remaining components of English language proficiency in which testing can occur.</p> <p>Iowa elaborates on conditions/timeframe for exemption(s) for a domain, and indicates that state policy allows exceptions in only three domains: reading, listening, and speaking, but then goes on to state in their submission Notes that " Iowa policy allows the state to grant writing domain exceptions for students on a 504 plan." This appears contradictory and needs to be clarified. In addition, if the State indeed has a policy regarding domain exemption for writing, this policy must be documented.</p>
<b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<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:                      Contradictory information in the Notes related to domain exemptions needs to be clarified or corrected. In addition, if the State indeed has a policy regarding domain exemption for writing, this policy must be documented.</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 IOWA

### **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
Note: This critical element does not apply to ELP assessments, as the requirements only apply to the inclusion of ELs in <b>academic assessments</b> .		
<b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:                      [list additional evidence needed w/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 IOWA**

**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: Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs;</p> <p>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;</p> <p>Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</p> <p>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>	<p><u>CE 5.3.1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.1.4.4</b> <i>ELPA21 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual (2018-19)</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.1.1.4</b> <i>AEA PD Online Directions (2018)</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.4.5</b> <i>IA TIDE User Guide (2018-19)</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.5.3.1</b> <i>ELPA21 Iowa Test Administration Manual (2018-19)</i>.</li> </ul> <p><u>CE 5.3.2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.1.4.3</b> <i>Iowa Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual (2019)</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.3.5</b> <i>Iowa ELPA21 Administrative Policies (2019)</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.1.1.4</b> <i>AEA PD Online Directions (2018)</i></li> </ul> <p><u>CE 5.3.3</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.1.4.3</b> <i>Iowa Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual (2019)</i></li> </ul> <p><u>CE 5.3.4</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.1.1.5</b> <i>ELL Module Data January 2019</i></li> </ul>	<p><u>CE 5.3.1</u></p> <p>The IDE stipulates that the response submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium in response to CE 4.7 constitutes a comprehensive presentation of assurances that appropriate accommodations are available and that the ELPA21 assessment is accessible to the range of ELs to whom the assessment is administered, including those with disabilities.</p> <p>Iowa provides additional detail to support the Consortium’s response. The State addresses accessibility features and accommodations in several of their training modules. To ensure that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs, Test Administrators are provided guidance on activating designated accessibility features and accommodations through TIDE (Test Information and Distribution Engine) and reminded in multiple resources when to do so (see for example <b>ST.2.4.5</b>, pp. 43-47 and <b>ST.5.3.1</b>, p. 5).</p> <p><u>CE 5.3.2</u></p> <p>Iowa explains which resources members of IEP and placement teams should consult to identify supports and accommodations appropriate for individual students (<b>ST.1.4.3</b>) and for clarification on who makes those decisions (<b>ST. 1.4.4</b>). The State ensures that clear distinctions are made between universal accessibility features, supports, and accommodations and provides tools to document individual students’ needs (<b>ST.1.4.3</b>, p. 40, <b>ST.1.4.4</b>, Appendix B).</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 IOWA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>Iowa asserts that test administrators' compliance with the State's policies on accommodations ensures that the same construct is assessed and that scores can be meaningfully compared between students who need/receive accommodations and those who do not.</p> <p><u>CE5.3.3</u>  <b>ST.1.4.3</b> (p. 21 and Tool 25) provides a satisfactory explanation of the State's process for individually reviewing and allowing exceptional requests for students who require accommodations beyond those normally allowed.</p> <p><u>CE 5.3.4</u>                      Iowa indicates that provision of required training of all test administrators ensures that students with disabilities or ELs are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits derived from that participation.</p> <p>Although Iowa notes the number of teachers who completed this training during the 2017-18 school year (<b>ST.1.1.5</b>), this does not substitute for evidence that all those who required training did in fact receive it (or a percentage of those whose participation was documented by IDE). It is likely that this information is available and reviewers would have liked to have seen it.</p> <p>IDE's battery of training modules includes ones for assessing students with significant cognitive disabilities/alternate forms of communication and another on administering paper tests as an accommodation. This provides further assurance that ELs with disabilities are not denied the opportunity to participate in ELPA21.</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 IOWA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or		
<input type="checkbox"/> 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 IOWA

**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"> <li>Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>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;</li> <li>Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures;</li> <li>Monitored for administrations of all required ELP assessments, and AELPA.</li> </ul>	<p><u>CE 5.4.1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.2.5.2</b> <i>Assurance for Proper and Ethical Test Administration</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.3.8</b> <i>State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.4.1</b> <i>State Monitoring Checklist for Test Security and Ethics</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.3.5</b> <i>ELPA21 Administrative Policies (2019)</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.4.3</b> <i>ELPA21 Monitoring Schedule (2019)</i></li> </ul> <p><u>CE 5.4.2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.1.4.3</b> <i>Iowa Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.3.8</b> <i>State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i></li> </ul> <p><u>CE 5.4.3</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.5.4.1</b> <i>Iowa ELL Guidelines (2013-14)</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.1.4.4</b> <i>ELPA21 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual (2018-19)</i></li> </ul> <p><u>CE 5.4.4</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.1.4.3</b> <i>Iowa Statewide Assessment System Accessibility Manual</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.1.4.4</b> <i>ELPA21 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual (2018-19)</i></li> </ul> <p><u>CE 5.4.5</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.2.5.2</b> <i>Assurance for Proper and Ethical Test Administration</i></li> </ul>	<p><u>CE 5.4.1</u></p> <p>Iowa’s submission adequately addresses this CE. In their Notes, IDE explains that the State’s policy on monitoring places responsibility on each school district superintendent and each building principal, who must confirm that ELPA21 has been administered consistent with the State’s policy on accommodations (<b>ST.2.5.2</b>).</p> <p>Trained district observers utilize a detailed monitoring checklist (<b>ST.2.4.1</b>) that includes a focus on accessibility and accommodations. In addition to districts’ self-monitoring, the State may conduct scheduled or unscheduled observations (<b>ST.2.3.8</b>) that include monitoring accessibility features and accommodations. In 2019, one observation is scheduled in each of Iowa’s Title III subgrantee school districts (see <b>ST.2.4.3</b>)</p> <p><u>CE 5.4.2</u></p> <p>Iowa adequately explains steps taken to ensure that the accommodations selected for students participating in ELPA21 are appropriate for addressing students’ disability or language needs and are administered fully and appropriately during testing (<b>ST.1.4.3</b>, p. 8, <b>ST.2.4.1</b>).</p> <p>Information about appropriate linguistic support for ELS in assessment, included under this CE in the State’s submission, seems to the reviewer to be irrelevant to ELPA21.</p> <p>One reviewer was curious to see the AIR report on accommodations mentioned in Iowa’s Notes 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 IOWA**

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"> <li>• <b>ST.2.4.1</b> <i>State Monitoring Checklist for Test Security and Ethics</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.3.8</b> <i>State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i></li> <li>• <b>ST2.4.2</b> <i>Iowa BEDS ELPA21 Survey Questions</i></li> </ul> <p><u>CE 5.5.6</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.2.3.8</b> <i>State of Iowa Test Security Manual</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.2.4.1</b> <i>State Monitoring Checklist for Test Security and Ethics</i></li> <li>• <b>ST2.4.2</b> <i>Iowa BEDS ELPA21 Survey Questions</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.5.4.2</b> <i>Iowa AEA Legislative Guide.</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.5.4.2</b> <i>Iowa Code 256B</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.5.4.4.</b> <i>Special Education Procedures July 1, 2018</i></li> </ul>	<p>wondered how this information is used by the State.</p> <p><u>CE 5.4.3</u> Iowa provides sufficient evidence of policies and practices to ensure that there is consistency between accommodations provided to students during instruction and/or practice and assessment. This evidence includes appropriate timeframe for determinations about accommodations assigned to ELLs (<b>ST.5.4.1</b>, p.20) and slight differences that may be necessary (<b>ST.1.4.4</b>). The importance of student familiarity with supports provided through the technology platform is also highlighted. Reviewers wish to note that they were unable to find the extended quotation included in Iowa’s notes for 5.4.3, and were left wondering if the wrong document was referenced.</p> <p>Reviewers were puzzled by the inclusion of <b>ST.5.4.1</b>, which dates from 2011, without any explanation from the State as to its relevance under ELPA21. If this information applies to ELs in the academic assessments (adopted prior to ELPA21), this should be made clear.</p> <p><u>CE 5.4.4</u> Iowa provides sufficient evidence that ELPA21 is administered consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s EL team, IEP team or placement team. Information about accessibility features and accommodations identified in those plans are entered by these individuals into the online testing system. Documentation is maintained for each student using the Personal Needs Profile (<b>ST.1.4.3</b>, Tool 6, p. 40; same as <b>ST.1.4.4</b>, Appendix B).</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 IOWA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>Domain exemptions are also made by IEP teams and noted in the IEP. Districts must email their ELPA21 state contact to request that exemption prior to testing. The need to list all accommodations and domain exemptions in a student’s IEP is addressed in test administrators’ training.</p> <p>It was not clear whether—or how—the monitoring process checks that the accommodations provided during assessment are consistent with those provided during instruction (as documented in a student’s IEP/504 plan). Iowa indicates that there is a state policy about consistent use of accommodations in instruction and assessment, as per IEP/504 plan, but reviewers were unable to locate information on how this is monitored.</p> <p><u>CE 5.4.5</u> Iowa provides adequate information to demonstrate that for ELPA21, accommodations are administered with fidelity to administration procedures. Compliance with all practices and procedures related to accommodations must be certified annually by school superintendents and building principals (ST.2.5.2, ST. 2.4.1).</p> <p><u>CE 5.4.6</u> Iowa addresses this CE by indicating that districts must document that “the ELPA21 with accommodations was monitored at least once using the monitoring checklist as a guide” (ST.2.3.8, p. 8, ST.2.4.2).</p> <p>Although Iowa indicates that districts and schools annually report their monitoring practices in</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 IOWA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		<p>response to the Iowa BEDS ELPA21 Survey Questions (ST.2.4.2), there is no detail included in the submission related to monitoring findings; furthermore, while the State’s submission notes the number of test administrations monitored, there is no evidence to establish that the requirement was met by all districts and schools (or the percentage for which the requirement was met). Reviewers would have liked to see this information.</p> <p>Monitoring of identification and implementation of accommodations for special education students is also the purview of nine regional agencies that oversee that population. Iowa notes that among the responsibilities of each Area Education Agency (AEA) is to provide assurances that students requiring special education receive appropriate assessments, with all accommodations identified as necessary/appropriate for those students (ST.5.4.6 [NOT ST.5.4.2, which the peer reviewer could not find], ST.5.4.7 [NOT ST.5.4.3], ST5.4.8 [NOT ST.5.4.4]).</p> <p>Reviewers would have liked some detail on how the AEAs work with IDE on supporting appropriate accommodations to support ELs with disabilities.</p> <p>Reviewers would have been interested in a summary of results of monitoring for the most recent administration; however, this is not required.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b> No additional evidence is required or</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 IOWA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:            Information to clarify whether—and/or how—the monitoring process checks that the accommodations provided during assessment are consistent with those provided during instruction (as documented in a student’s IEP/504 plan).</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 IOWA

**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><b>For ELP standards:</b> 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>	<p><u>CE 6.1.1</u>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.6.1.1</b> <i>Memorandum of Understanding and Agreement May 1, 2016</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.6.1.2</b> <i>IA ELPA21 MOU signature page 2016</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.6.1.3</b> <i>State Board Minutes January 19, 2017</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.6.1.4</b> <i>Achievement Level Descriptors Presentation to State Board 1.19.17</i></li> </ul> <p><u>CE 6.1.2</u>: NA</p> </p>	<p><u>CE 6.1.1</u> Iowa satisfies this Critical Element with an explanation that they have signed a MOU with ELPA21 confirming that by virtue of participation in the Consortium, they will use the ELPA21 ELP achievement standards and performance level descriptors (<b>ST.6.1.1, ST.6.1.2</b>). IDE’s response also includes questions about standard-setting for ELPA21 and the achievement level descriptors that were raised and addressed through a PowerPoint presentation at a State Board meeting (<b>ST.6.1.3</b> and <b>ST.6.1.4</b>).</p> <p>One reviewer raised the desirability of a more explicit approval by the State of the performance level cut-scores. A formal document would have eliminated any ambiguity about this matter.</p> <p><u>CE 6.1.2</u> Iowa has not yet developed alternate achievement standards, although a state representative participates in Consortium efforts to create Alt-ELPA21 for students with significant cognitive disabilities and establish corresponding achievement standards. In the interim, and until Iowa State Board of Education review and approval, the State’s EL students with significant cognitive disabilities will continue to take ELPA21 with accommodations.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></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: [list additional evidence needed w/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 IOWA

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 IOWA**

**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:  <i>ELP achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate ELP achievement standards,</i> such that:                      Cut scores are developed for every grade/grade band, content domain/language domain, and/or composite for which proficiency-level scores are reported.</p>	<p>Iowa offers no additional evidence.</p>	<p>6.2 (Overall)                      The IDE stipulates that the response submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium in response to CE 6.2 constitutes a clear and comprehensive account of the assessment’s validity based on this Critical Element.</p> <p><u>6.2.1</u>                      The IDE stipulates that the response submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium in response to CE 3.2.1 constitutes a clear and comprehensive account of the assessment’s validity based on this factor of CE 6.2.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></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:                      [list additional evidence needed w/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 IOWA

**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><b>For ELP achievement standards:</b> 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><u>CE 6.3</u>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.6.3.1</b> <i>ELPA21 Achievement Level Descriptors All Grades and Domains (2017)</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.1.1.4</b> <i>AEA PD Online Directions (2018)</i></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Module:</b> <i>Accessing, Interpreting, and Using ELPA21 Results 2018-2019 (training)</i></li> </ul> <p><u>CE 6.3.1:</u> NA</p> <p><u>CE 6.3.2:</u> NA</p> </p>	<p><u>CE 6.3</u> The IDE stipulates that the response submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium in response to CE 6.3 constitutes the complete presentation on this critical element. ELPA21 results are expressed in terms that clearly align with ELP standards and performance level descriptors developed by the Consortium and agreed to by the state (see <b>ST.6.3.1</b>).</p> <p>Iowa’s response to this critical element refers to training and guidance on using ELPA21 results, including the Achievement Level Descriptors; however, that information is tangential to the focus of this CE.</p> <p><u>CE.6.3.1</u> Iowa indicates in the submission Notes that the state has not adopted alternate ELP achievement standards for ELs with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Iowa notes that a state representative participates in Consortium efforts to create Alt-ELPA21 for students with significant cognitive disabilities and establish corresponding achievement standards. In the interim, and until Iowa State Board of Education review and approval, the State’s EL students with significant cognitive disabilities will continue to take ELPA21 with accommodations.</p> <p><u>CE 6.3.2</u> See response to <u>CE 6.3.1</u> above.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</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 IOWA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:                      [list additional evidence needed w/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 IOWA

**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 <b>English language proficiency for all ELs including the number and percentage of ELs attaining ELP</b>.</p> <p>For the <b>ELP assessment</b>, the State provides coherent and timely information about each student’s attainment of the State’s ELP standards to parents that: Reports the <b>ELs’ English proficiency</b> in terms of the State’s grade level/grade-band ELP standards (including performance-level descriptors); Are provided in an understandable and uniform format; Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian; Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an</p>	<p><u>CE 6.4.1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.6.4.1</b> <i>Example of Iowa School Performance Profile-English Language Performance (2018)</i></li> </ul> <p><u>CE 6.4.2.1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.6.4.3</b> <i>Score Report-Kindergarten ELPA2 Summative 2017-2018</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.6.4.4</b> <i>Score Report-Grade1 ELPA21 Summative 2017-2018</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.6.4.5</b> <i>Score Report-Grade5 ELPA21 Summative 2017-2018</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.6.4.6</b> <i>Score Report-Grade 6 ELPA21 Summative 2017-2018</i></li> </ul> <p><u>CE 6.4.2.2: No State evidence</u></p> <p><u>CE 6.4.2.3</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ST.6.4.7</b> <i>Sample EL Parent Letter ELPA21 Score Report</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.6.4.8</b> <i>ELPA21-ALDs-All-Domains-and-Grades Spanish</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.6.4.9</b> <i>ELPA21-ALDs-All-Domains-and-Grades Vietnamese</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.6.4.10</b> <i>IA ELPA21 Individual Student Report Spanish</i></li> <li>• <b>ST.6.4.11</b> <i>IA ELPA21 Individual Student Report Vietnamese</i></li> </ul> <p><u>CE 6.4.2.4: No State evidence</u></p>	<p><u>6.4.1</u></p> <p>Through the Iowa Department of Education website, Iowa School Performance Profiles, performance reports are made available to the public. As evidence, Iowa provides an example of one web page that addresses the number and percent of ELLs who are making progress towards English proficiency and what the scores mean (<b>ST.6.4.1</b>). On this site, domain and composite scores are disaggregated by program (EL, low SES, students with disabilities) and race (Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic, Multi-Racial, Native American, Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, White).</p> <p>While interesting, this evidentiary document does not address the specific requirement to report the number and percentage of students attaining proficiency (not just “making progress”).</p> <p>Iowa must provide information not just on the extent to which students are approaching the finish line (progress) but on the number and percent that crossed the finish line (achieved proficiency).</p> <p>Because this CE calls for timely reporting of assessment results, Iowa should provide a schedule for release of student results to all consumers of that information.</p> <p><u>6.4.2.1</u></p> <p>The IDE stipulates that the response submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium in response to CE 6.4.2.1 constitutes the complete presentation on reporting each student’s EL proficiency in terms of grade level/grade band ELPA21 standards and performance levels. IDE further stipulates that the</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 IOWA**

<p>alternative format accessible to that parent.</p>		<p>State complies fully with all elements of the Consortium response.</p> <p>Iowa uses the Consortium-designed individual student score reports modified to include the State’s logo/branding information. Iowa includes as evidence several examples of individual student score reports for the ELPA21 assessment (see <b>ST.6.4.3, ST.6.4.4, ST.6.4.5, ST.6.4.6</b>). The individual student score reports include proficiency in terms of the State’s ELP standards (including performance-level descriptors), overall and by domain (listening, speaking, reading, writing).</p> <p><u>6.4.2.2</u></p> <p>The IDE stipulates that the response submitted by the ELPA21 Consortium in response to CE 6.4.2.2 constitutes the complete presentation on reporting each student’s EL proficiency in terms of grade level/grade band ELPA21 standards and performance levels. IDE further stipulates that the State complies fully with all elements of the Consortium response.</p> <p>Iowa uses the Consortium-designed individual student score reports modified to include the State’s logo/branding information.</p> <p><u>6.4.2.3</u></p> <p>Iowa provides to districts and schools a parent letter (see <b>ST.6.4.7</b> for example) to accompany each individual student’s performance report. The letter explains proficiency reporting categories.</p> <p>Reviewers are concerned as to whether the report to parents has understandable format and content. The report does provide useful information about student performance; however, interpretive information should be provided about</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 IOWA

		<p>the comparisons of test scores with average scores at school and district levels. Reviewers suggest that the State revisit the reporting of standard error of measurement such as a graphic with a footnote, which might be more suitable for this audience. They strongly suggest raising this matter with other members of the Consortium.</p> <p>The State provides to districts and schools the ELPA21 Achievement Level Descriptors translated into Spanish, Marshallese, S’gaw Karen (spoken in Myanmar, Thailand), Russian, and Vietnamese. Individual student reports are translated into Spanish, S’gaw Karen, and Vietnamese (examples of each are provided as evidence; see <b>ST.6.4.4.7, ST.6.4.4.8, ST.6.4.4.9, ST.6.4.4.10, ST.6.4.4.11</b>).</p> <p>IDE has a contract with a translation service to meet districts’ needs for translations of parent communications about the annual assessment of English proficiency.</p> <p>One reviewer is unable to confirm that letters and reports are made available “to the extent practicable” in a language they will understand, without additional detail on the home-languages spoken in the state. There is no detail to indicate whether, where written translation is not practicable, reports and other communications about annual assessment of English proficiency are conveyed orally. This information would have enhanced Iowa’s response.</p> <p><u>6.4.2.4</u> Iowa indicates that they have not had any requests for an alternate format from a parent/guardian with a disability as defined by the ADA (amended) but expresses willingness to accommodate such a request through various state resources.</p> <p>Reviewers would have liked to know how the State communicates to parents/guardians that they may make a request for alternate format.</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 IOWA

<b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: CE 6.4.1: Iowa must provide information on the number and percent of students achieving proficiency; and A schedule/timeline for release of student results to all consumers of that information		

### 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 ASSESSMENTS .....4**  
**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 ..... 17**  
**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security..... 18**  
**Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 22**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY .....25**  
**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.....31**  
**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability ..... 31**  
**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility ..... 33**  
**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum ..... 34**  
**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 35**  
**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.....39**  
**Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 39**  
**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.

..... 45

**SECTION 6: ELP ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING.....50**

**Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of ELP Achievement Standards for All Students..... 50**

**Critical Element 6.2 – ELP Achievement Standards Setting ..... 52**

**Critical Element 6.3 –Aligned ELP Achievement Standards ..... 53**

**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting ..... 55**

**SECTION 7: DOES NOT APPLY TO ELP ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW .....58**

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><b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b></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><b>For ELP standards:</b> The ELP standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing;</li> <li>• address the different proficiency levels of ELs; and</li> </ul> <p>align to the State academic content standards (see definition<sup>5</sup>). 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><b>EL 1.2.1</b> <i>Council of Chief State School Officers English Language Proficiency Standards Development (2013)</i>, pp. 4, 12-19.</p> <p><b>EL 1.2.2</b> <i>English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards (2014)</i>, pp. 31-210.</p> <p><b>EL 1.2.3</b> <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><b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b></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>		

<sup>5</sup> 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](http://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"> <li>All ELs in grades K-12.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>ELPA21’s Evidence:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>EL 1.3.1</b> <i>White Paper: Developing an Alternate ELPA21 for English Learners with the Most Significant Cognitive Disabilities</i></li> <li><b>EL 1.3.2</b> <i>Alt-ELPA21 Theory of Action</i></li> <li><b>EL 1.3.3</b> <i>Alt-ELPA Participation Guidelines</i></li> <li><b>EL 1.3.4</b> <i>Accessibility and Accommodations Wish List</i></li> <li><b>EL 1.3.5</b> <i>Addendum to the ELPA21 Peer Review Submission – January 2019: Alternate ELPA21 (Alt-ELPA21)</i></li> <li><b>EL 1.3.6</b> <i>Classroom Perspectives Report</i></li> <li><b>EL 1.3.7</b> <i>ICQ - Report</i></li> <li><b>EL 1.3.8</b> <i>Standards Prioritization Evaluation</i></li> <li><b>EL 1.3.9</b> <i>Talking Points for State Leaders: Alternate English Language Proficiency Standards and Assessments</i></li> <li><b>EL 1.3.10</b> <i>Final CCSSO ELP Standards for ELWSCDs Agenda May 2018</i></li> <li><b>EL 1.3.11</b> <i>ELP Standards for ELWSCD Meeting Participant List</i></li> <li><b>EL 1.3.12</b> <i>Work group 3 ELWSCD language and CCR_CCSSO Project 040618</i></li> </ul>	<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"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	Reviewed by Department Staff Only	Reviewed by Department Staff Only
<b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement</b>		
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)).

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<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"> <li>• State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education).</li> <li>• Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas).</li> <li>• Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State.</li> <li>• Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents.</li> </ul>	<p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>	<p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</b></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"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement of purposes and intended interpretations and uses: <b>EL2.1.2</b> (ELPA21 Theory of Action, p. 3 and p. 10)</li> <li>• Technically sound test blueprints that measure depth and breadth of ELP standards: <b>EL2.1.2.1</b>, <i>ELPA21 Assessment Framework - Summative School Year 2015-2016</i>, p. 7-13  <b>EL2.1.2.3a-h</b> <i>Field Test Slots All Form 1A ELPA21 ONLINE Summative Test Form (2017), Kindergarten - grade 12</i>  <b>EL2.1.2.4</b> <i>Blueprint Drafts Phase 3 (2016)</i></li> <li>• Tailored to knowledge and skills in the ELP standards and includes the range of complexity: <b>EL2.1.3.1</b> <i>Independent Evaluation of the English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century [ELPA21] Item Pool Alignment</i>  <b>EL 2.1.3.1.1</b> <i>ELPA21 Internal Memo: ELPA21 2019-2020 Activities</i> (This document is a bullet-point to-do list to address deficiencies in the alignment.)</li> <li>• Computer-adaptive assessments: N/A</li> <li>• Portfolio assessment: N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

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"> <li>• Computer-adaptive assessments: N/A</li> <li>• Portfolio assessment: N/A</li> </ul>
--	--	--

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"> <li>Assess student English language proficiency based on the <i>State’s ELP standards</i> in terms of content and language processes.</li> </ul>	<p><b>EL 2.1.2.1</b> <i>ELPA21 Assessment Framework - Summative School Year 2015-2016</i> (pp. 19-25)  <b>EL 2.2.1</b> <i>ELPA21 Item Development Plan Version 2.0 (2014)</i>  <b>EL 2.2.2a-f</b> <i>ELPA21 Task and Item Specifications, Kindergarten through Grades 9-12 (2016)</i>  <b>EL 2.2.3</b> <i>ELPA21 Item Writer Training Plan (2014)</i>  <b>EL 2.2.4</b> <i>Editorial Review Plan (2014)</i>  <b>EL 2.2.5</b> <i>Editorial Style Guide (2019)</i>  <b>EL 2.2.6</b> <i>Item Development Process Report (2015)</i>  <b>EL 2.2.7</b> <i>Item Cognitive Laboratory Report (2015)</i> – related to technology-enhanced items only  <b>EL 2.2.8</b> <i>Spring 2015 ELPA21 Field Test Technical Report (2016)</i>, pp. 13-16.  <b>EL 2.2.9</b> <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><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>		

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"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations:   <b>EL 2.3.1.1a-f</b> <i>Assessment Guides, Kindergarten through Grades 9-12</i>  <b>EL 2.3.1.2</b> <i>Accessibility and Accommodations Manual (2018-19)</i>  <b>EL 2.3.1.3</b> <i>Quick Start Checklists (2016)</i>  <b>EL 2.3.1.4</b> <i>Test Coordinator's Manual (2016)</i>  <b>EL 2.3.1.5a-f</b> <i>Directions for Administration, Paper and Pencil, Kindergarten through Grades 9-12</i>  <b>EL 2.5.1.2a-f</b> <i>Directions for Administration, Braille Version, Kindergarten through Grades 9-12</i>  <b>EL 2.5.1.3a-b</b> <i>Directions for Administration ELPA21 Summative Writing Supplement (Spring 2018, Kindergarten and Grade 1)</i>  <b>EL 2.5.1.4</b> <i>ELPA21 Spring 2018 Summative Test Administration Manual (TAM) for Online Testing (2018)</i> </li> <li>• Procedures to ensure that appropriate teachers and personnel can administer the assessments and use appropriate accommodations:   <b>EL 2.3.2.1</b> <i>Training Webinar Plan (2016)</i>  <b>EL 2.3.2.2</b> <i>Accessibility Features and Accommodations (2016)</i>  <b>EL 2.3.2.3</b> <i>Administration Site Overview (2016)</i>  <b>EL 2.3.2.4</b> <i>Student Testing Experience (2016)</i>  <b>EL 2.3.2.5</b> <i>Student Testing Session (2016)</i>  <b>EL 2.3.2.6</b> <i>Testing Lab Management (2016)</i>  <b>EL 2.3.2.7</b> <i>Platform Overview (2016)</i>  <b>EL 2.3.2.8</b> <i>Troubleshooting (2016)</i> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations:                       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.                       However, see comments on section 5.3.                 </li> <li>• Procedures to ensure that appropriate teachers and personnel can administer the assessments and use appropriate accommodations:                       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.                 </li> <li>• Defined requirements and contingency plans for technology-based assessments:                       ELPA 21 created documents addressing technology requirements (hardware, headsets) as well as a                 </li> </ul>

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><b>EL 2.3.2.9</b> <i>Workstation Preparation (2016)</i>  <b>EL 2.3.2.10</b> <i>Interactive Demos Access Instructions (2016)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Defined requirements and contingency plans for technology-based assessments:</li> </ul> <p><b>EL 2.3.3.1</b> <i>Operational Hardware Specifications</i>  <b>EL 2.3.3.2</b> <i>Operational Headset Specifications</i>  <b>EL 2.3.2.8</b> <i>Troubleshooting (2016)</i>  <b>EL 2.5.1.4</b> <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><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></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**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<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><b>EL 2.4.1</b> <i>ELPA21 2017-18 Summative Alerts</i></p>	<p>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.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>		

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"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> <li>• Application of test security procedures to the general ELP assessments and the AELPA.</li> </ul>	<p><b>EL 2.5.1.1</b> <i>ELPA21 Implementation Manual (2017-18)</i>, pp. 14-27, 35-36, 40-41, 44, Appendices A, B, C, and D.  <b>EL 2.3.1.5a-f</b> <i>Directions for Administration, Paper and Pencil, Kindergarten through Grades 9-12 (2017-18)</i>  <b>EL 2.5.1.2a-f</b> <i>Directions for Administration, Braille Version, Kindergarten through Grades 9-12 (2017-18)</i>  <b>EL 2.5.1.3a-b</b> <i>Directions for Administration ELPA21 Summative Writing Supplement, Kindergarten and Grade 1 (Spring 2018)</i>  <b>EL 2.3.1.2</b> <i>Accessibility and Accommodations Manual (2018-19)</i>, Appendix E.  <b>EL 2.5.1.4</b> <i>ELPA21 Spring 2018 Summative Test Administration Manual (TAM) for Online Testing</i>, pp. 2, 36.  <b>EL 2.5.1.5</b> <i>Data Sharing Agreement (2017)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <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"> <li>Investigation of irregularities: This is left to the States; no consortium-provided documentation was provided. State-specific evidence will need to be reviewed.</li> <li>N/A: there is not currently an AELPA in place.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>x</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The consortium should provide evidence of test security during the test development process.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>		

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"> <li>• To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results;</li> <li>• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect integrity of test-related data in test administration: <b>EL 2.5.1.1 ELPA21 Implementation Manual (2017-18)</b>, pp. 14-27, 35-36, 40-41, 44, Appendices A, B, C, and D.</li> <li>• Secure student-level assessment data:  <b>EL 2.5.1.1 ELPA21 Implementation Manual (2017-18)</b>, pp. 17-27, Appendix A <b>EL 2.5.1.4 ELPA21 Spring 2018 Summative Test Administration Manual (TAM) for Online Testing</b>, p. 1. <b>EL 2.5.1.5 Data Sharing Agreement (2017)</b></li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Protect personally identifiable information: State-specific evidence regarding individual student data and minimum N sizes should be reviewed.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b>		
<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"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>EL 1.3.5</b> <i>Addendum to the ELPA21 Peer Review Submission – January 2019: Alternate ELPA21 (Alt-ELPA21)</i></li> <li>• <b>EL 2.1.2</b> <i>ELPA21 Theory of Action (2014)</i>, pp. 5, 10</li> <li>• <b>EL 3.1.1</b> <i>A Quality Assurance Plan for ELPA21</i></li> <li>• <b>EL 2.1.2.1</b> <i>ELPA21 Assessment Framework-Summative School Year 2015-2016</i></li> <li>• <b>EL 2.1.2.1</b> <i>ELPA21 Assessment Framework-Summative School Year 2015-2016</i>, pp. 7-13, 16, 24-25</li> <li>• <b>EL 2.1.3.1</b> <i>Independent Evaluation of the English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century (ELPA21) Item Pool Alignment (2019)</i>,</li> <li>• <b>EL 2.2.2 a-f</b> <i>ELPA21 Task and Item Specification Guidelines</i></li> <li>• <b>EL 2.2.3</b> <i>Item Writer Training Plan</i></li> <li>• <b>EL 2.2.6</b> <i>Item Development Process Report</i>, pp. 49-50, Appendix A</li> <li>• <b>EL 2.1.3.1.1</b> <i>ELPA21 Internal Memo: ELPA21 2019-2020 Activities (2019)</i></li> <li>• N/A: There is no AELPA.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See comments in section 2.1 above.</li> </ul> <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"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <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"> <li>• N/A: There is no AELPA.</li> </ul>

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

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**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<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><b>EL 2.1.3.1</b>, <i>Independent Evaluation of the English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (ELPA21) Item Pool Alignment</i></p> <p><b>EL 2.1.3.1.1</b>, <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><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>		

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><b>EL 3.3.1</b>, <i>ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report, Part 1</i>  <b>EL 3.3.2</b>, <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><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>		

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><b>EL 3.4.1</b> <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><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>		

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"> <li>• 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>);</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability:  <b>EL 3.3.1 ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 1</b>, p. 17.  <b>EL 3.3.2 ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 2_Nebraska Example</b>, Section 6 Figures S6.1 – S6.10, Section 7 Figures S7.1 – S7.6, Section 8 Figures S8.1, S8.2.</li> <li>• Overall and conditional SEMs:  <b>EL 3.3.1 ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 1</b>, p. 18.  <b>EL 3.3.2 ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 2</b>, Section 6 Figures S6.1 – S6.10, Section 7 Figures S7.1 – S7.6.</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy estimates:  <b>EL 3.3.1 ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 1</b>, pp.18-20.  <b>EL 3.3.2 ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 2_Nebraska Example</b>, Section 8 Figures S8.1, S8.2.</li> <li>• N/A: ELPA21 is not computer-adaptive.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <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"> <li>• Overall and conditional SEMs are included by domain (EL 3.3.2, p. 111-116)</li> </ul> <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**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<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"> <li>• N/A: ELPA21 is not computer-adaptive.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>		

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><b>For all State ELP assessments,</b> assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition<sup>6</sup>).</p> <p><b>For ELP assessments,</b> 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><b>EL 3.1.1,</b> <i>A Quality Assurance Plan for ELPA21: Gathering the Evidence to Evaluate Validity, Reliability, Fairness, and Utility</i> (2013)</p> <p><b>EL 2.1.2</b> <i>ELPA21 Theory of Action</i> (2014), p. 5.</p> <p><b>EL 2.1.2.1</b> <i>ELPA21 Assessment Framework-Summative School Year 2015-2016</i>, pp. 14-15.</p> <p><b>EL2.2.1</b> <i>Item Development Plan</i> (2014), pp. 1-4.</p> <p><b>EL 2.3.1.2</b> <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><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u><sub>x</sub> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peers request item writer training materials to better be able to determine how central UDL is in the test design.</li> <li>• Further documentation that specifically addresses the fairness and accessibility of the ELP assessment for ELs with disabilities.</li> </ul>		

<sup>6</sup> 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](http://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**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for <b>ELP assessments</b>, 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><b>EL 2.2.8</b> <i>Spring 2015 ELPA21 Field Test Technical Report (2016)</i>, Table 3.3, p. 16; pp. 19-25.  <b>EL 3.1.1.2</b> <i>ELPA21 Standard Setting Technical Report (2016)</i>  <b>EL 3.1.1.3a-f</b> <i>Standard Setting Workshop Materials (IOIBs)</i>  <b>EL 2.1.1.1</b> <i>2017-18 Summative Score Reporting Specifications</i>  <b>EL 3.3.1</b> <i>ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 1</i>  <b>EL 3.3.2</b> <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><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Item maps showing item difficulty and student ability across the continuum in each domain and overall (by grade/grade span).</li> </ul>		

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**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<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.  <b>EL 2.2.9</b> <i>Item Analysis and Calibration (2017)</i>  <b>EL 4.5.2</b> <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><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></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"> <li>Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p><b>EL 2.1.2.1</b> <i>ELPA21 Assessment Framework - Summative School Year 2015-2016</i> (p. 15)  <b>EL 2.1.2.3 a-f</b> <i>Field Test Slots All Form 1A ELPA21 ONLINE Summative Test Form (2017)</i>  <b>EL 2.2.2a-f</b> <i>ELPA21 Task and Item Specifications (2016)</i>  <b>EL 2.2.6</b> <i>Item Development Process Report (2015)</i>, pp. 53-56  <b>EL 2.2.9</b> <i>Item Analysis and Calibration (2017)</i>  <b>EL 3.3.3</b> <i>ELPA21 AAA TMT Review of Items Showing Differential Item Functioning for English Language Learners with Disabilities</i>  <b>EL 4.6.1</b> <i>ELPA21 Summative and Screener PP Style Guide TB 020218</i>  <b>EL 4.6.2</b> <i>Examples of Paper-based Representation of Online Items</i>  <b>EL 4.6.3 a-f</b> <i>ELPA21 Paper and Pencil Summative Test Form Planners (2017)</i>  <b>EL 4.6.4</b> <i>A Data-informed, Judgment-based Procedure for Linking Cut Scores on Alternative Assessment Formats</i>  <b>EL 4.6.5 a-f</b> <i>ELPA21 Braille Summative Test Form Planners (2017)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul> <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"> <li>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.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Details about the design and development process of paper and Braille forms to justify the comparability of different versions.</li> </ul>		

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"> <li>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</li> <li>Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 <i>A Quality Assurance Plan for ELPA21 (2013)</i>). 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).</li> <li>Consortium-provided evidence in this section was not relevant:  <b>EL 4.7.2.1</b> <i>Alt-ELPA A Path Forward (ASES-ELL SCASS) October 2017</i>  <b>EL 4.7.2.2</b> <i>Fairness in Testing ELs and ELSWDs_MC</i>  <b>EL 4.7.2.3</b> <i>Fairness in Testing ELs and ELSWDs_NS</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>		

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 students<sup>8</sup> 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"> <li>• <b>For ELP assessments</b>, 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).</li> </ul>		<p>N/A: State-specific (although the consortium provided some additional evidence)</p>
<p><b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>No additional evidence is required for the consortium.</p>		

<sup>8</sup> 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"> <li>Note: This critical element does not apply to ELP assessments, as the requirements only apply to the inclusion of ELs in <b>academic assessments</b>.</li> </ul>		N/A
<b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>		

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"> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>EL 2.3.1.2 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual</b> (2018-19), pp. 2-3, 6-15, Figure 1, Appendices C-E</li> <li>• <b>EL 2.3.1.2 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual</b> (2018-19), p. 9, Appendix B</li> <li>• <b>EL 2.2.8 Spring 2015 ELPA21 Field Test Technical Report</b> (2016), pp. 13-16.</li> <li>• <b>EL 3.3.3</b> (Redacted) <i>ELPA21 AAA TMT Review of Items Showing Differential Item Functioning for English Language Learners with Disabilities</i></li> <li>• According to the consortium’s narrative (p. 93), exceptional requests are handled by the States.</li> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peers believe that the consortium has made available an appropriate list of accommodations for ELs on the ELPA21.</li> <li>• 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.”</li> </ul> <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"> <li>• State-provided evidence should be reviewed regarding exceptional requests.</li> </ul> <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"> <li>• State-provided evidence should be reviewed regarding the extent to which accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students the opportunities to</li> </ul>

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.
<b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• State-provided evidence should be reviewed regarding exceptional requests.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>		

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**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<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"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures;</li> <li>• Monitored for administrations of all required ELP assessments, and AELPA.</li> </ul>	<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><b>EL 2.3.1.1a-f</b> <i>Assessment Guides (2016)</i>  <b>EL 2.3.1.4</b> <i>Test Coordinator's Manual (2016)</i>  <b>EL 2.3.2.5</b> <i>Student Testing Session (2016)</i>  <b>EL 2.3.2.9</b> <i>Workstation Preparation (2016)</i>  <b>EL 2.3.1.2</b> <i>Accessibility and Accommodations Manual (2018-2019)</i>, p. 3, Appendices C, D, E.  <b>EL 2.3.2.2</b> <i>Accessibility Features and Accommodations (2016)</i></p>	<p>State-provided evidence regarding monitoring test administration for special populations should be reviewed.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b></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><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required from the consortium. However, State-specific evidence regarding monitoring test administration for special populations should be reviewed.</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><b><i>For ELP standards:</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State adopted ELP achievement standards that address the different proficiency levels of ELs;</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>		<p>N/A: State-specific</p>
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></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"> <li>• <b><i>ELP achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate ELP achievement standards</i></b>, such that:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Cut scores are developed for every grade/grade band, content domain/language domain, and/or composite for which proficiency-level scores are reported.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>EL 3.1.1.2 ELPA21 Standard Setting Technical Report</b></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><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluate the cut scores, particularly at cuts 3 and 4.</li> </ul>		

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**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>For ELP achievement standards:</b> 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><b>EL 1.2.2</b> <i>English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards</i>, p. 10  <b>EL 2.1.1.1</b> <i>ELPA21 2017-18 Summative Score Reporting Specifications</i>, pp.13-18  <b>EL 2.2.6</b> <i>Item Development Process Report</i>, p.20  <b>EL 3.1.1.1</b> <i>ELP Standards at a Glance</i>, p. 1  <b>EL 3.1.1.2</b> <i>ELPA21 Standard Setting Technical Report</i>, pp. 11-20, 26-27, 73-75, 79  <b>EL 3.2.3</b> <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><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></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 <b>English language proficiency for all ELs including the number and percentage of ELs attaining ELP</b>.</p> <p>For the <b>ELP assessment</b>, 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"> <li>• Reports the <b>ELs’ English proficiency</b> in terms of the State’s grade level/grade-band ELP standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>• Are provided in an understandable and uniform format;</li> <li>• 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;</li> </ul>	<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><b>EL 2.1.1.1</b> <i>ELPA21 2017-18 Summative Score Reporting Specifications</i>, pp. 22 -27.  <b>EL 3.3.1</b> <i>ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 1</i>  <b>EL 6.4.1</b> <i>Issue Brief Reporting_4-9-14 (v2)</i>, pp. 1, 2, 4.</p> <p><b>EL 2.1.1.2</b> <i>Summative Score Reporting Specifications</i>, pp. 22-25  <b>EL 3.3.1</b> <i>ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 1</i>, p. 28  <b>EL 6.4.1</b> <i>Issue Brief Reporting_4-9-14 (v2)</i>, pp. 4-7</p> <p><b>EL 4.7.1.13</b> 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><b>EL 4.7.1.12</b> <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**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>		
<b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<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.