



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Glenda Ritz  
Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Indiana Department of Education  
South Tower, Suite 600  
115 West Washington Street  
Indianapolis, IN 46204

January 6, 2017

Dear Superintendent Ritz:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) maintains the essential requirements from NCLB that each State annually administer high-quality assessments in at least reading/language arts, mathematics, and science that meet nationally recognized professional and technical standards. Therefore, as you know, the Department reinstated peer review of State assessment systems so that each State receives feedback from external experts on the assessments it is currently administering. We appreciate the efforts required to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in June 2016. State assessment systems provide essential information that States, districts, principals, and teachers can use to identify the academic needs of students, target resources and supports toward students who need them most, evaluate school and program effectiveness, and close achievement gaps among students. A high-quality assessment system also provides useful information to parents about their child's advancement against and achievement of grade-level standards. The Department's peer review of State assessment systems is designed to provide feedback to States to support the development and administration of high-quality assessments.

On October 6, 2016, the Department sent a letter to chief State school officers outlining the outcomes for States related to the assessment peer review. I am writing to provide you feedback on your State's recent submission of evidence. External peer reviewers and Department staff evaluated Indiana Department of Education's (IDOE) submission and found, based on the evidence received, that the component of your assessment system met many, but not all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- Reading/ language arts (R/LA) and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (ISTEP+):  
**Substantially meets requirements**

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.*

**Substantially meets requirements** means that this component meets most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The specific list of items required for Indiana to submit is enclosed with this letter. The Department expects that IDOE should be able to provide this additional information within one year. IDOE must provide to the Department a plan and timeline by which it will submit the additional documentation within 30 days of the receipt of this letter. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action.

The Department notes that IDOE submitted a waiver request for assessing speaking and listening that was approved on July 24, 2016, for the 2016–2017, 2017–2018, and 2018–2019 school years.

In addition, the full peer review notes from the review are enclosed. These recommendations to the Department formed the basis of the Department’s 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 Patricia Johnson of my staff at: [OSS.Indiana@ed.gov](mailto:OSS.Indiana@ed.gov).

Sincerely,

/s/

Ann Whalen  
Senior Advisor to the Secretary  
Delegated the Duties of Assistant Secretary  
for Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Michele Walker, Director of Student Assessment

**Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed to Meet the Requirements for Indiana’s Assessment System**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Additional Evidence Needed</b>
<b>1.5 – Participation Rate Data</b>	<p>For the entire assessment system, Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation in all required subjects by grade level, that show—                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Numbers of students tested</li> <li>○ Numbers of students enrolled, and</li> <li>○ Evidence of procedures that State has to ensure that all students are tested and counted in calculation of participation rates.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b>	<p>For the Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress Plus (ISTEP+) reading/language arts (R/LA) tests in grades 3-8, IDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the tests assess the full range of the State content standards, including speaking and listening. (Note: Indiana has received a speaking and listening waiver; therefore, the Department does not expect Indiana to submit additional evidence regarding speaking and listening during the period of the waiver.)</li> </ul>
<b>2.3 – Test Administration</b>	<p>For the entire assessment system, IDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments.</li> </ul>
<b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b>	<p>For the entire assessment system, IDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a summary of monitoring that did occur in the 2014-2015 testing cycle (e.g., how many schools, how many monitors were used).</li> <li>• Evidence that the State monitors all assessments in its assessment system</li> </ul>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b>	<p>For the ISTEP+ R/LA and mathematics tests in grades 3-8, IDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of a systematic process and timeline the State will implement to address gaps and/or weaknesses identified in the alignment studies submitted by the State.</li> </ul>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b>	<p>For the ISTEP+ R/LA and mathematics tests in grades 3-8, IDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the tests measure the cognitive processes appropriate grade level as represented in the academic content standards, such as:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Results of cognitive labs exploring student performance on items that show the items require complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills; OR</li> <li>○ Reports of expert judgment of items that show the items require complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills; OR</li> <li>○ Empirical evidence that shows the relationships of items intended to require complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills to other measures that require similar levels of cognitive complexity in the content area (e.g., teacher ratings of student performance, student performance on performance tasks or external assessments of the same knowledge and skills).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships</b>	<p>For the ISTEP+ R/LA and mathematics tests in grades 3-8, IDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that shows the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with criterion and other variables for all student groups, such as:</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<b>with Other Variables</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reports of analyses that demonstrate positive correlations between State assessment results and external measures that assess similar constructs (e.g., NAEP, Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study, assessments of the same content area administered by some or all districts in the State), and college-readiness assessments; OR</li> <li>○ Reports of analyses that demonstrate convergent relationships between State assessment results and measures other than test scores, such as performance criteria, including college- and career-readiness; OR</li> <li>○ Reports of analyses that demonstrate positive correlations between State assessment results and other variables, such as academic characteristic of test takers; OR</li> <li>○ Reports of analyses that show stronger positive relationships with measures of the same construct than with measures of different constructs; OR</li> <li>○ Reports of analyses that show assessment scores at tested grades are positively correlated with teacher judgments of student readiness at entry in the next grade level.</li> </ul>
<b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b>	<p>For the ISTEP+ R/LA and mathematics tests in grades 3-8, IDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence that the State followed a technically sound process to set achievement standards (e.g., a full technical report for achievement standards setting).</li> </ul>
<b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b>	<p>For the ISTEP+ R/LA and mathematics tests in grades 3-8, IDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence that State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards.</li> </ul>
<b>6.4 – Reporting</b>	<p>For the ISTEP+ R/LA and mathematics tests in grades 3-8, IDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence of a process and timeline for the reporting of student results to schools and parents.</li> </ul>

# U. S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## June, 2016 State 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 INDIANA

## Contents

<b>SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students	3
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards	4
1.3 – Required Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)	5
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)	6
1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only)	8
<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 – Test Design and Development	9
2.2 – Item Development	10
2.3 – Test Administration	12
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)	13
2.5 – Test Security	14
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy	16
<b>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY</b>	<b>19</b>
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	19
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	20
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	21
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	23
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER</b>	<b>24</b>
4.1 – Reliability	24
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility	29
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	31
4.4 – Scoring	33
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	34
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	35
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	36
<b>SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS</b>	<b>38</b>
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	38
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs	40
5.3 – Accommodations	41
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	42
<b>SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING</b>	<b>44</b>
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	44
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting	45
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	46
6.4 – Reporting	47

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR INDIANA**

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

<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>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</b></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all subjects</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 1 folder, in the Critical Element 1.1 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #1_ELA Standards 2014</p> <p>Evidence #2_Mathematics Standards 2014</p> <p>Evidence #3_State Board Standards Adoption April 9, 2014</p>	<p>The April 9, 2014 State Board Standards Adoption seemed to table the standards for further discussion. The state needs to provide evidence of the actual adoption of the Standards by the State Board. There was reference to this adoption in Evidence #67, slide 3 (April 28, 2014), however, this is not actual documentation of the adoption.</p> <p>The peers had questions about the status of high school ELA and mathematics, science, and the alternate assessments.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.1 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>• Evidence that the State Board adopted the Academic Content Standards for ELA and mathematics.</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 INDIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all three subjects <i>Evidence is located in the Section 1 folder, in the Critical Element 1.2 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #4_Indiana Process and Participants 2014</p> <p>Evidence #5_Achieve Review 2014 Indiana K-12 Content CCR for ELA and Math</p> <p>Evidence #6_Indiana Chamber Recommendations CCR Standards</p> <p>Evidence #7_Kathleen Porter Magee Evaluation</p> <p>Evidence #8_Sandra Stotsky Evaluation</p> <p>Evidence #9_Terrence Moore K-12 Evaluation</p> <p>Evidence #10_Ritz Lubbers Letter to Sec Duncan-Indiana CCR Standards</p> <p>Evidence #11_Indiana Standards Timeline and Stakeholders 2014</p> <p>Evidence #12_Indiana ELA Standards Review Committee 2014</p> <p>Evidence #13_College Career Panel Review Committee 2014</p> <p>Evidence #14_Indiana Math Standards Review Committee 2014</p> <p>Evidence #15_Public Comment Summary 2014</p>	<p>Evidence includes process and reviews, as well as external evaluations and recommendations, for Indiana’s CCR Standards in ELA and math, Grades 3-8.</p> <p>In Evidence #15, Public Comment Summary, Indiana provided a summary of the process used to incorporate the recommendations from the public and experts into the academic content standards for grades 3-8 in ELA and mathematics.</p> <p>Reviewers were curious about the number of ELA reviews (i.e., Evidence #5, 7, 8, 9), in contrast to only Evidence #5 for mathematics.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.2 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 INDIANA**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p><b>1.3 – Required Assessments</b></p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12);</li> <li>• Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence #16_Most Recent Year's List of All Indiana Assessments</p>	<p>Indiana provided a list of assessments given in 2014-15 which included grade 3-8 r/ela and math; one science test in each applicable grade band; and hs tests in r/ela and math plus hs science. AA-AAAS offered in same grade combinations.</p> <p>Evidence 16 was a word document-it did not appear to be a State publication. However a published test administration manual on the State website verified the information provided in the word document.</p> <p>Note that this evidence submission only provides evidence of r/ela and math general assessment program.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</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 INDIANA**

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p><b>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</b></p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;</li> <li>• For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment;</li> <li>○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Indiana Code that asserts participation for all:</b>  Evidence #17_IC20-32-2-2.3 defines any statewide or national assessment that a student is required to complete be administered by all public and nonpublic schools that voluntarily have become accredited under IC 20-19-2-8.  Evidence #18_ IC 20-32-2-3 clarifies inclusion of individuals enrolled in public schools, accredited nonpublic schools, or other nonpublic schools that have requested and received from the state board specific approval of the school’s educational program.  Evidence #19_511 IAC 6.2-6 requires that points be deducted from a school’s performance and improvement category scores if the school fails to assess at least 95 percent of its students.  <b>Additional documentation specific to students with disabilities and LEP:</b>  Evidence #20_Program Manual Chapter 10, page 14 provides information for LEP students.  Evidence #21_IC 20-32-5-16 cites information on inclusion of students with disabilities.</p>	<p>Indiana’s evidence submitted addresses all criteria 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 INDIANA**

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
__x_ No additional evidence is required.		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR INDIANA**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p><b>1.5 – Participation Data</b></p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>	<p>Prompts for Reviewers:                      --data disaggregated by student group: ELA/Math/Science                      --Shows students tested and students enrolled for each breakout                      --for end-of-course HS, procedures to ensure each student is tested and counted in participation rate along with data                      --includes grade level tests and AA-AAAS</p> <p>Evidence #22_Statewide Participation Rates</p>	<p>State evidence 22 shows overall participation rates by subject area and for subgroups and gen ed and AA-AAAS</p> <p>Data does not show grade levels, nor does data show numerator and denominator.</p> <p>Evidence does not show procedures for ensuring each student is tested and counted in calculation of participation rates on each required assessment, or show corresponding data (numbers as noted in previous comment)</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p>x__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation in tests by grade level, that show                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Numbers of students tested</li> <li>○ Numbers of students enrolled</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence of procedures that State has to ensure that all students is tested and counted in calculation of participation rates.</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 INDIANA

### SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, 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 full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 2 folder, in the Critical Element 2.1 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #23_ELA Test Blueprints Development</p> <p>Evidence #24_TITLE20 AR32 ch5-1</p> <p>Evidence #25_ELA Blueprints</p> <p>Evidence #26_Math Blueprints</p> <p>Evidence #27_ELA Test Specifications</p> <p>Evidence #28_Math Test Specifications</p> <p>Evidence #29_ISTEP Spring15 Technical Report 1_29_16_FINAL</p>	<p>Evidence shows all ISTEP+ test blueprints and test specifications information. As well, the ISTEP+ Technical Report confirms the blueprint and specifications processes and decisions.</p> <p>The test design and development process was determined to be appropriate.</p> <p>The reviewers have a concern that the Technical Report needs to include a section dedicated to the purpose of the assessment, including intended test score interpretation and uses. (See further comments in Section 3.)</p>
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 INDIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><b>Evidence for Item Development:</b>  <i>Evidence is located in the Section 2 folder, in the Critical Element 2.1 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #27_ELA Test Specifications and            Evidence #28_Math Test Specifications</p> <p>Evidence #29_ISTEP_Spring15_Technical Report_1_29_16_FINAL:</p> <p><b>Evidence for Item Alignment:</b>            Evidence #29_ISTEP_Spring15_Technical Report_1_29_16_FINAL:</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 2 folder, in the Critical Element 2.2 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #30_WestEd Alignment Study            Evidence #31_Roeber Alignment Study</p> <p><b>Evidence for Item Performance:</b>  <i>Evidence is located in the Section 2 folder, in the Critical Element 2.1 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #29_ISTEP_Spring15_Technical Report_1_29_16_FINAL:</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 2 folder, in the Critical Element 2.2 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #32_Pearson Cognitive Lab Study</p>	<p>The evidence submitted, such as #27, #28, and #29, indicates that the item development process used was adequate and appropriate.</p> <p>Evidence #32_Pearson Cognitive Lab Study, with results published in 2011, do not seem relevant as evidence for this element.</p> <p>Evidence #27_ELA Test Specifications and Evidence #28_Math Test Specifications include columns of information regarding Standards Alignment, Clarification/Specification, Depth of Knowledge, Alignment, and Item Type.</p> <p>Evidence #29_ISTEP_Spring15_Technical Report_1_29_16_FINAL:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 6-15 outline all item and test development, but specific topics are covered as follows:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Page 6: Alignment, Item Specs/Blueprints, Item Development</li> <li>○ Page 7: Item Content and Fairness, Item Selection and Form Development</li> <li>○ Pages 8-15: Item and Test Development for Test Administrations from 2008-09 through 2014-15</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Pages 65-66 outline Total Test Design, which includes, grade level, content area, item type and number of items.</li> <li>• Pages 67-70 outline the ELA test forms by grade, by Standard coverage, by item type and number of items/points.</li> <li>• Pages 71-74 outline the mathematics test forms by grade, by Standard coverage, by item type and number of items/points.</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 INDIANA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>Evidence #29_ISTEP_Spring15_Technical Report_1_29_16_FINAL:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 6 outlines Alignment, Item Specs/Blueprints, Item Development.</li> <li>• Pages 8-15 outline Item and Test Development for Test Administrations from 2008-09 through 2014-15.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #30_WestEd Alignment Study and Evidence #31_Roeber Alignment Study both show agreeable alignment.</p> <p>Evidence #29_ISTEP_Spring15_Technical Report_1_29_16_FINAL:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While Pages 12-15 outline the 2014-15 Test Administration, page 15 addresses Operational Selections based on field test data including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Pages 81-83, Rater Reliability Statistics for ELA Operational and Field Test Items</li> <li>○ Pages 84-87, Rater Reliability Statistics for Mathematics Operational and Field Test Items</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #32_Pearson Cognitive Lab Study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While this study informs later grade level studies, the format and range indicates the extended research base for ISTEP+.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </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 INDIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <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 all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments;</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>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 2 folder, in the Critical Element 2.3 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #33_Test Coordinator's Manual_2015</p> <p>Evidence #34_Accommodations Guidance_2015</p> <p>Evidence #35_Training Materials</p> <p>Evidence #36_Technology Guidance</p>	<p>Evidence #40, Chapter 10, Page 3 states that: “All test examiners should be trained to understand the testing procedures and their responsibilities as test examiners.” This doesn’t assert that the test examiners must be trained.</p> <p>The U. S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems, Non-Regulatory Guidance for States for Meeting Requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (“the guidance”), as amended (September 25, 2015) provides a very specific list of evidence for this element, including agendas for training sessions and sign-in sheets for tracking attendance. The reviewers suggest evidence such as, an outline (e.g., a PowerPoint presentation) of the training process, the process for delivering the training to all those administering the test, and training materials for the test examiners, including materials for both the on-line and paper/pencil test.</p> <p>The reviewers suggest a contingency plan for the administration of the on-line assessment in the event of a disruption during testing.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.3 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 needs to be submitted to document that test examiners are fully trained in test administration for both modes (i.e., on-line and paper/pencil) of testing.</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 INDIANA**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p><b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b></p> <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.</p>	<p>Evidence #37_Denise Intermediate #9001 NAEP Visit_2014-15</p> <p>Evidence #38_Northview High School #0933 ECA Sp15 Site Visits 2014-15_FINAL</p> <p>Evidence #39_Monitoring Description</p>	<p>Evidence 39 describes an adequate process for the State to monitor test administration</p> <p>Evidence 38 and 37 provide evidence that monitoring did occur</p> <p>What seems lacking is a rationale for why only NAEP and ECA monitored in 2014-15. Also, there is not a report of total monitoring efforts or summary. From the evidence submitted it is unclear how much monitoring in total actually occurs.</p> <p>There is a rationale provided in evidence 39 that describes a tiered approach to schools selected in monitoring..</p> <p>None of the evidence indicates that AA-AAAS tests are monitored.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p>x The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A summary of monitoring that did occur in the 2014-15 testing cycle (how many schools, how many monitors employed, who are monitors?).</li> <li>• A rationale as to why only some parts of the State tests are monitored in a given year (eg why only NAEP and ECA? What about Istep 3-8 and AA-AAS?)</li> </ul> <p>A specific plan for monitoring that includes AA-AAS as well as general education assessments.</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 INDIANA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></p> <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, 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> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 2 folder, in the Critical Element 2.5 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #40_Chapter 10 (Testing Policies, Administration, and Security) 2014-2015_FL...</p> <p>Evidence #41_Indiana Testing Security and Integrity Agreement_2014-2015_FINAL</p> <p>Evidence #42_Assessment Roles, Responsibilities_2014-15</p> <p>Evidence #43_Required Test Coordinator Designation_2014-15 (Supt, Princ MEMO)</p> <p>Evidence #44_Testing Security &amp; Integrity Training_2014-15_FINAL</p> <p>Evidence #45_Code of Ethical Practices and Procedures_2014-2015_FINAL</p> <p>Evidence #46_Testing Concerns and Security Violations Report_2014-2015_FINAL</p> <p>Evidence #47_Protocol for Reporting &amp; Investigating Alleged Breaches or Irregularitie...</p> <p>Evidence #48_Memo_Corporation X School Z Testing Security Concern _5-5-15_final</p> <p>Evidence #49_Follow-up Memo Corporation X School Z Testing Security Concern _5-20-15_final</p>	<p>The reviewers agree that this element is appropriately addressed.</p> <p>There is evidence that a remediation incident occurred (#48 and #49). The reviewers suggest that the state establish a process for addressing other such events.</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 INDIANA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR INDIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b></p> <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 materials and related data in test development, administration, and 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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p><b>Evidence for Test Security:</b>  <i>Evidence is located in the Section 2 folder, in the Critical Element 2.5 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #40_Chapter 10 (Testing Policies, Administration, and Security) 2014-15, page 19, part B.</p> <p>Evidence #45_Code of Ethical Practices and Procedures_2014-15</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 2 folder, in the Critical Element 2.6 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #50_PowerPoint_Ethical Testing and Test Security Training_2014-15</p> <p><b>Evidence for Student Security:</b>            Evidence #51_Student Test Number Description</p>	<p>Similar to 2.5, evidence in this critical element relates to assessment irregularities, as well as the guidance for maintaining materials, roles, responsibilities and security related to ISTEP+ test administration. In addition, test security and test ethical procedures are critical to this documentation.</p> <p>The Indiana Department of Education uses a combination of Legal, Operational and Technological Controls to ensure that student confidentiality is maintained and that no student information is released in an unauthorized manner. The way in which these controls are applied changes based on the medium being used to view data.</p> <p>If personal identifiable information is to be accessed via a web application, then the Indiana Department of Education Office of Legal Affairs is consulted on ensuring that the web application authenticates that a requestor is a designated, responsible party eligible to consume the types of data they are requesting. Operational and technological controls are implemented by ensuring that access to data consumption roles are password protected and that authentication is secure. Additional technological controls are implemented via Application Security Appliances (commonly referred to as firewalls) ensuring that individuals cannot access personal identifiable information outside of the password protected role-based access.</p> <p>If data files are being requested outside of the context of a web application, then the Indiana</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 INDIANA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>Department of Education Office of Legal Affairs communicates with the requestor(s) to determine and authenticate their identity. After that, the purpose of the request is determined and the Office of Legal Affairs (1) decides whether the request can be safely fulfilled, and (2) suppresses any data that would allow for third parties to identify individuals.</p> <p>The Indiana Department of Education simultaneously employs two methods of suppression for reports that attempt to aggregate personal identifiable information--automated and manual suppression. Through manual and automated (algorithmic) means, for the smallest sub-group that is presented in each report, the Department ensures that any counts less than ten are fully redacted/suppressed. This guideline is followed even if it destroys the informative power of the requested report.</p> <p>Evidence #40_Chapter 10 (Testing Policies, Administration, and Security) 2014-15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On page 3, roles and security are defined for Test Examiners and Proctors.</li> <li>• On page 4, roles and security are defined for Corporation Test Coordinators.</li> <li>• One page 5, roles and security are defined for School Test Coordinators.</li> <li>• On pages 5-6, Formal Training for Staff and Testing Security and Integrity Agreement is outlined.</li> <li>• On pages 6-12, the Test Security Policy/Plan is described in detail from start to finish of testing.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #45_Code of Ethical Practices and Procedures_2014-15</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 INDIANA**

<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>• Pages 1-3, Section #3, outline Test Security procedures.</li> <li>• Pages 4-5, Section #5, outline all Testing Conditions related to security from start to finish of testing.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #50_PowerPoint_Ethical Testing and Test Security Training_2014-15 is the training that those involved in test administration received to cover ethical testing and all test security matters.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </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 INDIANA

### SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 3 folder, in the Critical Element 3.1 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #52_ISTEP+ 2015 Grade 8 Mathematics and ELA Scoring Guide</p> <p>Evidence #53_ISTEP+ 2015 Grade 8 Mathematics and English Language Arts Assessment Book</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 3 folder, in the Critical Element 3.2 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #54_Validity Study Summary – The entire document needs to be submitted.</p>	<p>Moving forward, additional attention needs to be paid to validity. Is there a plan to more adequately address this? Perhaps the state could use Michael Kane references for ideas to help integrate validity evidence into a more coherent argument to support the purpose and uses of the test. (See also Pages 21 &amp; 22 of the <i>Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing</i>, 2014)</p> <p>Also the two alignment studies, Evidence #30 &amp; #31, should be cited as evidence here.</p> <p>A description of a systematic process and timeline the system will provide to identify any gaps or weaknesses (e.g., lack of items addressing higher order thinking skills) in the alignment studies should be provided.</p> <p>Evidence #57, #66 &amp; #80, appendices to the Validity Studies, need to be included as evidence here. Additionally, the four other appendices in the Roeber/Briggs study need to be submitted.</p> <p>Greater clarity needs to be provided to demonstrate how Evidences #52 applies to this item.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.1 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>• If the assessment is to be used to show student growth, additional validity studies/evidence must be submitted.</li> <li>• The state needs to submit a description of a systematic process and timeline to address gaps or weaknesses identified by the alignment studies.</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 INDIANA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 3 folder, in the Critical Element 3.2 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #54_Validity Study Summary</p>	<p>The reviewers did not find evidence that this item has been adequately addressed.</p> <p>Following additional item development, cognitive labs might be used to evaluate the cognitive demand of new items.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.2 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>• A process and timeline for addressing the shortfall of the cognitive demand, as identified in the alignment studies, needs to be submitted.</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 INDIANA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></p> <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 academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 2 folder, in the Critical Element 2.1 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #29_ISTEP_Spring15_Technical Report_1_29_16_FINAL</p>	<p>While the technical report (Evidence #29, page 5 &amp; 6) states that the scores appear to be essentially unidimensional, the unidimensional validity study (Evidence #57, page 6) claims that not all validity values are within acceptable ranges. It would be useful to reconcile the two sources of evidence.</p> <p>Evidence #57 should be included in the evidence column.</p> <p>Evidence #29_ISTEP_Spring15_Technical Report_1_29_16_FINAL includes all of the ISTEP technical information related to validity and reliability. Specifically, the following pages are critical to this element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 25-36, Section 6 discusses analyses of the internal structure of the assessment. Items were analyzed in terms of their p-values, with questions less than .30 deemed too difficult and those above .90 understood to be fairly easy.</li> <li>• Pages 43-49, Section 8 discusses the dimensionality of the assessment content as compared to the desired academic content: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Using the Kaiser criterion of computing the eigenvalues of the correlation matrix;</li> <li>○ Further, item omission rates were evaluated with consideration given to the position with respect to the test session; and</li> <li>○ Items that were omitted by more than 5% students, those questions were highlighted and examined.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Pages 6-15, Section 2 describes the review of items by content experts from the contractor CTB as well as from the IDOE.</li> <li>• Page 26, Section 6 indicates Differential Item</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 INDIANA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		Functioning (DIF) analysis was used to statistically evaluate whether items functioned appropriately for various student subgroups.
<b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b>		
_X_ No additional evidence is required.		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR INDIANA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 3 folder, in the Critical Element 3.4 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #55_Indiana CCR Integrated Summary</p>	<p>Evidence for this element could be an indicator of college and career readiness, an important goal for the state, so there should be some relationship between performance on ISTEP+ and college and career ready criteria such as participation in AP courses or scores on the SAT.</p> <p>Evidence #55 may include some of the criteria to use in establishing adequate validity evidence, however no correlational studies were conducted to relate this criteria to the ISTEP+.</p> <p>Other examples of possible evidence to support this critical element are suggested in the guidance for this element.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.4 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>Validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables must be provided. (This might be hard for the state to produce at this time. This is dependent upon development and administration of the high school tests.)</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 INDIANA

### SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <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 and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 2 folder, in the Critical Element 2.1 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #29_ISTEP_Spring15_Technical Report_1_29_16_FINAL</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 4 folder, in the Critical Element 4.1 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #56_ISTEP Comparability Mode Effects</p> <p>Evidence #57_Unidimensional Validity Study</p>	<p>Evidence for this element is adequate.</p> <p>Evidence #29_ISTEP_Spring15_Technical Report_1_29_16_FINAL summarizes the test validity and reliability. Specific to this critical element are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 43-49, Section 8 provides the core summary of the Reliability and Validity of the assessment. Classification accuracy indices depend on several factors, including the reliability of the actual test forms, the distribution of scores, the number of cut scores, and the location of each cut score. The probability of a correct classification (Consistency) is the probability that the classification the student received is consistent with the classification that the student would have received on a parallel form; in other words, that the classification is correct. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ For ELA, Consistency ranges from 0.75 (PP1PP Grade 5, All proficiency levels) to 0.91 (PP2PP Grade 7, Pass+ ), with an average of 0.85 across all grades and forms.</li> <li>○ For MA, Consistency ranges from .80 (PP2OL Grade 4, All proficiency levels) to 0.95 (PP2PP Grade 7, Pass+ ), with an average of 0.89 across all grades and forms.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Pages 43-49, Section includes that the classification consistency and accuracy should be considered together. The probability of accuracy (Accuracy) represents the agreement between the observed classification based on the actual test form, and true classification</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 INDIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>given the modeled form. Accuracy for the ELA grades and forms ranges from 0.82 (PP1PP Grade 5, All proficiency levels) to 0.94 (OL1OL Grade 3, OL1OL/PP1PP Grade 4, and PP2PP Grade 7, Pass+ ), with an average of 0.89. Accuracy for the MA grades and forms ranges from 0.86 (PP1OL/PP2OL Grade 4, All proficiency levels) to 0.96 (PP1PP/PP2PPL Grade 7, PP1OL/PP1PP/PP2PP Grade 8, Pass+), with an average of 0.92.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 37 &amp; 43, Section 7 include item level data. A summary comparison of the classical statistics results for Spring 2015 ISTEP+ by operational forms is presented in this section. Average item difficulties (p -values) range from 0.52 to 0.61 across ELA grades and forms, and from 0.49 to 0.63 across MA grades and forms. Average item–test correlations range from 0.40 to 0.44 across ELA grades and forms, and from 0.42 to 0.47 across MA grades and forms.</li> <li>• Page 92, Table 16 presents item-test correlations. These studies correlate correct responses to the remainder of the items in the test. As shown in Table 16, the average p-values for the operational tests range from 0.53 to 0.60 in the ELA grades and range from 0.50 to 0.62 in the MA grades. The item–test correlations for operational items across all grades and content areas are within typical and acceptable ranges.</li> <li>• Pages 99-102, Tables 21 and 22 provide Differential Item Function (DIF) analysis of test items tests for question bias. In the operational test gender DIF analyses, there were a total of 44 items (~4%) flagged for moderate (B) DIF and 9 items (~1%) flagged</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 INDIANA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>for large (C) DIF. For the operational test ethnicity DIF analyses for White vs. African American, there were 30 items (~3%) flagged for moderate DIF and 2 items flagged for large DIF. For the operational test ethnicity DIF analyses for White vs. Hispanic, there were 17 items (~2%) flagged for moderate DIF and 7 items (~1%) flagged for large DIF.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Items are evaluated across administrations from the content reviews, bias and sensitivity reviews, alignment workshops, and the various statistical analyses are exhaustive and sensitive to the test blueprints. This process can sometimes result in the elimination of some operational items from student scores and of some field test items from the item pool. For ELA and MA, problematic flagged items (e.g., items with negative item–test correlation, poor fit, extremely low p -value, and/or large DIF) found in the operationalized field test were avoided as much as possible in the selection of the Spring 2015 final operational forms.</li> <li>• Page 39 describes the evaluation of the performance of items and tests in relation to the Indiana Academic Standards. Reliability and error metrics, the Item Response Theory (IRT) location value and estimated amount of IRT information contributing to each standard are delineated. The tables also provide the Indiana Performance Index (IPI) at the Pass cut score, the state-level mean IPI obtained, and the average p –values for the state and for students in each proficiency level. To define mastery of each content standard, a mastery cut score for each standard was calculated as the expected IPI for a student at the Pass cut score in the given content area. This reference point</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 INDIANA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>changes with item difficulty and the number of items associated with each standard. If more difficult items contribute to a content standard, a lower IPI would be required to achieve mastery than if less difficult items were used. A student is said to have mastered a given content standard if the student’s IPI is at or above the IPI expected for the student performing at the Pass cut score.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 40, Section 7 presents Test-level analysis. The ISTEP+ uses item-pattern scoring so that the pattern of student responses to items and the IRT item parameters of the items can be used to estimate the student’s final scale score using maximum-likelihood methods. This improves the information provided beyond that of the simple scale score by considering how students respond to individual items.</li> <li>• Page 44, Table 42 shows the total test reliability for the Spring 2015 ISTEP+ averages 0.90 and ranges between 0.86 and 0.94. Such a range is indicative of the high reliability of the Spring 2015 ISTEP+ operational tests and forms. The mean (and range) of the state-level reliability coefficients for each content area are as follows: ELA 0.88 (range 0.86–0.89), MA 0.93 (range 0.92–0.94)</li> <li>• Page 123, Table 27 presents mean, standard deviation, LOSS, HOSS and percentiles of student scores.</li> <li>• Pages 156-159 show the scale score means and standard deviations for the state by form, and break students out by proficiency level (Did Not Pass, Pass, and Pass+ ).</li> <li>• Pages 160-167, Tables 38-41 provide impact data across proficiency levels for gender, ethnicity, and special population subgroups.</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 INDIANA**

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>• Pages 125-132, Tables 29-32 include comparative performance across subgroups and reflect what was provided for the scale score descriptive statistics.</li> <li>• Pages 103-122, Tables 23-26 also report Cronbach’s alpha value, indicating reliability. The reported alpha values are generally in the accepted range, with some exceptions including “Writing Conventions of Standard English” and “Number Sense”.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #56_ISTEP Comparability Mode Effects notes that various mode-effect studies were performed. These studies and their analysis led to an adjustment of some students’ final scores for some grades and form modes. This is described further in Appendix B of the Tech Report.</p> <p>Evidence #57_Unidimensional Validity Study notes the ISTEP+ total scores:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are highly reliable measures;</li> <li>• Appear to be essentially unidimensional; and</li> <li>• Can be used to classify students into proficiency levels with high levels of consistency.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b>		
__X__ No additional evidence is required.		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR INDIANA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b></p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 2 folder, in the Critical Element 2.1 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #29_ISTEP_Spring15_Technical Report_1_29_16_FINAL</p> <p>The information outlined in Critical Element 4.1 also helps to clarify this Critical Element.</p>	<p>The reviewers are interested in seeing some information on the training of item writers, including how bias, fairness and sensitivity are addressed.</p> <p>Evidence #29_ISTEP_Spring15_Technical Report_1_29_16_FINAL includes all of the ISTEP technical information related to validity and reliability. Specifically, the following pages are critical to the accessibility and fairness of ISTEP+:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 6-15 provide all of the item development information;</li> <li>• Page 7 provides information specific to test design and development and UDL;</li> <li>• Pages 23-24 provide information on Data Integrity, including:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Explanation of the development of a representative “validation” sample, handscoring sample or field test sample; and</li> <li>○ Explanation of the threestratification variables are used: region, community type, and socio-economic status.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Pages 25-36 offer information regarding the methods used including the following:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Pages 25-26: Item-Level Analyses;</li> <li>○ Page 26: Differential Item Functioning;</li> <li>○ Pages 26-27: Test-Level Analyses, including the Cronbach index;</li> <li>○ Pages 27-29: Test Scaling and Equating;</li> <li>○ Pages 29-30: Model Fit;</li> <li>○ Pages 30-31: Local Independence;</li> <li>○ Pages 31-32: Reverse Gamma;</li> <li>○ Page 32: Equating;</li> <li>○ Pages 32-33: Vertical Item Selection;</li> <li>○ Pages 33-34: Vertical Scaling Data;</li> </ul> </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 INDIANA**

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>○ Pages 34-35: Calibration Methods;</li> <li>○ Pages 35-36: Setting LOSS and HOSS; and</li> <li>○ Page 36: Cut Score Setting Workshop.</li> </ul> <p>The information outlined in Critical Element 4.1 also helps to clarify this Critical Element.</p>
<b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR INDIANA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 2 folder, in the Critical Element 2.1 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #29_ISTEP_Spring15_Technical Report_1_29_16_FINAL includes all of the ISTEP technical information related to validity and reliability.</p>	<p>Plotting the cut scores on a test information function (TIF) would be helpful in determining whether the test addresses the full range of performance adequately.</p> <p>Evidence #29_ISTEP_Spring15_Technical Report_1_29_16_FINAL includes all of the ISTEP technical information related to validity and reliability.</p> <p>The following pages are key to this Critical Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 8 outlines the Workshop IDOE, CTB, and teachers (general and special education) had to determine Item Specifications that 1) analyze grade level and content area indicators to determine appropriate indicator “weight” and Depth of Knowledge (DOK); 2) recommend item formats appropriate for assessing each indicator and suggest approaches to best test individual indicators; and 3) set content “limits,” or areas within the Academic Standards appropriate for the ISTEP+. Also included were discussions about cognitive complexity.</li> <li>• Pages 103-122, Tables 23-26 present the item difficulty analysis across standards items.</li> </ul> <p>The test information related to the content strands does not help to inform that the test addresses the full performance continuum.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 103-122, Tables 23-26 present an analysis of test information functions (TIF) and ability estimates for students at different performance levels across the full performance continuum or a pool information function across the full performance continuum. Test</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 INDIANA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>information functions including total test information and cut score test information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 193-208, Figures 17–32 show the Test Characteristic Curves (TCC) as well as the Standard Error of Measurement (SEM) curves across the Spring 2015 ISTEP+ operational forms for each content area and grade. The TCC plots resemble each other (in that they lay close to or even on top of one another) in terms of difficulty (position against the horizontal or x-axis), discrimination (slope), and accuracy (points along the SEM curve that are low or flat). The SEM plots show low variance around the cut score values.</li> <li>• As noted above, Figures 17-32 plot the standard error of measurement (as well as the test characteristic curves).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </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 INDIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 2 folder, in the Critical Element 2.1 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #29_ISTEP_Spring15 Technical Report1_29_16_FINAL</p>	<p>The evidence presented is adequate for this item.</p> <p>Evidence #29_ISTEP_Spring15_Technical Report_1_29_16_FINAL includes all of the ISTEP technical information related to validity and reliability. Specifically, the following pages are critical to the Scoring Procedures of ISTEP+:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 18-22, Section 4 provides comprehensive information on the Scoring Procedures of ISTEP+;</li> <li>• Pages 23-24, Section 5 includes information on Data Population and Samples;</li> <li>• Pages 25-36, Section 6 provides information on the Methods Used in Analyzing ISTEP+;</li> <li>• Pages 238-244, Appendix A outlines Handscoring and Operation Procedures; and</li> <li>• Pages 245-246, also in Appendix A, outline how scoring is monitored.</li> </ul> <p>The following pages include data to support ISTEP+ rater reliability (inter-rater reliability), which show that in general, items values are within the acceptable range:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 81-83 show rater reliability for ELA; and</li> <li>• Pages 84-88 show rater reliability for math.</li> </ul> <p>The following pages include further data to support ISTEP+ total test reliability, which show that the reliability for the Spring 2015 ISTEP+ operation test and forms averages 0.90 and ranges between 0.86 and 0.94, which are indicative of high reliability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 168-169 show reliability coefficients.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 4.4 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 INDIANA**

<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>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b></p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Evidence is located in the Section 2 folder, in the Critical Element 2.1 folder: Evidence #29_ISTEP_Spring15_Technical Report_1_29_16_FINAL.</p>	<p>The reviewers found no evidence of multiple assessment forms.</p> <p>Evidence #29_ISTEP_Spring15_Technical Report_1_29_16_FINAL includes all of the ISTEP technical information related to validity and reliability. Specifically, the following pages are critical to this Critical Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 37, The Tech Report observes that the 2014 and 2015 ELA and MA tests were completely different so a direct comparison is not reasonable across years.</li> <li>• Equating procedures within and across modes is discussed in Section 4 – Critical Element 4.6</li> </ul>
<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 INDIANA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, 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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 2 folder, in the Critical Element 2.1 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #29_ISTEP_Spring15_Technical Report_1_29_16_FINAL</p>	<p>There is evidence that the state addressed the issues of differing performance on the on-line and the paper/pencil test and adjusted scores to attain comparability.</p> <p>Evidence #29_ISTEP_Spring15_Technical Report_1_29_16_FINAL includes all of the ISTEP technical information related to validity and reliability.</p> <p>Specifically, the following pages are critical to the Scoring Procedures of ISTEP+:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 103-120, Tables 23 and 24 of the Tech Report compare results of the test forms between and across modes. The tables report Cronbach's alpha and Standard Error Measurement, comparing the reliability of the various forms and modes. The reported alpha values are generally in the accepted range, with some exceptions including Writing, Conventions of Standard English and Number Sense.</li> <li>• As noted in the Tech Report, IDOE commissioned a mode effect study comparing paper-pencil (PP) and online (OL) test modes. A review of this study by the SBOE and a group of consultants indicated that bias was present, usually favoring the PP tests. This motivated adjustments to some students' final scale scores. The adjustments are documented on pages 247-248, Appendix B of the Tech Report.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 4.6 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 INDIANA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and 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).</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><b>Evidence for Clear and Technically Sound Assessment Criteria:</b>  <i>Evidence is located in the Section 2 folder, in the Critical Element 2.1 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #29_ISTEP_Spring15_Technical Report_1_29_16_FINAL includes all of the ISTEP technical information related to validity and reliability.</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 4 folder, in the Critical Element 4.7 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #58_ISTEP Assessment Contract includes all of the expectations for the State assessment system.</p> <p><b>Evidence for Content Alignment:</b>  <i>Evidence is located in the Section 2 folder, in the Critical Element 2.1 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #29_ISTEP_Spring15_Technical Report_1_29_16_FINAL</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 2 folder, in the Critical Element 2.2 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #30_WestEd Alignment Study</p> <p>Evidence #31_Roeber Alignment Study</p> <p><b>Evidence for TAC Participation:</b>  <i>Evidence is located in the Section 4 folder, in the Critical Element 4.7 folder:</i></p>	<p>Reviewers suggest that a process and plan be developed to monitor and improve, as needed, the quality of the assessment system for future administrations.</p> <p>Evidence #58_ISTEP Assessment Contract includes all of the expectations for the State assessment system. The following pages evidence the critical areas noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyses for Validity, Reliability and Fairness</li> <li>• Independent Studies of Alignment and Comparability</li> <li>• Requirements for the Technical Report</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence for Content Alignment:</b>            Evidence #29_ISTEP_Spring15_Technical Report_1_29_16_FINAL:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 6 outlines Alignment, Item Specs/Blueprints, Item Development.</li> <li>• Pages 8-15 outline Item and Test Development for Test Administrations from 2008-09 through 2014-15.</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 INDIANA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Evidence #59_TAC Formation Resolution  Evidence #60_TAC Members and Roles  Evidence #61_TAC and SBOE Cut Score Review Documentation.	
<b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR INDIANA

### SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs;</li> <li>• Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;</li> <li>• Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 5 folder, in the Critical Element 5.1 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #62_Accommodations Resource Guide and Toolkit</p> <p>Evidence #63_IIEP - Walkthrough for TORs (10-12-2015)</p> <p>Evidence #64_Appendix C (Accessibility and Accommodations Guidance)_2014-2015_FINAL</p> <p>Evidence #65_IIEP - Walkthrough for District Administrators (11-11-2015)</p> <p>Evidence #66_IN Validity Study 7 Assessment of Special Needs Students v. 1.1</p>	<p>The inability to use multiple accommodations simultaneously in a single test administration could present fairness issues for students with disabilities. Refer to Critical Element 4.7 for a way to address this.</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 INDIANA**

<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>• Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</li> <li>• Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments);</li> <li>• The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </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 INDIANA**

<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>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 5 folder, in the Critical Element 5.1 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #62_Accommodations Resource Guide and Toolkit</p> <p>Evidence #64_Appendix C (Accessibility and Accommodations Guidance) 2014-2015_FINAL</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 5 folder, in the Critical Element 5.2 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #67_Assessment Update (2014_2015) FINAL</p> <p>Evidence #68_EL Guidebook 11-20-14</p> <p>Evidence #69_ENL Presentation</p>	<p>Reviewers agreed that evidence addressing this element is adequate.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.2 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 INDIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities (SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;</li> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> <li>Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) 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> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 5 folder, in the Critical Element 5.1 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #62_Accommodations Resource Guide and Toolkit</p> <p>Evidence #64_Appendix C (Accessibility and Accommodations Guidance) 2014-2015 FINAL</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 2 folder, in the Critical Element 2.1 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #29_ISTEP Spring15 Technical Report 1_29_16_FINAL</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 5 folder, in the Critical Element 5.3 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #70_Non-Standard Assessment Accommodation Request 2015-16 FINAL</p>	<p>To better satisfy the goal that listed accommodations are effective, sources from research literature, such as <i>Validity and Accommodations: the Journey toward Accessible Assessments</i>, Barton, 2007, cited in the technical report, could be referenced within Evidence # 62.</p> <p>Indiana has a state IEP where a report is pulled that summarizes the frequency of use of each accommodation used on the State’s assessments in ELA and in mathematics by BOTH students with disabilities and English learners with disabilities. At this time we do not have a state ILP for EL students so we do not have the specific accommodations used Non Standard Accommodations form</p>
<p><b>Section 5.3 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 INDIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners 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 or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 5 folder, in the Critical Element 5.4 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #71_Accommodation Report - Public and Non-Public ISTEP 3-8</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 5 folder, in the Critical Element 5.1 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #62_Accommodations Resource Guide and Toolkit</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 5 folder, in the Critical Element 5.4 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #72_Chapter 1 (ISTEP+) 2014-2015 FINAL</p> <p>Evidence #73_Chapter 4 (Alternate Assessment) 2014-2015_FINAL</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 2 folder, in the Critical Element 2.5 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #40_Chapter 10 Testing Policies Administration and Security 2015-2016 FINAL 2-24-16</p> <p>Evidence #45_Code of Ethical Practices and Procedures 2015-2016 FINAL</p>	<p>The state should provide schedules for monitoring test administration for special populations, including the appropriate provision of accommodations, as defined in the IEP. This is to ensure consistent use and availability of accommodations.</p> <p>The Office of Special Education (OSE) funds the Indiana Resource Network <a href="http://doe.in.gov/specialed/indiana-resource-network">doe.in.gov/specialed/indiana-resource-network</a>.</p> <p>The Office of Student Assessment (OSA) works directly with three of these groups: Indiana IEP Resource Center; Project SUCCESS and PATINS Project to support teachers on selecting appropriate accommodations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State level accommodations reports pulled from the Indiana IEP for review for the OSA and OSE);</li> <li>• Universal Design for Learning (UDL) webinar <a href="http://doe.in.gov/specialed/virtualprofessionaldevelopment">doe.in.gov/specialed/virtualprofessionaldevelopment</a>;</li> <li>• 2015-2016 Indiana Assessment Program Manual Chapter 1 and 4 <a href="http://doe.in.gov/assessment">doe.in.gov/assessment</a>;</li> <li>• Accommodations Resource Guide and Toolkit doc;</li> <li>• School and Corporation Data reports <a href="http://doe.in.gov/accountability/find-school-andcorporation-data-reports">doe.in.gov/accountability/find-school-andcorporation-data-reports</a>;</li> <li>• For Alternate Assessment results under the header “Alternate and Modified Assessments” 2015 NCSC Results by Corporation and School;</li> <li>• Chapter 10-Testing Policies-Administration</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 INDIANA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 5 folder, in the Critical Element 5.4 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #74_Copy of 2015 NCSC-2</p> <p>Evidence #75_Testing Irregularity Report 2015-2016 FINAL</p>	<p>and Security;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Code of Ethical Practices and Procedures document;</li> <li>• Testing Irregularity Report;</li> <li>• OSA staff site visits during the testing window;</li> <li>• School and Corporation Data reports <a href="http://doe.in.gov/accountability/find-school-and-corporation-data-reports">doe.in.gov/accountability/find-school-and-corporation-data-reports</a>; and</li> <li>• For 2014 Under the header “ISTEP+ (2014)” 2014 Accommodations for Special Education and English Learner.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<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 INDIANA**

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING**

<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>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;</li> <li>• The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply;</li> <li>• The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 6 folder, in the Critical Element 6.1 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #76_ELA 3-8 Performance Level Descriptors_2015</p> <p>Evidence #77_Math 3-8 Performance Level Descriptors_2015</p> <p>Evidence #78_SBOE_Cut Score Approval</p> <p>Evidence #79_SBOE_Cut Score Modification Approval</p>	<p>The evidence presented for this critical element is adequate.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.1 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 INDIANA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b></p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 2 folder, in the Critical Element 2.1 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #29_ISTEP_Spring15_Technical Report_1_29_16_FINAL</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 6 folder, in the Critical Element 6.2 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #80_Standards Setting Validity Study_2015</p> <p>Evidence #81_Bookmarking Explanation</p> <p>Evidence #82_Standards Setting Panelists</p>	<p>The reviewers need to see a technical report that describes the standard-setting process and results.</p> <p>Evidence #29_ISTEP_Spring15_Technical Report_1_29_16_FINAL:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 36 provides information on the ISTEP+ Cut Score Setting Workshop</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #80_Standards Setting Validity Study_2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to the study in summary, procedures to determine cut scores for the 2015 ISTEP+ tests were carried out well, with a couple of minor exceptions according to the Standards Setting Validity Study.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #82_Standards Setting Panelists This document shows panelists and their varied backgrounds and range of expertise.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.2 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>• A technical report that describes the standard-setting process and results needs to be submitted.</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 INDIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><b>Evidence for State Standards Setting:</b> <i>Evidence is located in the Section 2 folder, in the Critical Element 2.1 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #29_ISTEP_Spring15_Technical Report_1_29_16_FINAL</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 6 folder, in the Critical Element 6.2 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #80_Standards Setting Validity Study_2015</p> <p>Evidence #81_Bookmarking Explanation</p> <p>Evidence #82_Standards Setting Panelists</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 6 folder, in the Critical Element 6.3 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #83_Resolution Remediation Redesign_2013</p> <p>Evidence #84_PLDs Development Process.docx</p>	<p>The main concern of the reviewers is determining how the performance level descriptors are aligned to content standards.</p> <p>The reviewers wonder if there is a more detailed standard setting report, primarily detailing the process. There are references to the standard setting in the technical report. There were references to an external review of the standard setting process. Those reviews of the standard setting process and the development of the performance level descriptors could be helpful.</p> <p>Evidence #29_ISTEP_Spring15_Technical Report_1_29_16_FINAL:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 36 provides information on the ISTEP+ Cut Score Setting Workshop.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #80_Standards Setting Validity Study_2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>According to the study in summary, procedures to determine cut scores for the 2015 ISTEP+ tests were carried out well, with a couple of minor exceptions according to the Standards Setting Validity Study.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #82_Standards Setting Panelists</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In this document, panelists and their varied backgrounds are outlined to show range of expertise.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #83_Resolution Remediation Redesign_2013</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This resolution shows the State higher education policy on remedial exemption.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State needs to provide a description of how the performance level descriptors are aligned to the academic achievement standards.</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 INDIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;</li> <li>• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;</li> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><i>Evidence is located in the Section 6 folder, in the Critical Element 6.4 folder:</i></p> <p>Evidence #85_ISTEP Guide to Test Interpretation_2015</p> <p>Evidence #86_ISTEP Assessment Guidance Videos for ELA and Mathematics</p> <p>Evidence #87_Applied Skills Scoring Guides for ELA and Mathematics:</p> <p>Evidence #88_Validity Study Statistical Support for Growth Reporting</p> <p>Evidence #89_GRF-GRT User Guide</p>	<p>The timeline for reporting student results to parents needs to be submitted.</p> <p>A concern is that parents may only be able to access student reports online. This raises a bias/fairness issue, if indeed this is the case.</p> <p>The online assistance seems more targeted to teachers and administrators rather than parents.</p> <p>Evidence #87 does not present anything but items. It doesn’t fit as evidence for scoring or reporting.</p> <p>Evidence #85_ISTEP Guide to Test Interpretation_2015: This guide provides information for families and all regarding how to review and understand all test results. In addition, it contains sample reports for interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 16-19 include a sample Student Report and detailed explanation</li> <li>• Pages 20-25 include a sample Classroom Report and detailed explanation</li> <li>• Pages 26-35 include a sample School Report and detailed explanation</li> <li>• Pages 37-49 include a sample Corporation Report and detailed explanation</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #86_ISTEP Assessment Guidance Videos for ELA and Mathematics: While it is understood that Web directed resources are not optimal resources for evidence, the links in this document show live training for all school and family partners on ISTEP+ test administration and use of assessments.</p> <p>Evidence #87_Applied Skills Scoring Guides for</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 INDIANA**

<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 extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>		<p>ELA and Mathematics: These documents, for both ELA and mathematics in Grades 3-8, show all open-ended assessment items and how to interpret scores, scoring and student understanding based on responses.</p> <p>Evidence #88_Validity Study Statistical Support for Growth Reporting: This report indicates two important conclusions about the use of ISTEP for student growth/vertical scaling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The available evidence indicates that floor and ceiling effects do not appear to pose a problem for the ISTEP+, and this lends some support to the continued use of SGPs as part of Indiana’s accountability system.</li> <li>There are improvements to be made to wholly make the case that ISTEP+ scale scores can be used to make direct inferences about student growth in terms of gain scores.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Timelines for reporting student results (e.g., to parents, teachers and principals) need to be submitted.</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.