



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Jennifer McCormick
Superintendent
Indiana Department of Education
South Tower, Suite 600
115 W. Washington Street
Indianapolis, IN 46204

September 24, 2018

Dear Superintendent McCormick:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (the 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), which governed State assessments through the 2016-2017 school year. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), which governs State assessments beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, 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 with a few additional requirements. I appreciate the efforts of the Indiana State Department of Education (IDOE) to prepare for the review, which occurred in February 2018 and which was also a follow-up to a review that 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 children'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.

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated IDOE's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the components of your assessment system meet 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 the Department's analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following in regards to the submitted assessments:

- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress-Plus (ISTEP+)). **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and the ESSA.**
- Reading/language arts, mathematics and science general assessments in high school (ISTEP+). **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and the ESSA.**
- Alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for grades 3-8 and high school in reading/language arts, mathematics and science (Indiana Standards Tools for

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.

Alternate Reporting (ISTAR)). **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and the ESSA.**

Substantially meets requirements means that these components meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The specific list of items required for IDOE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Within 30 days of receipt of this letter, IDOE must provide to the Department a plan and timeline by which it will submit the additional documentation.

Please note that the assessment requirements for ESEA, as amended by the NCLB, were in effect through the end of the 2016-2017 school year. The IDOE peer review was conducted under the requirements of this statute. Beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, the assessment requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, will apply to State assessments. Given that this review began under the requirements of the ESEA as amended by the NCLB, it is important to indicate that while the IDOE assessments meet many of the peer review guidance criteria under the NCLB, the State is still responsible to ensure that these assessments also comply with the requirements of the ESSA. Department staff have carefully reviewed IDOE evidence and peer review recommendations in light of the updated requirements for State assessments under the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. As a result of this additional review, I have determined that the IDOE administration of the ISTAR assessment needs to meet one additional requirement related to alternate academic achievement standards to fully meet ESSA requirements. This requirement is listed under critical element 6.3 along with the other evidence needed from the February 2018 peer review.

The full peer review notes from the review are also enclosed. These recommendations to the Department formed the basis of our determination. Please note that the peers' recommendations may differ from the Department's feedback; we encourage you to read the full peer notes for additional suggestions and recommendations for improving your assessment system beyond what is noted in the Department's feedback. Department staff will reach out to your assessment director in the next few days to discuss the peer notes and the Department's determination and to answer any questions you may 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. We have found it a pleasure working with your staff on this review. I wish you well in your continued efforts to improve student achievement in Indiana. If you have any questions, please contact Collette Roney of my staff at: OSS.Indiana@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan
Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary
Education

Enclosures

cc: Charity Flores, Director of Assessment

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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<p>2.1 – Test Design and Development</p>	<p>For the Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress-Plus (ISTEP+) reading/language arts and mathematics tests in grades 3-8 and high school, and ISTEP+ in high school science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that tests are designed to assess the full range of the State’s academic content standards (e.g., evidence that the tests do not systematically exclude content in the content standards from the assessments). <p>For the (Indiana Standards Tools for Alternate Reporting (ISTAR)):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the rationale for the reduced breadth within each grade and/or comparison of intended content compared to grade-level academic content standards (e.g., an evidence-based rationale for the reduced breadth within each grade and/or comparison of intended content compared to grade-level academic content standard).
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p>	<p>For the ISTEP+ reading/language arts and mathematics tests in grades 3-8 and high school and ISTAR reading/language arts, mathematics and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of a systematic process and timeline the State will implement to address specific gaps and/or weaknesses identified in the alignment studies submitted by the State (e.g., the alignment of the rigor of the ISTEP tests with State academic content standards as measured by depth of knowledge (DOK classification); and gaps in ISTAR content coverage as measured by number of grade-level standards assessed).
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards (ISTAR) (additional requirement under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA</p>	<p>For the ISTAR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the ISTAR alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act. IDOE should provide this evidence by December 31, 2020.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

February 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes (including resubmission)



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.

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

Table of Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS . 7
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students 7
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards 8
1.3 – Required Assessments 9
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments 10
1.5 – Participation Data 11

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 12
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 13
2.2 – Item Development..... 16
2.3 – Test Administration 19
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration..... 21
2.5 – Test Security 23
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 25

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 26
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 27
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 29
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 31
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables 32

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 34
4.1 – Reliability..... 34
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 36
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 38
4.4 – Scoring 39
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 40
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 41
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... 43

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 45
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 46
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 48
5.3 – Accommodations..... 49
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 50

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 51
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students
..... 51
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 52
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 54
6.4 – Reporting..... 56

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

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 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</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>ISTEP+ High School Evidence source #1 provides the Grade 6 – 12 R/LA content standards.</p> <p>Evidence source #2 provides the mathematics content standards; high school course standards start on page 109.</p> <p>Evidence source #3 provides the science content standards; high school course standards start on page 45.</p> <p>Evidence source #4 provides a discussion of the content standards by the Indiana education board of directors, but no vote was taken to approve the standards.</p> <p>Evidence source #11 is a letter from the superintendent of schools to the US Dept. Secretary of Education stating the process for content standards development and that the board of directors approved the content standards for adoption.</p> <p>ISTAR Evidence source #138-140 provides the aligned content standards for the alternate assessment, ISTAR, with the general assessment content standards assessed using ISTEP+ assessments.</p>	<p>ISTEP+ High School Evidence source #4 (April 9, 2014) provides a discussion of the content standards by the Indiana education board of directors, but no vote was taken to approve the standards.</p> <p>ISTAR</p>
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Indiana

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</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>ISTEP+ High School Evidence source #5 provides the process for developing standards, including the composition of evaluation teams for R/LA and mathematics.</p> <p>Evidence source #3 provides an overview of the process for developing standards for science (p45-46).</p> <p>External reviews and recommendations regarding the standards appear in evidence sources #6 through 10.</p> <p>Committee members involved in standards evaluation teams appear in evidence sources #12 though 14.</p> <p>Evidence source #15 provided a list of panel members that included university personnel.</p> <p>Evidence source #16 provided a summary of the public comment process and results.</p> <p>ISTAR</p> <p>Evidence presented is sufficient for the general assessment.</p>	<p>ISTEP+ High School Where critical recommendations are provided, it would be nice to see a summary of resolutions – i.e., whether the State addressed suggestions and how.</p> <p>ISTAR</p>
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR 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 align="center">1.3 – Required Assessments</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"> • Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). 	<p>Evidence #17 submitted by Indiana listed assessments for ISTEP 3-8 Math/English and Language Arts. Grade 10 Biology.</p> <p>ISTAR grades 4-6 science</p>	<p>requirements met</p>
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</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—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>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</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"> • 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; • For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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; ○ 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. 	<p>Evidence #18-#22 Indiana submitted defines and cites that all students in public elementary and secondary schools are included in the assessment system.</p>	<p>requirements met</p>
<p>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</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—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 align="center">1.5 – Participation Data</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>Evidence 23a and 23b</p>	<p>provides aggregate overall participation rates for ELA and Mathematics, but does not show rates by grade level. also provides overall numbers for participation rate numerator and denominator with minimal description of denominator ‘rules’.</p>
<p>stemming from 2016 peer review</p>		
<p>For the entire assessment system, Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in all required subjects by grade level, that show— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Numbers of students tested ○ Numbers of students enrolled, and ○ Evidence of procedures that State has to ensure that all students are tested and counted in calculation of participation rates. 		
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in all required subjects <u>by grade level</u>, that show— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Numbers of students tested and Numbers of students enrolled, 		

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
------------------	--	--

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 align="center">2.1 – Test Design and Development</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"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • 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); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<p>ISTEP+ Grades 3-8 Resubmission Evidence is required that the reading/language arts tests assess the full range of the State content standards (excluding speaking and listening for which IDOE has a waiver)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic standards are presented on weblink at http://www.doe.in.gov/standards • Technical Report provides <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Test development process in Section 2, p6-15 ○ Test design including item types and mode of administration in Table 3, p65 ○ Academic standards represented on assessments by test points in Table 4, p67-70 ○ Test blueprints in Table 8, p77 <p>ISTEP+ High School The purpose of the assessments is stated on page 1 of Evidence source #30. Intended test score interpretations and uses are described on pages 3-4 of Evidence source #30.</p> <p>Evidence sources #24-26 provide the R/LA, mathematics, and science test blueprints for HS assessments. Evidence source #30, Appendix A beginning on page 56 also provides the test blueprints.</p> <p>Evidence sources #27-29 provide the R/LA, mathematics, and science item specifications for HS assessments.</p> <p>Evidence source #30, pages 10-13 describe the test development process.</p>	<p>ISTEP+ Grades 3-8 Resubmission Evidence is present to make a judgment regarding whether the full range of the State content standards are assessed; however, there is no explicit judgment made. It does seem reasonable based on this review that ISTEP+ does assess the full range of standards.</p> <p>ISTEP+ High School</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>ISTAR Evidence source #95, page 4, states the purposes and uses for the ISTAR.</p> <p>Evidence source #95, pages 1-22, describe the test design and development. Appendix E (pp. 77-90) and F (pp. 93-109) provide test blueprint tables.</p> <p>Evidence sources #96-99 provide item specifications for the ISTAR for each subject and grade level.</p> <p>Evidence sources #112-116 are some test design development artifacts that show that multiple designs were considered and that subject matter experts were consulted.</p> <p>Evidence source #128 is another test design artifact that shows that the IDOE TAC was consulted.</p> <p>Evidence source #130 looks like it might be the final test blueprint for the ISTAR, but this excel document is not accompanied by any explanation.</p> <p>Validity evidence for the adaptive design and delivery is provided in evidence source #95, pp. 59-60 and supporting graphics are presented on pp. 341-348.</p>	<p>ISTAR</p>
stemming from 2016 peer review		
<p>For the ISTEP+ reading/language arts (R/LA) tests in grades 3-8, IDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the tests assess the full range of the State content standards 		
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input 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
------------------	--	--

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 style="text-align: center;">2.2 – Item Development</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>ISTEP+ High School Evidence sources #27-29 provide the R/LA, mathematics, and science item specifications for HS assessments. (New Biology item specifications for 2018-19 are presented in Evidence source #137). Passage specifications for R/LA are provided in Evidence source #90.</p> <p>Item development and selection processes are described in Evidence source #30, pages 10-17.</p> <p>Item and passage review (for R/LA) and sensitivity and bias review orientation/training powerpoint presentations are provided as Evidence sources #91b-e for R/LA, mathematics, and science.</p> <p>Item field testing, analysis, and equating is described in Evidence source #30, pages 31-37.</p> <p>Evidence source #31 provides a favorable item alignment to content standards based on categorical concurrence, depth of knowledge, breadth of content coverage, and breadth of cognitive complexity.</p> <p>Administration mode comparability studies are described in Evidence source #30, pages 27-32.</p> <p>Technology-enhanced items for R/LA and mathematics assessments are reviewed and cognitive labs conducted to evaluate the utility of such items in Evidence source #32, pages 59-60.</p> <p>Item performance methods and summary of findings are presented in Evidence source #30, pages 35-37. Appendix C (p.73) contains a summary of the item statistics and Appendix D (p.74-76) contain a summary of the differential item functioning results.</p>	<p>ISTEP+ High School</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>Validity evidence related to the item development process is presented in Evidence source #30, pages 45-54.</p> <p>ISTAR Evidence source #95 provides item development descriptions for the process (pp. 11-18) and bias reviews (pp. 18-20).</p> <p>Item specifications are presented in evidence sources #96-99.</p> <p>Evidence source #100 provides a favorable item alignment to content standards based on categorical concurrence, depth of knowledge, breadth of content coverage, and breadth of cognitive complexity with some exceptions outlines in the appendices (pp. 59-75).</p> <p>Evidence source #117 provides the item data review summary worksheets.</p>	<p>ISTAR Future submissions should identify and demonstrate how the State intends to or has reconcile(d) the information provided in alignment studies with test blueprints. Additionally, gaps identified in the appendices should be addressed.</p>
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Indiana

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
------------------	--	--

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Indiana

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that 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; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>ISTEP+ Grades 3-8 Resubmission Evidence source #40 and #44 provide evidence that all staff involved in test administration are trained.</p> <p>ISTEP+ High School Evidence source #33 provides an overview of each of the standardized assessments in the Indiana assessment system along with standardized administration procedures for those assessments.</p> <p>Evidence source #34 provides specific instructions for the administration proctors of the ISTEP+.</p> <p>Evidence source #35 provides policies, guidance and procedures regarding test accommodations.</p> <p>Evidence source #36 provides instruction for interacting with the test delivery platform.</p> <p>Evidence source #80 provided guidance around outages and systemwide failures.</p> <p>Evidence source #40 and #44 provide evidence that all staff involved in test administration are trained.</p> <p>ISTAR Evidence source #95, pages 23-29, documents the test administration process.</p> <p>Evidence source #35 provides guidance on administering test accommodations.</p> <p>Evidence sources #101, 102, 103, and 133 are manuals and guidance documents that establish</p>	<p>ISTEP+ Grades 3-8 Resubmission</p> <p>ISTEP+ High School</p> <p>ISTAR</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>standardized testing procedures.</p> <p>Evidence sources #104, 105, 106, 107, and 109 are documents that show that training in test administration is provided to key personnel responsible for test delivery.</p> <p>Evidence source #133 provides the contingency plans for technology failures during testing. Evidence source #103 also provides guidance on the use of the administration software.</p>	
stemming from 2016 peer review		
<p>For the entire assessment system, IDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 		
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
__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—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 align="center">2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</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 38-44; 110-111 provide evidence that monitoring is systematically planned and conducted during testing cycles.</p>	<p>evidence establishes that monitoring is systematically planned and conducted during testing cycles.</p>
<p>stemming from 2016 peer review</p>		
<p>For the entire assessment system, IDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a summary of monitoring that did occur in a testing cycle (e.g., how many schools, how many monitors were used). • Evidence that the State monitors all assessments in its assessment system 		
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p>__x_ No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Indiana

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
------------------	--	--

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Indiana

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.5 – Test Security</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"> • 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; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. 	<p>ISTEP+ High School Evidence source #41, Section 8, p.20-23 discuss the test security policy and procedures. Section 2, p.2 provides the test monitoring within schools policy.</p> <p>Evidence source #42 is a copy of the security and integrity agreement that testing personnel must sign.</p> <p>Evidence source #44 provides the powerpoint presentation used for training testing personnel about test security and integrity.</p> <p>Evidence source #45 provides the testing-related code of ethics policy.</p> <p>Evidence source #46 provides a blank copy of form used to report concerns and security violations related to standardized testing.</p> <p>Evidence source #47 provides the policy and protocol for reporting and investigating security breaches and test irregularities.</p> <p>Evidence source #92 provides the blank form completed once training on test security has been completed.</p> <p>Evidence source #93 provides a catalog of test administration issues and intended responses by the vendor.</p> <p>Evidence source #141 describes how schools are selected for monitoring.</p> <p>Evidence source #142 provides the memo sent to schools regarding the test monitoring and security procedures, including how schools are selected for</p>	<p>ISTEP+ High School Evidence source #41 was very clear and comprehensive.</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>monitoring.</p> <p>ISTAR Evidence source #95, page 26, describes the security measures in place for the computer delivered platform for ISTAR.</p> <p>Evidence source #33, pp. 48-51, describe the standardized procedures for test security throughout the lifecycle of an assessment.</p> <p>See the notes for ISTEP+ High School above for more documentation of security procedures, forms, training, and reporting of irregularities.</p>	<p>ISTAR</p>
Section 2.5 Summary Statement		
<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>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</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"> • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p>ISTEP+ High School Evidence sources #41, 44, and 45 provide information regarding protecting test materials.</p> <p>The Information Security Framework, submitted February 5, 2018 for review, contains policies in Chapter 9 to ensure the security of student-level assessment data.</p> <p>The <i>STN Lookup Collection Instructions</i> and associated memo, submitted February 6, 2018 for review, contains information that supports the protection of personally identifiable information for students.</p> <p>ISTAR See the notes above provided for ISTEP+ High School.</p>	<p>ISTEP+ High School</p> <p>ISTAR</p>
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</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
------------------	--	--

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>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</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"> • 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; • 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. 	<p>ISTEP+ Grades 3-8 Resubmission Evidence is required that describes a systematic process and timeline the State will implement to address gaps and/or weaknesses identified in the alignment studies submitted by the State. This evidence has not been provided.</p> <p>ISTEP+ High School Evidence source #31 provides alignment study results that are favorable, with respect to content coverage. The report does list several standards that are not covered by the assessments.</p> <p>ISTAR Evidence source #100 provides alignment study</p>	<p>ISTEP+ Grades 3-8 Resubmission Evidence is required that describes a systematic process and timeline the State will implement to address gaps and/or weaknesses identified in the alignment studies submitted by the State. This evidence has not been provided.</p> <p>Evidence source #81 is an excel spreadsheet that provides evidence that something might be being done to address the alignment gaps; however, it alone is not sufficient for understanding the process being taken to fill those gaps and under what timeline. Evidence source #89 is not the WestEd alignment study as indicated in IDOE’s resubmission index.</p> <p>The State should consider providing a rationale for why some standards were not addressed; and provide some interpretation of whether the blueprints match the findings in the alignment study conducted by WestEd.</p> <p>ISTEP+ High School Evidence is required that describes a systematic process and timeline the State will implement to address gaps and/or weaknesses identified in the alignment studies submitted by the State.</p> <p>The State should consider providing a rationale for why some standards were not addressed; and provide some interpretation of whether the blueprints match the findings in the alignment study conducted by WestEd.</p> <p>ISTAR Evidence is required that describes a systematic process and timeline the State will implement to</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>results that are seemingly favorable, with respect to content coverage. The report does list several standards that are not covered by the assessments in the appendices.</p>	<p>address gaps and/or weaknesses identified in the alignment studies submitted by the State.</p> <p>The State should consider providing a rationale for why some standards were not addressed; and provide some interpretation of whether the blueprints match the findings in the alignment study conducted by WestEd.</p>
<p>stemming from 2016 peer review</p>		
<p>For the ISTEP+ R/LA and mathematics tests in grades 3-8, IDOE must provide:</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 		
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		
<p>For the ISTEP+ R/LA and mathematics tests in grades 3-8 and HS and ISTAR, IDOE must provide:</p>		
<p>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.</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>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</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>ISTEP+ Grades 3-8 Resubmission The WestEd alignment study provides evidence that depth of knowledge for items was evaluated.</p> <p>ISTEP+ High School Evidence source #31 provides evidence that depth of knowledge for items was evaluated.</p> <p>ISTAR Evidence source #100 is the alignment study which does provide evidence that depth of knowledge for items was evaluated, but also states that interpretation of findings needs to be made alongside the test blueprints.</p>	<p>ISTEP+ Grades 3-8 Resubmission Evidence source #82 and #83 are uninterpretable without some narrative describing the voter feedback purpose, methods, results, and conclusions. Evidence source #84 and #85 look like exemplars provided to hand-scorers to help them interpret and implement scoring rubrics. This evidence does not provide support that the assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level. Evidence source #52 is a correlational study between Grade 8 ISTEP+ test scores and PSAT test scores (taken in Grade 10). These correlational study results do not provide support that the grade 3-8 ISTEP+ tests tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p> <p>ISTEP+ High School Some gaps were identified in the alignment study (e.g., no items addressed DOK #4). It would be helpful to provide a summary on how the State intends to address such gaps.</p> <p>ISTAR Evidence source #95, page 58, explicitly states that no evidence for validity based on cognitive processes can be provided based on the test data and that a special study is needed.</p> <p>The State could compare the findings in Evidence source #100 with test blueprints to determine whether validity is supported for this critical element, identify gaps, and present a plan and timeline for resolving those gaps.</p>
<p>stemming from 2016 peer review</p>		
<p>For the ISTEP+ R/LA and mathematics tests in grades 3-8, IDOE must provide:</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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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"> ○ Results of cognitive labs exploring student performance on items that show the items require complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills; OR ○ Reports of expert judgment of items that show the items require complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills; OR ○ 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). 		
Section 3.2 Summary Statement		
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 style="text-align: center;">3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</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>ISTEP+ High School Evidence source #30 provides a summary of DIF statistics on pages 74-76 which does show that some items experience differential item functioning. An interpretation of findings and process for resolution is found on page 36.</p> <p>Evidence source #30 provides a summary of score averages by subgroup for raw scores (pp. 167-169, 194-198, 209-211), scale scores (231-232, 245-246, 251-252), and performance level classifications (pp. 263, 270, 273). These summaries do show subgroup differences, which may call the internal structure of the assessment into question. However, there are no follow up analyses to make this determination.</p> <p>A review of dimensionality studies is presented in Evidence source #55 showing that the ISTEP+ assessments are essentially unidimensional.</p> <p>ISTAR Evidence source #95, pp. 58-61, provides a summary of validity that supports the internal structure of ISTAR. Supporting graphics, data, and tables are presented in Appendix R (pp. 237-270) and Appendix T (pp. 341-348).</p>	<p>ISTEP+ High School Evidence source #30 provides a summary of score averages by subgroup for raw scores (pp. 167-169, 194-198, 209-211), scale scores (231-232, 245-246, 251-252), and performance level classifications (pp. 263, 270, 273). These summaries do show subgroup differences, which may call the internal structure of the assessment into question. However, there are no follow up analyses to make this determination.</p> <p>The State needs to provide an interpretation of their findings or submit a plan for how they intend to address the differences in performance between subgroups.</p> <p>ISTAR</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For ISTEP+ HS, please provide an interpretation of findings or submit a plan for addressing the differences in performance between subgroups. 		

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 align="center">3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>ISTEP+ Grades 3-8 Resubmission Evidence that the R/LA and mathematics tests in grades 3-8 are related as expected with criterion and other variables for all student groups is required. Examples of supporting evidence was provided in the 2016 peer review findings.</p> <p>IDOE provided a correlational study between ISTEP+ and PSAT scores (evidence source #52) showing moderately positive correlations between the two measures.</p> <p>ISTEP+ High School IDOE provided a correlational study between ISTEP+ and PSAT scores (evidence source #52) showing moderately positive correlations between the two measures.</p> <p>ISTAR Evidence source #95, pp. 62-63, provides evidence to support validity based on relations to other variables (i.e., the LCI).</p>	<p>ISTEP+ Grades 3-8 Resubmission Future validity studies conducted should consider some of the other examples provided in the 2016 peer review guidance.</p> <p>ISTEP+ High School Evidence source #53 does not support this critical element as there is no correlational data between external measures and the ISTEP+ presented.</p> <p>ISTAR Evidence source #53 does not support this critical element as there is no correlational data between external measures and ISTAR presented.</p>
<p>stemming from 2016 peer review</p>		
<p>For the ISTEP+ R/LA and mathematics tests in grades 3-8, IDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that shows the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with criterion and other variables for all student groups, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 ○ 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 ○ Reports of analyses that demonstrate positive correlations between State assessment results and other variables, such as academic characteristic of test takers; OR 		

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"> ○ Reports of analyses that show stronger positive relationships with measures of the same construct than with measures of different constructs; OR ○ 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. 	
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		
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
-------------------------	---	---

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>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</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>ISTEP+ High School</p> <p>Item development processes are described in Evidence source #30, pages 10-15.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training for bias and sensitivity provided to passage writers/searchers (p. 11) • Bias/sensitivity reviews (pp. 12, 14) • Universal design reviews (p. 14) <p>Item and passage review (for R/LA) and sensitivity and bias review orientation/training powerpoint presentations are provided as Evidence sources #91b-e for R/LA, mathematics, and science.</p> <p>In Evidence source #30, subgroup reliability estimates are provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coefficient Alpha: p.39 and by subgroup in Appendix I (pp. 167-169, 194-198, 209-211) • SEM: p.40 and by subgroup in Appendix K (pp. 231, 245, 251) <p>Evidence source #94 is a checklist that includes fairness and accessibility criteria; however, it is unclear how this checklist is used and by whom and during what part of the item development process.</p> <p>Evidence source #30 provides a summary of DIF statistics on pages 74-76 which does show that some items experience differential item functioning.</p> <p>Evidence source #30 provides an overview of steps taken to ensure validity of test score interpretations and uses for all examinees within its validity argument synthesis, pages 52-53.</p> <p>ISTAR</p> <p>Evidence source #95, page 69, addresses the</p>	<p>ISTEP+ High School</p> <p>The State could strengthen its attention to fairness and accessibility by devoting a chapter in the technical report to test design, development and analysis steps taken to ensure fairness and accessibility of its assessments including a summary of findings following critical analyses such as results of bias review meetings and interpretations of differential item functioning studies.</p> <p>ISTAR</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
	measures taken to ensure the fairness and accessibility of ISTAR. It references other sections of the technical report that relate to inclusion (Chapter 1) and use of Universal Design principals (Chapter 2) for test development to support this critical element.	
Section 4.2 Summary Statement		
___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 align="center">4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</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>ISTEP+ High School Evidence source #27-29 provide the item specifications for R/LA, mathematics, and science ISTEP+ assessments.</p> <p>Evidence source #30 provides a summary of item p-values by mode of administration (p. 73), information curves (p. 100, 121, 130) and conditional standard error of measurement curves (p. 101, 122, 131) including a summary (p. 40).</p> <p>ISTAR</p> <p>Evidence source #95, page 69, addresses the measures taken to ensure precise measurement across the full performance continuum. It references other sections of the technical report that relate to test design and analysis to support this critical element, including Chapter 2 and Appendices R, S and T.</p>	<p>ISTEP+ High School It is unclear whether the p-value summaries reported support that the full performance continuum is assessed as there is no range information provided for these statistics.</p> <p>Likewise, while information curves are presented, no interpretations are made to address whether information is sufficient across the entire performance continuum.</p> <p>ISTAR</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Indiana

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</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>ISTEP+ High School Evidence source #30, pages 33-37 describe the equating process.</p> <p>ISTAR The equating design is described in Evidence source #95 on pp. 33-34. However, this is the first year for administration and equating was not necessary. Page 70 provides a brief summary. Evidence source #128, pp. 9-10, also provides a description of the intended scaling and equating design for future years.</p>	<p>ISTEP+ High School</p> <p>ISTAR</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Indiana

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</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"> • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>ISTEP+ High School Evidence source #30, pages 27-30 provide a mode comparability study and adjustments made to scores to account for mode score differences.</p> <p>ISTAR Evidence source #95, page 70, provides a brief explanation that while a paper/pencil version of the online administration can be made available, it was not used in the most recent year’s test administration.</p>	<p>ISTEP+ High School</p> <p>ISTAR</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</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
------------------	--	--

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 align="center">4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</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>ISTEP+ High School Evidence source #30 is the ISTEP+'s most recent technical report. Evidence source #31 provides an alignment study. Evidence source #56 is the contract between the State and its vendor for test development, administration, analysis, and reporting services which does include provisions for monitoring, maintaining and improving the assessment program. Evidence source #57 and #58 indicate a TAC exists for the State assessment program. Evidence source #59a-b indicate that the SBOE is apprised, discuss, and make decisions about the future of the assessment program, including the approval of cut scores. Evidence source #93 provides evidence that the State logs test-related issues and concerns and that the vendor provides suggestions or next steps for resolution and improvement.</p> <p>ISTAR Evidence source #95 is the ISTAR's most recent technical report. Also, on page 70, technical analysis and ongoing maintenance is addressed briefly. Evidence source #100 provides an alignment study. Evidence source #120 is the contract between the State and its vendor for test development, administration, analysis, and reporting services which does include provisions for monitoring, maintaining and improving the assessment program. Evidence source #57 and #58 indicate a TAC exists for the State assessment program. Evidence source #121 is a memorandum that announces the ISTAR cut scores and performance</p>	<p>ISTEP+ High School TAC meeting notes/reports and improvement timelines would also be helpful for supporting this critical element.</p> <p>ISTAR TAC meeting notes/reports and improvement timelines would also be helpful for supporting 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	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	level descriptors.	
Section 4.7 Summary Statement		
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

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
------------------	--	--

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 style="text-align: center;">5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</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"> • 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; • 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; • 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; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; • Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic 	<p>ISTEP+ High School Evidence source #60 is an accommodations resource guide and provides support for inclusion of all students with disabilities in accountability testing (p. 5) and notification that modifications to curriculum or assessments can result in disqualification for a high school diploma (p. 6-7).</p> <p>Evidence source #70 is an accessibility guide for test users.</p> <p>Evidence source #35 provides guidance for the use of accessibility features and accommodations.</p> <p>The <i>PearsonAccessnext Online User Guide</i> (submitted for review February 6, 2018) contains steps for adding students after the pre-registration window has closed.</p> <p>ISTAR Refer to the notes above.</p> <p>Additionally, Evidence source #95, p4-5, provides information regarding inclusion of all students with supporting appendices. Appendix A provides participation guidelines and Appendix B provides a flowchart for making decisions about whether ISTAR is the appropriate test to take.</p>	<p>ISTEP+ High School Evidence source #63 is a validity report on whether the ISTEP+ is accommodating for students with disabilities. The findings show that students practice the test on a different system than the one actually used for operational testing which can hinder the validity for the assessment for students with disabilities. Likewise, access to accommodations for those requiring two or more is questionable since the administration software used does not allow for the use of more than one accommodation. The State should address the assessment platforms to better support students needing accommodations during testing.</p> <p>The state needs to provide evidence for how students with disabilities who qualify for ISTEP+ administration are included in testing if they enroll in schools after the student upload deadline.</p> <p>ISTAR The note above does not apply to ISTAR as ISTAR is delivered on a different assessment platform.</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>achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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); 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. 		
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
__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 align="center">5.3 – Accommodations</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"> 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; Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); 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; Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<p>ISTEP+ High School Evidence source #60 is an accommodations resource guide.</p> <p>Evidence source #70 is an accessibility guide for test users.</p> <p>Evidence source #66 describes the process for and provides forms for non-standard accommodation requests.</p> <p>Evidence source #30, pp. 20-21 provides participation requirements and allowable accommodations.</p> <p>Evidence source #67a provides an accounting of the percent of examinees receiving accommodations.</p> <p>ISTAR Refer to the note above for ISTEP+ High School and the following:</p> <p>Evidence source #95, pp. 26-27, provides participation requirements and allowable accommodations. Pages 5-7 provide the participation data for ISTAR disaggregated by accommodation type, disability status and English Learner status.</p> <p>Evidence source #35 provides guidance for the use of accessibility features and accommodations.</p>	<p>ISTEP+ High School</p> <p>ISTAR</p>
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Indiana

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</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"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 	<p>ISTEP+ High School Evidence source #60 is an accommodations resource guide.</p> <p>Evidence source #69 provides criteria for when it is appropriate for students to be administered the AA-AAS.</p> <p>Evidence source #41, pp. 13-14, provides administration policies around the use of accommodations.</p> <p>Evidence source #40 provides a checklist for onsite review of testing and testing procedures including appropriate administration of accommodations.</p> <p>ISTAR Refer to the notes presented above for ISTEP+ High School.</p>	<p>ISTEP+ High School</p> <p>ISTAR</p>
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required .</p> <p align="center">○</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 align="center">6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</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>ISTEP+ Grades 3-8 Resubmission The Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress Plus (ISTEP+) Cut Score Setting Technical Report was provided for review February 5, 2018. This report does provide support that the State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards.</p> <p>ISTEP+ High School Evidence source #71 is the standard setting study report that details how the standard setting study was conducted (pp. 8-9, 15-24), how panelists were selected (p.12-13), panel composition (p.30-32), and evaluations of procedural validity (pp. 25-28, 58-62).</p> <p>ISTAR Evidence source #123 is the standard setting study report that details how the standard setting study was conducted (pp. 7-8) and characteristics of panelists (p. 8-10).</p> <p>Evidence source #95, pp. 36-40, also provide a description of the standard setting process.</p> <p>Evidence source #134 provides a process evaluation for the standard setting study and the ELA validation study resulting in findings that support the processes.</p>	<p>ISTEP+ Grades 3-8 Resubmission Evidence source #86 does not provide sufficient detail to evaluate this critical element.</p> <p>ISTEP+ High School</p> <p>ISTAR</p>
<p>stemming from 2016 peer review</p>		
<p>For the ISTEP+ R/LA and mathematics tests in grades 3-8, IDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the State followed a technically sound process to set achievement standards (e.g., a full technical report for achievement standards setting). 		
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>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

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>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</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>ISTEP+ Grades 3-8 Resubmission Evidence that the State’s academic standards are aligned with the State’s academic content standards for the R/LA, mathematics, and science tests in Grades 3-8 was provided in The Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress Plus (ISTEP+) Cut Score Setting Technical Report (submitted for review February 5, 2018) where performance level descriptors are used to set cut scores.</p> <p>ISTEP+ High School Evidence that the State’s academic standards are aligned with the State’s academic content standards for the R/LA, mathematics, and science tests in high school is provided in Evidence source #71 where performance level descriptors are used to set cut scores.</p> <p>ISTAR Evidence source #95, page 3, alludes that the PLDs drafted and approved by the SBOE align to the standards and connectors. These PLDs were used to set standards as described in Evidence source #123.</p>	<p>ISTEP+ Grades 3-8 Resubmission Evidence source #86 does not provide sufficient detail to evaluate this critical element. Evidence #89 is not the WestEd Alignment Study. Evidence #31 is the WestEd Alignment Study for Grade 10.</p> <p>ISTEP+ High School To strengthen support for this critical element, the State could perform some validation study to substantiate the claims within its PLDs that students are ready for 2-year, 4-year, etc. college coursework.</p> <p>ISTAR</p>
stemming from 2016 peer review		
For the ISTEP+ R/LA and mathematics tests in grades 3-8, IDOE must provide:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards. 		
Section 6.3 Summary Statement		
__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
------------------	--	--

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 style="text-align: center;">6.4 – Reporting</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"> • 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; • 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; • 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"> • Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; • Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); • Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; • Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to 	<p>ISTEP+ Grades 3-8 Resubmission Evidence that a process and timeline for the reporting of student results to schools and parents for the R/LA and mathematics tests in grades 3-8 is required. Evidence source #88 provides a date for when score reports are available through the State online portal. Gaining access to student reports is described in Evidence source #87.</p> <p>Evidence source #74 provides links to videos that support the use of score reports for instructional purposes.</p> <p>ISTEP+ High School Evidence source #87 provides an interpretive guide for score reports.</p> <p>Evidence source #88 provides a brief timeline for reporting activities for the ISTEP+.</p> <p>Evidence source #74 provides links to videos that support the use of score reports for instructional purposes.</p> <p>ISTAR Evidence source #129 provides an interpretive guide for score reports.</p> <p>Evidence source #135 provides a brief timeline for reporting activities for the ISTAR.</p> <p>Evidence source #95, pp. 41-46, provide the tools, processes, quality control measures, and student counts for reporting student results. Pages 47-56 present the student results within the technical report.</p>	<p>ISTEP+ Grades 3-8 Resubmission</p> <p>ISTEP+ High School</p> <p>ISTAR</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
the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 		
stemming from 2016 peer review		
For the ISTEP+ R/LA and mathematics tests in grades 3-8, IDOE must provide:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of a process and timeline for the reporting of student results to schools and parents. 		
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
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.