



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable John White
State Superintendent
Louisiana Department of Education
P.O. Box 94064
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064

April 13, 2018

Dear Superintendent White:

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 (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 Louisiana Department of Education (LDE) to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in August 2017.

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 LDE's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the components of your assessment system meet most, but not all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- General assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts (R/LA) for grades 3-8 of the Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (LEAP): **Partially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB**

The components that **partially meet requirements** of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, do not meet a number of the requirements of the statute and regulations and/or LDE will need to provide substantial

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.

additional information to demonstrate it meets the requirements. The Department expects that LDE may not be able to submit all of the required information within one year.

The specific list of items required for LDE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because several of the State's components have partially met the requirements, the Department is placing a condition on the State's Title I grant award related to those components of the assessment system. To satisfy this condition, LDE must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. LDE must submit a plan and timeline within 30 days for when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. The Department will also host regular (e.g., quarterly) progress calls with the State to discuss the State's progress on its timeline. If, following the peer review of the additional evidence, adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action. Additionally, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) will monitor progress on matters pertaining to requirements in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) related to the participation of students with disabilities in Title I assessments. Insufficient progress to address such matters may lead OSERS to place a condition on LDE's federal fiscal year 2017 IDEA Part B grant award.

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

Please note that the assessment requirements for ESEA, as amended by the NCLB, were in effect through the end of the 2016-17 school year. The LDE peer review was conducted under the requirements of this statute. Beginning in the 2017-18 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 LEAP assessments partially meet most 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 LDE 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 LDE administration of the LEAP assessments has met the new requirements of ESEA, as amended by the ESSA.

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.

Page 3 – The Honorable John White

If you have any questions, please contact Brenda Calderon of my staff at: OSS.Louisiana@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Jason Botel
Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary,
Delegated the Authority to Perform the
Functions and Duties of the Position of
Assistant Secretary, Office of Elementary and
Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Jan Sibley, Director of Assessment

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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments	<p>For the entire assessment system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that a policy is in place to ensure that students with disabilities who are publicly placed in private schools are included in required accountability assessments.
2.1 – Test Design and Development	<p>For the Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (LEAP) assessments in grades 3-8 reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the assessments tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflect appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and require complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills). • Evidence regarding how the test blueprints are used to construct its assessments (e.g., how do the test blueprints describe the characteristics of the test items used to measure each content standard, not simply the number of such items or the number of points that these items count overall?). • Evidence of the tests are a reliable and valid set of measures well aligned to the breadth, depth, and complexity of Louisiana’s content standards.
2.2 – Item Development	<p>For the LEAP assessments in grades 3-8 R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that clearly describes how the Louisiana Department of Education (LDE) builds assessments based upon multiple test item vendors. • Evidence that clearly describes how LDE develops and selects new test items (e.g., a technical report that describes the item selection procedures, reviews, and other steps used, with documentation of the results at each step in the process). • Evidence that test items used in the LEAP assessments, are aligned to State content standards (See also evidence requested in critical element 3.1).
2.3 – Test Administration	<p>For the LEAP assessments in grades 3-8 R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering LEAP receive training on the State’s established procedures for administration (i.e., for assessment accommodations/accessibility, for the use of technology, etc.).
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	<p>For the LEAP assessments in grades 3-8 R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of adequate alignment between the LEAP assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content, the full range of the academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	<p>For the LEAP assessments in grades 3-8 R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of adequate alignment between the LEAP assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure the intended cognitive processes of the academic content standards (see also evidence requested in critical element 3.1).
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	<p>For the LEAP assessments in grades 3-8 R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the use of 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.
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	<p>For the LEAP assessments in grades 3-8 R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables (e.g., performance on other tests, student grades, or teacher judgment of student achievement).
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	<p>For the LEAP assessments in grades 3-8 R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the comparability of the meaning and interpretations of assessment results, especially for the Spanish math translations or the braille test forms.
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	<p>For the LEAP assessments in grades 3-8 R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system.
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	<p>For the LEAP assessments in grades 3-8 R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LDE has procedures in place to ensure individualized educational plan teams make decisions about how to assess students based on individual student needs. • Evidence that LDE has provided for parents and for educators clear user-friendly 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. • Evidence that the guidance given to educators regarding participation in the alternate assessment of alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) is aligned with federal requirements of the ESEA. • Evidence that the extended content standards used to support the AA-AAAS promote access to the grade level academic content standards.
5.2 – Procedures for Including ELs	<p>For the LEAP assessments in grades 3-8 R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for English learners, including, to the extent practicable, assessments in the language most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do to determine the students’ mastery of skills in

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	academic content areas until the students have achieved English language proficiency.
5.3 - Accommodations	<p>For the LEAP assessments in grades 3-8 R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the accommodations used by local districts (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. This may include evidence such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Documentation of the basis for determining which accommodations were reasonable and appropriate (for example, literature reviews, state specific empirical research studies, consultation with the State’s technical advisory committee (TAC), etc). ○ A description of how the State made determinations for which accommodations would be offered.
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	<p>For the LEAP assessments in grades 3-8 R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State monitors the test administration for special populations, such as summaries of State or district monitoring activity.
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	<p>For the LEAP assessments in grades 3-8 R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the <i>rigor</i> of the State’s academic achievement standards. This may include, for example, an external alignment study of its content standards, assessments, and achievement standards.
6.4 – Reporting	<p>For the LEAP assessments in grades 3-8 R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that parent reports are prepared in alternate formats accessible to parents with visual impairments, such as braille and large-print. • Evidence of a timeline for test report delivery to educators.

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

August 2017 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS .	4
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students	4
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards	5
1.3 – Required Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only).....	6
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only).....	8
1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only).....	10
SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	12
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	12
2.2 – Item Development.....	15
2.3 – Test Administration	17
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)	18
2.5 – Test Security	19
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	20
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....	21
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	21
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	22
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	23
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	24
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	25
4.1 – Reliability.....	25
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	26
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	27
4.4 – Scoring	28
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	29
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	30
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	31
SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS	32
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	32
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	35
5.3 – Accommodations.....	36
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	37
SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .	38
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	38
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	39
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	40
6.4 – Reporting.....	41

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

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>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit 1, Sections 5.1.10-5.1.13, provide evidence of the adoption of the Louisiana Student Standards for ELA and Math. • Exhibit 2, page 2 indicates the Louisiana Student Standards for ELA are rigorous and internationally benchmarked. • Exhibits 3 and 4 provide evidence that the Louisiana Student Standards for ELA and Math are challenging; the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) adopted the Common Core State Standards for English language arts and mathematics in 2012. After a standards revision process outlined in the evidence provided, the 2016-2017 and current Louisiana Student Standards for ELA and Math were adopted by BESE in 2016. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit 1, Sections 5.1.10-5.1.13, provides evidence of the adoption of the Louisiana Student Standards for ELA and Math (page 4 of Exhibit 1). • The application of the standards for all students is mentioned in Exhibit 2, page 3 for ELA. A comparable document is not provided for Math, although Exhibit 6 does indicate that accomplishment of the Math standards contained in the document will assure successful transitions in school and following (Exhibit 6, p 1).
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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 LOUISIANA

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>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state has asserted that the content standards documents specify what students should know and be able to do at each grade level and by the end of high school to successfully transition to post-secondary education and work. This evidence is provided in Exhibits 5 (ELA, page 1); Exhibit 6 (Math, page 1), as well as Exhibit 7; slide 3; Exhibit 8, page 3; and, Exhibit 9, page 1. • Exhibit 10 is the report to BESE on educator and public reviews of ELA and Math standards. • Exhibit 2, page 2, indicates that the LA standards are internationally benchmarked. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although the process of development and review is described in Exhibit 9, the actual evidence of the reviews for coherence and rigor is not shown in the links provided on slide 41 of exhibit 10. Links to summaries of review committee and public commentary are shown on slide 41, but the actual reports are not shown in the linked pages from either BESE or the Department. • The international benchmarking of the ELA standards is not supported with actual evidence. Is this available from the state?
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State must provide evidence of the coherence and rigor of LA’s content standards from external reviews. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

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>1.3 – 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>Reviewed Evidence 14, Bulletin 118 LA makes note that Policy revisions for Bulletin 118 will be going to BESE in August 2017.</p> <p>Chapter 1 outlines General provisions, which reference AYP and NCLB. Chapter 11 outlines school performance categories. Chapters 18 and 19 not found (see pgs. 25-26). Chapter 33 outlines New Schools and/or Significantly Reconfigured Schools</p> <p>Chapter 57 outlines Assessment Program overview (pgs. 56-57).</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">- There appear to be missing tested grades in the chart (e.g., 6th).</p> <p>Alt assessment alluded to in Chapters 35 and 39 (respectively):</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">3. The school performance scores for alternative schools will exclude the assessment data for students who are not full academic year (FAY) enrollees.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">1. Only students with significant cognitive disabilities are eligible to participate in LEAP Alternate Assessment Level 1 (LAA 1) as defined by the LEAP Alternate Assessment Level 1 participation criteria.</p> <p>Specific tests are outlined on pg. 43 (e.g., LEAP, ELDA, LEAP ALT, EOC)</p>	<p>Exhibit 20 provides evidence that LA administered the LEAP to grades 3-8, and Exhibit 12 provides evidence that LA administered the EOC for grades 9-12 (as applicable). However, Exhibit 14, p. 58 states that “The LEAP measures how well students in grades four and eight have mastered the state content standards.” The policy states that the test is administered in grades 4-8, but the practice indicates 3-8.</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 LOUISIANA

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
Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State must clarify whether it requires all student in grades 3-8 to test, or all students in grades 4-8 to test, for the purposes of accountability. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

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>LA makes note that Policy revisions for Bulletin 118 will be going to BESE in August 2017.</p> <p>Reviewed Evidence 15, Bulletin 111</p> <p>Chapter 1 states that “Every school shall participate in a school accountability system based on student achievement as approved by the Louisiana State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education.”</p> <p>Chapter 5 states that LA students in grades 3-8 will participate in at least one of the following assessments on an annual basis (LEAP, LEAP ALT). And students in grades 9-12 will participate in at least one of the following on an annual basis (EOC, LEAP ALT, ACT). All LEP students will take the ELDA annually, in addition to the appropriate state assessment (and will be included in accountability). Chapter 39 discuss including students with disabilities in the annual assessment and those with significant cognitive disabilities are able to take the ALT.</p> <p>Evidence 16 is a user guide intended to support school-level teams in the accessibility and accommodations decision-making process.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>Documentation provided did not address policies to ensure that students with disabilities who are publicly placed in private are included in required accountability assessments. Exhibit 49 (pg. 3) did state that LDOE staff conducted 244 site visits in district, charter, and nonpublic scholarship schools.</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 LOUISIANA

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
Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State must provide evidence that a policy is in place to ensure that students with disabilities, who are publicly placed in private schools, are included in required accountability assessments. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

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>1.5 – 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>Index states that part rates on the ELA and math assessments are 99% in grades 3-8 and above 96% in HS.</p> <p>Exhibit 20, on pgs. 174-180, shows part rate (disaggregated) for grades 3-8 for the LEAP assessment.</p> <p>Exhibit 44 shows final part rate in general and ALT assessments, broken down by subgroup, and includes the high school grades.</p> <p>Bulletin 118 cites the following information as it relates to HS (pg. 16):</p> <p>B. Louisiana students in grades 9, 10, 11, and 12 will participate in at least one of the following state assessments on an annual basis:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. EOC (when they are enrolled in the course for which a test is available); 2. GEE (only for repeating testers); 3. LEAP Alternate Assessment Level 1 (LAA 1); 4. EXPLORE in grade 9; 5. PLAN in grade 10; 6. ACT in grade 11 or 12. <p>G. A score from a twelfth grade student will count in only one accountability cycle.</p> <p>A. The test score of every student who is enrolled in any school in an LEA on October 1 of the academic year and who is eligible to take a test</p>	<p>2</p> <p>State does not provide a description for cohort participation rate procedures as it relates to students in high school. How is the state calculating and accounting students in high school?</p> <p>Not sure if evidence satisfies the requirement that the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each HS student is tested and counted in the calculation of part rate on each of the required assessments?</p> <p>Uses reading math EOC for accountability. EOC test part rate is the only relevant test. Looking for some description of cohort part rate procedures. Need to know how they are calculating and accounting for students in HS. The actual data looks generally.</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 LOUISIANA

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>at a given school within the same LEA shall be included in the LEA’s district performance score (DPS). The score of every student that will count in the DPS will be counted at the school where the student was enrolled on February 1 for SPS and subgroup AYP.</p>	
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: State must provide evidence that it has procedures in place for ensuring that each high school student is tested and counted in the calculation of part rate on each of the required assessments.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <p><u>Statement of Purposes of the Assessments</u> The purposes of the LEAP grade 3-8 are listed on page 7 of Exhibit 20.</p> <p><u>Test Blueprints</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence-centered design used in test development. See Exhibit 62, p. 1. Claims and sub-claims for the ELA assessments are listed in Exhibit 62, p. 2-6. Principles for item development listed in Exhibit 62, p. 6-31. • Exhibits 23-34 are provided for educators to illustrate the types of measures used in LA’s assessment programs. <p><u>Processes to Assure Assessments Tailored to Content Standards, Etc.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit 62 provides detail on the design of the LEAP ELA assessments (p. 6-31). Exhibit 97 F describes what DRC/Pearson proposed to do to create the LEAP assessments. • Exhibits 3 & 4 are provided to show the alignment of the LA tests cover the depth and complexity of LA’s standards. <p><u>Computer-Adaptive Tests?</u> The LEAP assessments are not computer-adaptive. According to the Technical Report</p>	<p><u>Statement of Purposes of the Assessments</u> The purposes and uses of the LEAP assessments are listed in Exhibit 20, Chapter 2, page 7. For the PARCC ELA items, purposes and uses are stated in greater detail in Exhibit 62.</p> <p><u>Test Blueprints</u> Peers found evidence of ELA LEAP blueprints and designs in Exhibit 21, p. 7-25 and math blueprints and designs in Exhibit 21, p. 26-32. Claims for the PARCC ELA assessments are provided in Exhibit 62 and for the PARCC math assessments are shown in Exhibit 96, p. 16-17.</p> <p>While Exhibits 23-34 help to see the types of assessment items used in LA’s assessment programs, they do not provide a sufficient level of detail on the underlying test blueprints used for test development.</p> <p><u>Processes to Assure Assessments Tailored to Content Standards, Etc.</u> Exhibit 62 provides detail on the design of the PARCC ELA assessments (p. 6-31). PARCC Math development is summarized in Exhibit 96.</p> <p>No evidence of the processes used to assure that the LEAP assessments were tailored to LA’s content standards was provided.</p> <p>No evidence was provided that the LA tests (the combination of PARCC items and DRC-</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 LOUISIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>(Exhibit 20, p. 5), the LEAP grade 3-8 assessments are both paper- and computer-administered.</p>	<p>developed items used) reflect appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and require complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills). Exhibits 3 and 4 show only the alignment of old to new content standards, not information on the alignment of LA’s tests to either old or new content standards.</p> <p>And, no evidence was presented that the DRC/Pearson plans described in Exhibit 97 F were actually implemented.</p> <p>This sentence illustrates the challenge that Peers faced in reviewing the LA submission: “The products of the above requirements are dual-mode assessments—paper-based tests (PBT) and computer-based tests (CBT)—composed of acquired test items aligned to the Louisiana Student Standards. DRC’s contract with PARCC provided for the use of items and related passages for two complete PARCC operational test forms for each content area and grade. These PARCC items/passages are the available item pool used for the LEAP 2025 forms construction” Exhibit 21, p. 4). Peers believe it is incumbent on the SEA to provide overall evidence of the quality of the assessments used in the state, regardless of item source(s), and that the assessments are a reliable and valid set of measures. Peers were unable to find this evidence.</p> <p><u>Computer-Adaptive Tests?</u> The LEAP tests are not computer adaptive.</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 LOUISIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State must provide detailed information on the design of all parts of the LEAP ELA and Math assessments, showing that the ELA and Math tests are “tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflect appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and require complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills)”.. • State must provide detailed information regarding how the test blueprints are used to construct its assessments. These blueprints should describe the characteristics of the test items used to measure each content standard, not simply the number of such items or the number of points that these items count overall. • State must provide evidence of the overall quality of its assessments (the combination of PARCC items and DRC-developed items used). This evidence should demonstrate that the tests are a reliable and valid set of measures well aligned to the breadth, depth, and complexity of LA’s content standards. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PARCC items were used to build portions of the LEAP 2025 assessments. • Details of the item development process are shown in Exhibit 43, the PARCC Item Development Technical Guide. • Exhibits 97 and 98 list what DRC/Pearson proposed to do to evaluate items and develop test forms. • A description of item review and selection processes is described in Exhibit 20, p. 18-19. • Proposed new item development processes are described in Exhibit 123. • Passage-selection procedures are described in the state application, supported by Exhibit 63. • Exhibits 45-48 describe the content and bias/sensitivity review procedures employed. • Exhibits 100 & 101 are cited as evidence of the comparability of the LEAP and PARCC assessments (as well as their content, administration, scoring, and psychometrics), concluding that the scale scores and achievement levels are comparable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The item development process used by PARCC appears to be well documented. The proposed DRC item selection process was described in its proposal to the SEA. Peers are not sure what steps were actually implemented. • Item review plans appear to be well documented, but the results of these reviews (e.g., the number of items flagged) were not provided. Exhibits 45-48, the item alignment and review PPTs, show only steps to provide reviewer orientation, not the results of the reviews carried out. The same is true for the bias reviews. • Exhibit 63 seems to be drawn from another document, perhaps provided in a PARCC item development document. However, the passage development/selection procedures described there appear to be thorough. • Evidence of the overall quality of its assessments (the combination of PARCC items and DRC-developed items used, regardless of item source) needs to be provided. The integrated document showing how DRC/Pearson put the assessment program together was not provided. • Exhibits 97 & 98 show sections of the DRC/Pearson item development proposal and are cited as evidence, without substantiation that they were actually implemented. • Exhibits 100 & 101 do not show evidence that

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>the tests used in LA – the combination of PARCC and DRC-developed items – are technically sound and that reasonable procedures were used to select the items.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No independent alignment information (between LA’s standards and its assessments, regardless of source) is provided.
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State must provide a coherent description of the procedures used to select PARCC and DRC-produced items as well as develop and select new items. Adequate documentation of this needs to be provided, ideally in a technical report that describes the item selection procedures, reviews, and other steps used, with documentation of the results at each step in the process. • State must provide an independent alignment study to show that the PARCC-provided and DRC-developed items, as used in the LEAP assessments, are aligned to state content standards. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibits 59-60, 65-70, and 76-77 provide the materials used to describe the test administration procedures for local educators. • LA indicates that the requirements for test administration training are provided in Exhibit 14. • LA indicates that the technology training requirements for online assessment administrators are provided in Exhibits 74-75. Exhibits 78-81 provide draft directions for technology users. • Exhibit 56 provides a 90-slide presentation made in March 2017 to district test coordinators. Slide 87 provides an e-mail address and hotline number for DTCs to raise questions, issues, and concerns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibits 59-60; 69-70; and 76-77 provide inter-rater reliability statistics from readers; not sure of its relevance here. • Test administrator and test coordinator directions appear to be clear and thorough (Exhibits 65-68). • Exhibit 14 does not appear to document the training in test administration required for local educators. • Exhibits 16 & 17 as well as the Test Administration Manuals (e.g., Exhibit 65) provide written resources for accommodations and accessibility decisions. Evidence of how educators learn to use these resources to appropriately administer the assessments was not provided, although educators are asked to certify that they are able to do so. • Exhibits 74 and 75 (mis-labeled) list only technology requirements, not the training procedures. • Exhibits 78-81, which describe directions for technology users, are shown in draft, not final form. • Exhibit 56 appears to be a thorough review of test administration procedures and issues.
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State must provide evidence of the processes used to train local educators on assessment administration (i.e., for assessment accommodations/accessibility, for the use of technology, etc.). 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

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>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 14, Bulletin 118</p> <p>Pg. 45 test security policy: k. procedures for monitoring of test sites to ensure that appropriate test security procedures are being followed and to observe test administration procedures.</p> <p>16. LDE staff will conduct site visits during testing to observe test administration procedures and to ensure that appropriate test security procedures are being followed. Schools with prior violations of test security or other testing irregularities will be identified for visits. Other schools will be randomly selected.</p> <p>Testing coordinator is responsible for monitoring testing sessions.</p> <p>Exhibit 49 stated that Site visits included monitoring of the administration of ACT, End-of-Course (EOC), and LEAP assessments. The LDOE prioritized sites with a record of infractions during previous test administrations; the remaining visits were randomly scheduled and included some sites that were requested by districts for monitoring. Monitors outlined their findings and reported them to districts and school leaders after each visit.</p>	<p>3</p> <p>State-submitted items meet the criteria. No additional evidence needed.</p>
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</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 LOUISIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A test security summary is provided in Exhibit 103. • Exhibit 57 provides a description of all official test security procedures (not the “handbook” as labeled). • LA uses an external contractor (Caveon) to audit its test security practices (see Exhibit 71). • Exhibits 65-68 outline test security procedures for test administrators and coordinators, as well as how local educators should properly secure testing materials. • Test security oaths are included in all test administrator and coordinator manuals (Exhibits 65-68). • LDOE indicates it conducts annual test security training for online and paper-based assessments (Exhibits 54 and 55). • Exhibit 58 outlines the procedures used in data forensics. • Exhibit 49 provides a report of investigations of testing irregularities by LDOE and LOIG. 	<p>The test security procedures used, the training provided, the monitoring conducted, and the data forensics procedures used are all well documented. Data on testing irregularities is also provided (see Exhibit 49).</p>
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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 LOUISIANA

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>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The test security provisions required of all LA vendors are described in Exhibit 99. This includes steps to protect the privacy of student-identifiable information. • Exhibit 14 provides legislative requirements for data security. • Exhibit 20 describes the procedures for keeping student information confidential during scoring. • Exhibit 97F describes the procedures DRC/Pearson propose to use to keep data private. 	<p>The materials provided by the state provide the evidence that 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.</p> <p>Peers did not find evidence of the minimum n group size in the evidence provided.</p> <p>Evidence was not provided that local districts are aware and use the state’s minimum group size for secondary reporting of group assessment results.</p>
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State must provide the minimum group size it uses for reporting group results. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit 20 provides a global overview of the test specifications for the 2016 LEAP ELA and Mathematics assessments. Test blueprints are shown on pages 26-36. • LA indicates that its standards are aligned to the Louisiana Student Standards for ELA and Math (Exhibits 3 and 4). • Item development information can be found in Exhibit 43 and Exhibit 20, pages 14-16. • Exhibit 20 provides construct-related validity information on pages 189-218. 	<p>LA chose here to provide a detailed description of the assessments used in LA, how they were developed and used. However, these assertions, as useful as they are to better understand the LA context, are not supported with evidence.</p> <p>Peers agreed with this statement: “At every stage of the test development process, the alignment of the item to the content standard must be reviewed and verified, since establishing content validity is one of the most important aspects in the legal defensibility of a test. As a result, it is essential that an item selected for a form link directly to the content standard which it measures” (Exhibit 20, p. 18). However, no information to support this necessary assertion was provided. For example, no evidence of an alignment study is provided. The crosswalk between the old and new standards does not show the alignment of the LEAP tests to the content standards.</p> <p>The information cited in Exhibit 20, p. 189-218, does not provide the evidence of construct-related information.</p>
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State must provide evidence of alignment between the State’s assessments (based on the combined set of PARCC and DRC-provided items) and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure. The evidence must describe how the tests measure the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance the content, and measure the standards at comparable levels of cognitive complexity. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

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>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit 43 provides the item and task specifications • Exhibits 45-48 detail the item alignment and bias review training procedures and materials used with the committee that study these. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit 43 provides a description of the procedures PARCC used to create its items; however, there is no evidence provided to show adequate validity evidence that its assessments (the combination of PARCC and DRC-provided items) tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards. • Exhibits 45-48 do not appear to be relevant here.
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State must provide adequate validity evidence (e.g., content reviews by experts, cognitive labs with students, and/or statistical analyses) to show that the State’s assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level, as represented in the State’s academic content standards. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit 41, 2017 LEAP 2025 ELA and Math Interpretive Guide contains sample reports on pages 11-13 and 16-18. • The item analysis and item correlations are in Exhibit 20, 2016 LEAP ELA and Mathematics Operational Technical Report, chapter 6 on pages 91-128. • Dimensionality analyses are in Exhibit 20, 2016 LEAP ELA and Mathematics Operational Technical Report, chapter 9 section 3, on pages 204-206. Construct-irrelevant variance is addressed with the differential item functioning (DIF) analysis in Exhibit 72, PARCC 2015 Technical Report, chapter 7, sections 7.1-7.4, pages 69-73, and in Exhibit 20, 2016 LEAP ELA and Mathematics Operational Technical Report, chapter 10 sections 10.1 and 10.2, on pages 219-230. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sample reports shown in Exhibit 41 illustrate how the LA assessments are reported • Exhibit 20, pages 91-128 do not provide support for the dimensions of the LA assessments. • DIF analyses are reported in Exhibits 20 and 72. Their relevance here is uncertain. • In conclusion, little to no information is provided to adequately the document 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. The manner in which the evidence in Exhibit 20, pages 204-206 was used to support the scoring and reporting structures was not provided.
	•	•
<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"> • State must provide evidence (e.g., content reviews by experts) that the use of 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. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exhibit 20 shows convergent and divergent correlational studies among claims and subclaims in chapter 9, p. 207-211 and p. 216-217, as well as Exhibit 96, PARCC 2016 Technical Report, p. 140-145. 	<p>Only a small amount of evidence is provided for this Critical Element.</p> <p>This citation may show a lack of divergence of the LA tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exhibit 20, p. 207: “In most cases, the PPM coefficients show that performance on one claim or subclaim is moderately to strongly related to performance on another claim or subclaim within the same grade and content area.” <p>This data may show some divergence among the tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exhibit 20, p. 116: “The correlation coefficients suggest that individual student scores for ELA and mathematics are moderately related, indicating that these two tests measure a similar knowledge base or general underlying ability, but still measure some different traits as planned.”
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State must provide additional evidence of the correlations between the LA tests and other measures (e.g., performance on other tests, student grades, or teacher judgment of student achievement). 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 	<p>Evidence provided for this Critical Element include the following: information in Exhibit 20:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An analysis of conditional standard error of measurement (CSEM) on p. 193-198. • Information on classification accuracy and consistency on p. 198-203. • Item analysis and item correlations on p. 91-128. • Proficiency and achievement level data on p. 180-182. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall test reliability coefficients are shown in Table 9.1 on p. 192 of Exhibit 20. • The standard errors of measurement of the LA assessments are also provided in Table 9.1 on p. 192 of Exhibit 20. • Conditional standard errors of measurement evidence are shown in Table 9.2 on p. 194 of Exhibit 20. • Classification accuracies are shown on p. 203-208 of Exhibit 20. • All of the data provided appear to be adequate; we concur with the summary provided by LDOE in Notes column of its peer review submission.
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u> X </u> 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 LOUISIANA

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>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit 43 describes the procedures and criteria for submitting and accepting items and stimuli; no page reference was provided. • Exhibit 20 describes the bias and sensitivity item reviews on p. 16. • Exhibit 72 provides the differential item functioning (DIF) analyses performed on p. 69-73. • Exhibit 20 describes how the state avoided items with DIF and how its vendor performed additional analyses after the administration on p. 219-230. • Exhibits 47 and 48 describe Louisiana’s bias review process and committee composition. • Exhibit 20 provides a description of how universal design was used in the item development process on p. 23. • Exhibit 20 summarizes the accommodations and designed supports provided on p. 23-24. • Exhibits 65-68 describe the procedures for administering assessments with accommodations, which are also described in Exhibit 16. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessibility of PARCC items is found on p. 11-48 in Exhibit 43. • Exhibit 20 shows attention to bias and sensitivity reviews (p. 16), considerable attention to avoiding items that showed DIF (p. 219-230), a brief description of the use of universal design in item development (p. 23), and a summary of the accommodations and supports provided (p. 23-24). • Exhibit 16 provides an extensive guide to accommodations and accessibility features offered in LEAP. • Evidence of how the SEA provided instructions to items writers on how to develop or select accessible items was not provided. • Evidence of how alternate test formats (e.g., braille) were developed was also missing.
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p> <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State must provide evidence of the instructions to items writers on the steps (e.g., item writer instructions, item review criteria) they should use to develop or select items to assure accessibility. • Evidence of how alternate test formats (e.g., braille) were developed should be provided. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit 20 provides a table of scale scores by CSEM on p. 193-198. • Exhibit 20 lists the test specifications on p.10-13. • Exhibit 21 provides the LEAP English Language Arts and Mathematics Assessment Frameworks on p. 7-29. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conditional standard errors of measurement show adequate levels of precision for the state’s tests at all three cut score levels.
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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 LOUISIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit 106 provides the handscoring training materials • Exhibit 20 describes the handscoring and autoscoring procedures and rules on p. 75-90. • Exhibits 22, 35-40, 59-60, 73, 76-77, 82, 94-95, and 104 list the final inter-rater reliability reports from 2016. • Exhibit 106 lists the human rater qualification procedures, human rater monitoring, retraining, dismissal, quality control procedures and handscoring procedures related to rescoring process. • Exhibit 108 provides the item-level scoring procedures on p. 35-51. • Exhibit 109 provides the LEAP ELA and Math raw score to scale score/achievement level tables for spring 2017. 	<p>The state has adequately documented the procedures used by its vendors (and the results of using those procedures) to demonstrate that it has implemented standardized procedures for scoring its assessments designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p> <p>Peers wondered whether the 10% read-behind level is adequate to permit the state to monitor the quality of the scoring conducted by its vendor.</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u> X </u> 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 LOUISIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit 20 describes the test specifications for ELA and Math on p. 10-13. • Exhibit 21 also describes the test blueprints for ELA and Math on p. 26-36. • Exhibits 45-48 provide item alignment and bias review committee presentation and summaries, as well as describe Louisiana’s alignment meeting review process and committee composition. • Exhibit 110 has detailed procedures for equating/linking and evaluation of equating. • Exhibit 111 provides notes from a recent Technical Advisory Committee meeting Spring 2017. • Exhibits 100 and 101 provide information on NCIEA-conducted process reviews of the grade 3-8 LEAP 2025 ELA and math assessments in both 2016 and 2017 to evaluate the comparability of the LEAP assessment scale scores and achievement levels to PARCC. The reviews focused on content, administration, scoring, and psychometrics. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evidence provided indicates that the state has ensured that all forms represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations across school years. • The NCIEA reviews shown in Exhibits 100 and 101 indicate that there is adequate evidence to support the claims that the LA assessment results can be compared to overall PARCC consortium results, as well as previous state assessment results. • Exhibit 111 has shown that the state has attended to the performance of students by assessment mode. • Evidence of the comparability of performance on multiple versions of its assessments (e.g., large-print or braille versions) was not provided. • Peers were uncertain how many test forms were used in the same grade and content area. If multiple forms were used, was this due entirely to the inclusion of field test items in an otherwise single operational test form? If not, support for the comparability of the multiple test forms for each grade and content area should be provided.
<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 LOUISIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exhibit 43 shows the item/stimulus development, review, and acceptance procedures on p. 14-16, as well as in Exhibit 118. Exhibit 74 shows the technical device requirement specifications. Exhibit 20 provides the DIF analyses and results p. 221-230. Exhibit 20 provides the paper vs. online mode effect study, procedures, and results p. 261-263. Exhibit 117 outlines the process for developing and reviewing Spanish math translations. Exhibit 105 outlines the process for developing and reviewing braille items. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exhibit 43 shows considerable attention to the development of the PARCC stimuli and items to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments. Exhibit 74 indicates the device requirements for the online assessments used in LA DIF analyses are described in Exhibit 20. The state has studied mode effects, as shown in Exhibit 20, p. 261-263. Exhibit 117 lists the procedures used to create new test translations. No data on comparability is provided. The process for developing and reviewing braille items is described in Exhibit 105. It is unclear what the origin and uses are for this document since no attribution is provided. Evidence of the comparability of the meaning and interpretations of assessment results, especially for the Spanish math translations or the braille test forms, needs to be provided.
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State must provide evidence of the comparability of the meaning and interpretations of assessment results, especially for the Spanish math translations or the braille test forms. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit 20 describes the procedures for monitoring, maintaining, and improving the quality of state assessment system • Exhibit 111 describes the conversation around maintaining and improving our assessment system. • Exhibit 116 describes issues related to improving quality of our data collection processes as well as quality control of the data files and reports. • Exhibit 112 references the standards review cycle on p. 45. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state has not indicated where in its Technical Report (Exhibit 20) the procedures for monitoring, maintaining, and improving the quality of state assessment system can be found. • Although TACs can serve to assist states to monitor and improve its assessment processes and procedures, the TAC minutes shown in Exhibit 111 do not specifically address quality improvement steps. • Peers are uncertain about the applicability of Exhibit 116. • Peers were also uncertain how Exhibit 112 contributes to monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, other than calling for review and revision of content standards at least once every seven years.
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State must provide explicit details about system(s) the state has in place 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. • If applicable, reference where this is described in Exhibit 20 and other exhibits. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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; 	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit 14 outlines the alternate assessment provisions, achievement levels, and performance standards. • Exhibit 17 and Exhibit 16 list the accommodations and accessibility features available and how to administer them. • Exhibit 89 provides links to support districts in decision-making for students with disabilities. • Exhibit 90, Chapter 5, describes the criteria for assessing a student using an alternate assessment. • Exhibit 17 provides parents the opportunity to receive information regarding assessments and accommodations. • Exhibit 90, Chapter 3, requires students with disabilities to have access to the general curriculum. • Exhibits 65-68 outline administration procedures, including the administration of accommodations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State says it has in place adequate procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system (see Exhibit 15, Chapter 39). Evidence of this is provided in Table 7.1 of Exhibit 20, p. 175. • The State says it has 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. Some evidence of this is found in Bulletin 1530, although peers questioned the clarity of the material described in this Bulletin (the letter of the law may have been met, but peers thought providing this information to local educators in a more user-friendly format - e.g., checklists or decision trees – would be helpful in making more useful participation decisions). • The State says it has provided 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. In Exhibit 17, on page 16,

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

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"> • Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA; • 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. 		<p>parents are shown only a choice for LAA1 or LAA2. What about participation in the general assessments without and with accommodations (only participation in the general assessment is requested)? Are these not choices that an IEP team also might make?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The criteria for inclusion in an alternate assessment are described in Exhibit 90, Chapter 5. The inclusion of LAA2 in Bulletin 1530 is outdated. The use of “standard deviation below average” in the criteria for LAA1 participation criteria shows that these criteria are also out of date. • The State says it has in place procedures to ensure individual educational plan (IEP) teams make decisions about how to assess students based on individual student needs. This is implied in the IEP form (Exhibit 17), but the process used is not stated explicitly. • The State says it has provided information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities. This evidence was provided in the TAMs (Exhibits 65 & 67) and in Exhibit 16. • While the Peers did not review state evidence for bullet 8 (whether alternately assessed student were given access to the state’s general curriculum), they wondered whether the state has evidence that the extended standards actually promote access to the

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		state's general curriculum.
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State must provide evidence that the State has procedures in place to ensure individual educational plan (IEP) teams make decisions about how to assess students based on individual student needs. • State must provide evidence that the State has provided, for parents and for educators, more user-friendly 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. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit 14, Chapter 23, outlines the process for determining English proficiency. • Exhibit 19 and Exhibit 16 outline LEP accommodations and administration. • Exhibits 65-68 describe the accessibility features and accommodations available. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 23 of Exhibit 14 does not refer to EL proficiency. Chapter 40 provides definitions of EL students and EL categories. • Accommodations for EL are described in general terms in Exhibit 16 and listed in Exhibit 19. Peers were uncertain as to the process for determining how accommodations are decided for ELs • EL testing procedures are described in Exhibits 65 and 67. • Peers feel that additional information on the selection of accommodations. In addition, information on which students are to be tested with the Spanish edition of the math tests could be provided. Examples could include training materials for districts, schools, teachers, and parents.
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State must provide additional information on the selection of accommodations. In addition, information on which students are to be tested with the Spanish edition of the math tests must be provided. Examples could include training materials for districts, schools, teachers, and parents. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibits 17 and 18 provide accommodations available for IEP and IAP teams to use when designing plans for students with disabilities. • Exhibit 19 and Exhibit 16, outline LEP accommodations and administration and instructs districts and schools to ensure accommodations are appropriate and effective for meeting the student’s needs and do not alter the construct being assessed. • Exhibit 91 is used by districts to submit requests for accommodations not listed on accommodation plans. • Exhibit 16 outlines the process for Unique Accommodation Requests. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Exhibits provided by the state show adequate evidence that a range of accommodations suitable for students with disabilities and ELs are provided, as well as how districts and schools are instructed in their use. • It also has in place a mechanism for local educators to request additional accommodations not on the state-approved list (Exhibits 91 and 16). • No information was provided by the SEA on how it determines on that the accommodations used by local districts (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.
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State must provide descriptions for the basis of determining which accommodations were reasonable and appropriate, for example, literature reviews, state-specific empirical research studies, consultation with the state’s TAC, etc. State must describe how it made determinations of which accommodations would be offered. • State must provide evidence that the accommodations used by local districts (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. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit 14 outlines the process LDOE follows to review IAP accommodations for students identified as 504. • Exhibit 14 outlines the procedures LEAs must follow when assigning appropriate accommodations for 504, SPED and EL students. • Exhibit 16 defines how accommodations and accessibility features are provided on statewide assessments. • Exhibit 14 outlines students who are eligible to participate in the alternate assessment. • Exhibit 14 outlines the process LEA’s must follow for assigning accommodations for students with an IEP on statewide assessments. • LDOE annually releases practice test and online tools trainings to ensure students with accommodations have adequate practice using the accommodations in the testing platform. • Exhibit 119 is used by Louisiana’s monitoring teams to ensure ELL students are receiving appropriate accommodations/accessibility features. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peers were uncertain where in Exhibit 14 the process LDOE follows to review IAP accommodations for students identified as 504, as well as the procedures LEAs must follow when assigning appropriate accommodations for 504, SPED and EL students are described. • Eligibility for participation in an alternate assessment is spelled out in Exhibit 14. • Exhibit 53 outlines the training provided to test monitors. This training included a reference to monitoring to assure students with disabilities received the accommodations appropriate for them. However, evidence, such as a summary of the results of state or district monitoring of the assessments of ELs and students with disabilities, has not been provided by the State.
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state should provide summarize the specific evidence from just the state or district monitoring of the assessments of ELs and students with disabilities to assure that accommodations were administered with fidelity to the students’ IEPs should be provided by the State. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels. 	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Louisiana Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) meeting minutes from April 2015, June 2015, and March 2016 are in Exhibits 8, 11, and 1, respectively. • State policies and regulations related to academic achievement standards are described in Exhibit 14 achievement levels, achievement level definitions (see chapter 61, p. 58-59). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit 1 (p. 5) indicates approval of the ELA and Mathematics <i>content</i> standards by the LA BESE. • The <i>achievement</i> standards references – the part numbers and pages numbers in Exhibit 8 and 11 – were not provided so peers could not find them. These Board minutes did not appear to document the approval of the <i>achievement</i> standards. • Policies related to the <i>achievement</i> standards are described in Exhibit 14, p. 58-59. There is a reference to their “amendment” in February 2016 by the BESE. These Board minutes were not provided, however.
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p> <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state might wish to clarify the <i>achievement</i> standards-related LA BESE decisions/references (by agenda item and page number) in Exhibits 1, 8 and 11, or provide the BESE minutes that show the achievement standards were approved. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An overview of the performance level setting process is described in Exhibit 20, chapter 2, p. 10-13 and chapter 6 p. 41-44. • PARCC Performance Level Setting Technical Report is included as Exhibit 93. • The ALD development process is described in Exhibit 93, chapter 3, p. 17-21. • The committee composition is described in Exhibit 93, chapter 6 page 40 and Appendix 5 p. 84-98. • After the Performance Level Setting vertical articulation meeting, the PARCC Governing Board conducted a reasonableness review of the cut scores. In this meeting they looked at impact data, median threshold scores from all 3 rounds of standard setting as well as vertical articulation, and the Standard Error of Judgment (SEJ) around the round 3 performance level setting judgments. This reasonableness review and the SEJ's associated with round 3 are detailed in Exhibit 93, PARCC Performance Level Setting Technical Report, chapter 7, pages 61-68. • The SEJ's in table 7.2, p. 64 of Exhibit 93 show that the cut scores are sufficiently reliable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is unclear where in Exhibit 20 the performance-level setting process is described; p. 10-13 and 41-44 do not appear to do so. • Performance-level setting for PARCC is adequately described in Exhibit 93. • The development of ALDs is adequately described in Exhibit 93, p. 17-21. • The review and approval of the PARCC performance levels that were set is well described in Exhibit 93, p. 61-68. • Peers believe that the State had adequately shown that PARCC used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable. • Peers noted that Exhibits 100 and 101 provide key support for the comparability of the PARCC assessment and the PARCC/DRC test used the following year. This evidence supports the use of the same achievement standards to report comparable results across the two assessments.
<p>Section 6.2 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 LOUISIANA

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>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ALD development process is described in Exhibit 93, chapter 3, p. 17-21. • The vertical articulation portion of the standard setting meeting is described in Exhibit 93, chapter 6 p. 57-58. • The challenging nature of the state’s performance levels can be seen in the LEAP 2025 achievement level percentages for the state and district levels. These data are shown in Exhibit 102, the 2017 LEAP District Media Report. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state uses the actual performance of students on its assessments as its evidence of the challenging nature of its achievement standards. This may be correct, but is not always the case. An independent rating of the rigor (e.g., DOK) of its standards and the match of its assessments to those standards would provide more compelling evidence. • No alignment data (content standards, assessments, and performance standards) is provided.
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State should provide independent evidence of the <i>rigor</i> of the state’s academic achievement standards, such as through an alignment study of its content standards, assessments, and achievement standards. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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 	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit 41 contains sample reports on p. 11-13 and 16-18. • Exhibit 114 shows the distribution procedures, development processes and logic on p. 5-13. • Exhibits 12 and 13 as well as Exhibit 115 provide essential dates for test administration and reporting. • Districts are notified through biweekly newsletters when reports are available or there is a public release, availability of test data, guide books released: http://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/newsroom/05-24-16-important-news-for-school-districts.pdf?sfvrsn=5 • Monthly webinars with school system testing and accountability contacts that are also posted to LDOE website http://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/assessment • Public release provides information regarding test results and transitioning to higher standards: http://www.louisianabelieves.com/newsroom/news-releases/2016/08/04/louisiana-students-show-improvement-as-schools-adjust-to-higher-expectations • Public report cards provide information related to subgroup performance, achievement on measures of state standards and College and Career readiness: http://www.louisianabelieves.com/assessment/school-letter-gradesbriefing.pdf?sfvrsn=11 • School letter grades and school performance scores released publically with summary webinar: http://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/webinars/2016-school-performance-score-media • LDOE recorded webinars provide presentations for redelivery 	<p>Peers did not find evidence that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • parent reports were prepared in alternate formats such as braille and large-print • dates for report delivery were provided (this information is missing in Exhibits 12 and 13 as well as Exhibit 115).

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>student's achievement;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 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. 	<p>of information about how data are used to calculate school performance scores and letter grades: https://itunes.apple.com/us/podcast/2016-2017-school-performance/id954891734?i=1000373967060&mt=2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Principals are provided with individual school profiles: http://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/accountability/2014-2015-principal-profile-template.pdf?sfvrsn=2 ● Principals are notified about profiles with District Planning Call and District Test Coordinator Call and newsletter http://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/district-support/november-district-planning-call.pdf?sfvrsn=2 http://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/assessment/assessment-and-accountability-call-november-2016.pptx?sfvrsn=2 http://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/newsroom/ldoe-weekly-district-newsletter-12-13-16.pdf?sfvrsn=4 ● District collaboratives are held in state regions and provide professional development, networking, and opportunities to discuss academic achievement results, goals, and reporting: http://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/district-support/dec-2016-sup-collab-event-overview.pdf?sfvrsn=38 ● Parent guide available in English, Spanish, Vietnamese, and Arabic. Copies posted to Family Support Toolbox Library: http://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/family-support-toolbox-library ● Parent guides available for school report cards in Family Support Toolbox Library: http://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/family-support-toolbox-library 	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR LOUISIANA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peers felt that the State should assure that parent reports are prepared in alternate formats accessible to parents with visual impairments, such as braille and large-print, as well as provide dates for report delivery to educators (the information missing in Exhibits 12 and 13 as well as Exhibit 115). 		

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