UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Frank Edelblut
Commissioner
New Hampshire Department of Education
101 Pleasant Street
Concord, NH 03301-3860

September 20, 2019

Dear Commissioner Edelblut:

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 Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). I appreciate the efforts of the New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) to prepare for the English language proficiency (ELP) assessment peer review, which occurred in April 2019. Specifically, NHDOE submitted evidence regarding ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS.

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

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

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

The assessments that partially meet requirements do not meet a number of the requirements of the statute and regulations and NHDOE will need to provide substantial additional information to

demonstrate it meets the requirements. The Department realizes that this was the first time your State was required to provide its ELP and AELPA for peer review and recognizes that it may take some time to address all of the required items. The specific list of items required for NHDOE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Within 30 days, NHDOE must provide a plan and timeline for submitting all required documentation. Upon submission of the plan, the Department will reach out to the State educational agency (SEA) to determine a mutually agreeable schedule. Resubmission should occur once all necessary evidence is complete (rather than in multiple submissions). The Department is placing a condition on NHDOE's Title I, Part A grant award. To satisfy this condition, NHDOE must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action.

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.

Additionally, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) will monitor progress on matters pertaining to requirements in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) related to the participation of students with disabilities in Title I assessments. In particular, OSERS will monitor progress against critical elements 1.4, 4.2, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4, 6.1 and 6.3. Insufficient progress to address such matters may lead OSERS to place a condition on NHDOE's fiscal year 2020 IDEA Part B grant award.

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

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

Sincerely,

/s/
Frank T. Brogan
Assistant Secretary for
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Julie Couch, Administrator, Bureau of Instructional Support

Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed to Meet the Requirements for New Hampshire's Use of the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS as English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
1.1 – State Adoption of ELP Standards for All English Learners	For the State's ELP standards: • Evidence that NH has adopted the most current WIDA ELP standards.
1.2 – Coherent and Progressive ELP Standards that Correspond to the State's Academic Content Standards	For the State's ELP standards: • For science, evidence that the ELP standards contain language proficiency expectations that reflect the language needed for ELs to acquire and demonstrate their achievement of the knowledge and skills identified in the State's academic content standards appropriate to each grade-level/grade-band. • For reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics, evidence of alignment of its current ELP standards to the State's academic content standards, including a plan to address findings of the previous alignment study.
1.3 – Required Assessments	For the Alternate ACCESS: • Evidence that the alternate ELP assessment is available in kindergarten.
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments	For the Alternate ACCESS: • Evidence that the State includes ELs with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the ELP assessment.

2.1 – Test Design and Development	For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:
	• Evidence that both assessments are aligned to the depth and breadth of the State's ELP standards, including:
	  o Statement of the purposes and intended uses of results.
	  o Test blueprints.
	  o Processes to ensure that the ELP assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State's ELP standards and reflects appropriate inclusion of the range of complexity found in the standards (e.g., detail about the routing rules, detail of the item selection process for paper forms to ensure it adheres to the blueprint).
	
	For ACCESS:
	• Evidence that the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the multi-stage adaptive administrations.
	• Evidence that proficiency determinations are made with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled.

2.2 – Item Development	For ACCESS: • Evidence of reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items (e.g., timeline of development, qualifications of item writers, item-writing training, item review processes and reviewer qualifications, field test processes for each domain, and TAC review).

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	For the Alternate ACCESS: • Evidence of reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess ELP (e.g., involvement of experts with knowledge of English learners with significant cognitive disabilities).
2.3 – Test Administration	For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS: • Evidence of established communication to educators of clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations (e.g., guidelines or recommended qualifications of test administrators including volunteers, training of volunteers, and qualifications and training for the human providers of accommodations). • Evidence of established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instruction support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities (e.g., content of training modules, evidence that training is required for test administrators and evidence of participation in such training). For ACCESS: • Evidence of established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration	For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS: • Evidence that 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 (e.g., a summary of monitoring activities, or redacted samples of completed test monitoring visits).
2.5 – Test Security	For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS: • Evidence of policies and procedures that prevent assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration. o Specifically, evidence for the Alternate ACCESS of policies and procedures to protect the integrity of the test given that the test form is unchanged for the past several years. • Evidence of detection of test irregularities. • Evidence of remediation following any test security incidents. • Evidence of the investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities (e.g., forensic analysis and plans to address concerns).

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy	For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS: • Policies and procedures to protect the integrity of test-related data in test administration (e.g., how data are protected by all parties, including during handoffs). • Policies and procedures to maintain secure student-level data that protect student privacy and confidentiality (e.g., guidelines for districts and schools).
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	For ACCESS: • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State's ELP assessment and the ELP standards the assessment is designed to measure in terms of language knowledge and skills and the depth and breadth of the State's ELP standards across all proficiency levels, domains, and modalities identified therein. • Documentation of alignment between the State's ELP standards and the language demands implied by, or explicitly stated in, the State's academic content standards. For the Alternate ACCESS: • Evidence of adequate linkage to the State's ELP standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and that the breadth of content and linguistic complexity determined in test design is appropriate for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.
3.2 – Validity Based on Linguistic Processes	For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS: • Adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended language processes appropriate for each grade level/grade-band as represented in the State's ELP standards.
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS: • Evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of the assessments are consistent with the subdomain structures of the State's ELP standards (e.g., an explanation of how the included statistical analyses relate to the validity framework for the assessments).
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS: • Adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.

4.1 – Reliability	For ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS:
	• Evidence of test reliability, including:
	  ○ Reliability by subgroups;
	  ○ Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results;
	  ○ Evidence that reliability statistics are used to inform ongoing maintenance and development.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	For ACCESS: • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of an EL's English language proficiency. For the Alternate ACCESS: • Evidence of reliability, including test information functions (TIFs) for overall composite scores.
4.2 – Fairness and accessibility	For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS: • Evidence that the assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in design, development, and analysis (e.g., the implementation of universal design principles, to the extent practicable, during item development and review, and additional differential item functioning (DIF) analyses to include more student subgroups). For the Alternate ACCESS: • Evidence that the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all EL students and fair across student groups, including ELs with disabilities, in their design, development, and analysis, guidance and instructions on appropriate instructional supports that can be used during the assessment, particularly for Braille and alternate modes of communication.
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS: • Evidence that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for ELP assessments, including performance for EL students with high and low levels of English language proficiency.
4.4 – Scoring	For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS: • Evidence that if an English learner has a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains/components (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) because there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected domain(s)/component(s), the State ensures that the student is assessed in the remaining domain(s)/component(s) in which it is possible to assess the student, including a description of how this will occur. For ACCESS: • Evidence of standardized scoring procedures and protocols that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State's ELP standards (e.g., evidence that the scoring of speaking items on the paper form of the test is monitored.) For the Alternate ACCESS: • Evidence of the implementation of standardized scoring procedures and protocols (e.g., definitions of key terms and test administration and scoring procedures).

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	For ACCESS: • Evidence that all forms adequately represent the State's ELP standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across settings, particularly for the listening domain (e.g., rationales for why equating is not done for the paper versions of the reading and listening domains and rationales for the use of the anchor item sets). For the Alternate ACCESS: • Evidence that all forms adequately represent the State's ELP standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across settings (e.g., evidence that using the same test items every year does not impact validity).
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS: • Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State's website. For the Alternate ACCESS: • Evidence of a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system.
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS: • Evidence of procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State's assessment system. • Evidence of policies that require the inclusion of an EL with a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains (i.e., ensuring that the student will be assessed based on the remaining components in which it is possible to assess the student).

5.3 – Accommodations	For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS:
	• Evidence that the provided accommodations:
	  ○ Are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student's need(s) to participate in the assessments.
	  ○ Do not alter the construct being assessed.
	  ○ 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.
	• Evidence of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.
	
	For the Alternate ACCESS:
	• Evidence that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs.
	• Evidence that accommodations do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment.

5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS: • Evidence that the State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for ELs with disabilities so that they are

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	appropriately included in the ELP assessments and receive accommodations that are: o Consistent with the State's policies for accommodations. o Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice. o Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student's IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL.
6.1 – State Adoption of ELP Achievement Standards for All Students	For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS: • Evidence that the State adopted ELP achievement standards that address the different proficiency levels of ELs. • If the State has developed alternate ELP achievement standards, evidence that it has adopted them only for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who cannot participate in the regular ELP assessment even with appropriate accommodations.
6.2 – ELP Achievement Standards-Setting	For the Alternate ACCESS: • Evidence that the State used a technically sound method and process for setting ELP achievement standards, such that cut scores are developed for every grade/grade band, content domain/language domain, and/or composite for which proficiency-level scores are reported.
6.3 –Aligned ELP Achievement Standards	For ACCESS: • Evidence that ELP assessment results are expressed in terms that are clearly aligned with the State's ELP standards and its ELP performance level descriptors. For the Alternate ACCESS: • If the State has developed alternate ELP achievement standards, evidence that the alternate ELP achievement standards are linked to the State's grade-level/grade-band ELP standards and reflect professional judgment of the highest ELP achievement standards possible for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.
6.4 – Reporting	For ACCESS and the Alternate ACCESS: • Evidence that the State's reporting of assessment results facilitates timely interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public. • Evidence that the State provides coherent and timely information about each student's attainment of the State's ELP standards to parents that are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian. • Evidence that student reports are, upon request by an individual with a disability, provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	For the Alternate ACCESS: • Evidence that performance level descriptors are included on student score reports.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

April State ELP Assessment Peer Review Notes

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

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

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS 4
Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of ELP Standards for All English Learners 4
Critical Element 1.2 – Coherent and Progressive ELP Standards that Correspond to the State's Academic Content Standards 5
Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments 8
Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments .. 9
Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments 10

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 11
Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development 11
Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development 14
Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration 16
Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration 21
Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security 22
Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 24

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY 25
Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content25
Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Linguistic Processes 27
Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 28
Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables 29

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER 31
Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability 31
Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility 34
Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum 36
Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring 37
Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 40
Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 42
Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 43

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 44
Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 44
Critical Element 5.2 – DOES NOT APPLY to ELP Assessment Peer Review46
Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations 47
Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

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

..... 50

SECTION 6: ELP ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING.....52
Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of ELP Achievement Standards for All Students..... 52
Critical Element 6.2 – ELP Achievement Standards Setting 53
Critical Element 6.3 –Aligned ELP Achievement Standards 55
Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting 57

SECTION 7: DOES NOT APPLY TO ELP ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW 59

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
For English language proficiency (ELP) standards: The State formally adopted K-12 ELP standards for all ELs in public schools in the State.		See states
Section 1.1 Summary Statement		
___ No additional evidence is required or _X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: **ACCESS & Alternate ACCESS** • Evidence to be provided by states.		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
For ELP standards: The ELP standards: • are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing; • address the different proficiency levels of ELs; and align to the State academic content standards (see definition[1]). The ELP standards must contain language proficiency expectations that reflect the language needed for ELs to acquire and demonstrate their achievement of the knowledge and skills identified in the State's academic content standards appropriate to each grade-level/grade-band in at least reading/language arts, mathematics, and science.	**ACCESS** 1.2-1 Understanding the WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards 1.2-2 English Language Proficiency Standards PreKindergarten through Grade 5 1.2-3 2012 Amplification of The English Language Development Standards 1.2-4 Alignment Study between the Common Core State Standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics and the WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards, 2007 Edition, PreKindergarten through Grade 12 1.2-5 K–12 English Language Development Standards Validation 2016	**ACCESS** The Peers felt that evidence with regards to the following aspects of the critical element were missing: • "align to the State academic content standards" • "… reflect the language needed for ELs to acquire and demonstrate their achievement of the knowledge and skills identified in the State's academic content standards…" The history of alignment work was not clear with regards to how it impacted future development. • For example, alignment studies claim to align to CCSS but the standards were written prior to the CCSS. The alignment study was conducted prior to development of CCSS? • From Section 1 of WIDA submission notes (p.2 column 3), "The 2012 Amplification… strengthened areas that 2016 validation study identified as not having strong alignment to content standards…" How can a document dated 2012 address issues identified in 2016? It is not clear what actions were taken to remediate or address the findings of the various alignment studies. • Evidence 1.2-4. Conducted in 2010, this study used Cook's criteria to examine linking and alignment of the WIDA ELP Standards MPIs and the CCSS in ELA and mathematics. The study results indicate adequate linking across all grade clusters between the WIDA ELP Standards MPIs and the CCSS in English

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		Language Arts (RWSL) and Mathematics. Strong Linking was observed in most grade clusters. Moderate Linking was observed in Reading grades K, 3-5, Writing grades 2, 3-5, 7, 9-12, and Mathematics grades K, 6, 7, and 9-12. However, the study noted that Limited Linking was observed in ELA Writing grade K and Mathematics grade 8. Reviewer comments state that limited Linking on some reporting categories indicated that the language functions and content stems in some MPIs did not adequately address or support those in the Common Core State Standards. Given the changes to the program since 2010, including the Amplification in 2012, an updated alignment study is warranted. There was no evidence provided with regards to alignment for science. • Submission notes indicate that WIDA has not conducted an alignment study between WIDA ELP standards and science or social studies standards.
	Alternate ACCESS The Alternate ACCESS uses the same ELP Standards as ACCESS. No additional evidence provided. However, WIDA is using the Alternate Model Performance Indicators (AMPIs). Are these extensions of the ELP Standards or separate standards?	**Alternate ACCESS** More information about the AMPIs needs to be provided. Are they intended to be extensions of the ELP standards or separate standards for Alternate ACCESS? Evidence of alignment is needed. • 2.2-8, p. 3. "The test is based on Alternate Model Performance Indicators (AMPIs) and Alternate English Language Proficiency (ELP) levels, which allow ELLs with significant cognitive disabilities to access the test tasks and demonstrate their proficiency in English.

Section 1.2 Summary Statement
___ No additional evidence is required or _X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: **ACCESS** • Current alignment evidence for ELA and Math including a plan to address findings • Alignment to science standards **Alternate ACCESS** • Alignment of AMPIs to ELP 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.

Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State's assessment system includes an ***annual general and alternate ELP assessment*** (aligned with State ELP standards) administered to: • All ELs in grades K-12.	Reviewed by Department Staff Only	Reviewed by Department Staff Only

Section 1.3 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
- [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]

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

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• The State has policies that require the inclusion ***of all public elementary and secondary ELs in the State's ELP assessment***, including ELs with disabilities.	Reviewed by Department Staff Only	Reviewed by Department Staff Only

Section 1.4 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
- [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
If the State has developed or amended challenging ***ELP*** standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with: • State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education). • Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas). • Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State. • Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents.	Reviewed by Department Staff Only	Reviewed by Department Staff Only

Section 1.5 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

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

- [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]

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

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State's test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to ***the depth and breadth of the State's ELP standards,*** and includes: • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of ***the State's ELP standards***, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. • Processes to ensure that the ELP assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in ***the State's ELP standards*** and reflects appropriate inclusion of the range of complexity found in the standards. • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and intended uses and interpretations of results. • If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the	**ACCESS** <u>Statement of purpose</u> • 2.1-1, p.3 • 2.1-2, p.5 <u>Test blueprints</u> • 2.1-2, p.19-23 • Description of multistage adaptive administration provided. <u>Knowledge, skills, range of complexity</u> • 1.2-3 • 2.1-2, pp. 9-11. <u>Item pool and selection</u> • No evidence provided. <u>Grade-level of student</u> • Based on grade level clusters	**ACCESS** <u>Statement of purpose</u> • 2.1-1 and Table 2 (p.11) in 2.1-3 explicitly address intended purposes and interpretations. <u>Test blueprints</u> • The test blueprints are not provided. It appears that the description of how test items are assigned to student, based on the PL of their responses in the domains ofRWLS and paired with academic areas, serve as the test blueprint for each student. The placement of the student in the proficiency level is explained, but it is not clear if the items assigned to a student adequately measure the depth and breadth of the ELP Standards. • Evidence that the ACCESS assessments adhere to the blueprint for both online and paper. <u>Knowledge, skills, range of complexity</u> • A general description is provided of how each domain for RWLS is assessed. However, it is not clear if each student is assessed on an adequate number and range of items to ascertain an appropriate inclusion of items across the range of complexity. • Additional information regarding routing rules and their adequacy. • Evidence regarding the range of complexity of the items (e.g. blueprints). • It is not clear, if each student takes all these items and if all or a subset of the items represents an

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

student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting. If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be *entirely* administered through a portfolio.	**Alternate ACCESS** <u>Statement of purpose</u> • 2.1-3, p. 3 and 2.1-4, p. 1. <u>Test blueprints</u> • Blueprints are referenced 2.1-4, p. 4. "Because the test blueprints across grade-level clusters by domain are the same and the Alternate PLs and AMPIs for the test tasks across grade-level clusters pose nearly identical linguistic challenges and differ only in the topics presented, it is desirable to have common cut scores across grade-level clusters by domain." • However, blueprints were not provided. <u>Range of complexity</u> • No evidence provided.	appropriate inclusion of the range of complexity found in the ELP standards. <u>Item pool and selection</u> • Evidence is needed regarding the item pool and item selection procedures. <u>Grade-level (grade bands)</u> • There is not enough information provided with regards to items in each pool and the relationship to the grade bands. Can items be tagged to multiple item pools? • Are all the items in the pool age appropriate? **Alternate ACCESS** <u>Test blueprints</u> • No evidence provided. No evidence of Processes to ensure that the ELP assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in ***the State's ELP standards*** and reflects appropriate inclusion of the range of complexity found in the standards.

Section 2.1 Summary Statement
___ No additional evidence is required or _X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: **ACCESS** • Test blueprints • Evidence of Processes to ensure that the ELP assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in ***the State's ELP standards*** and reflects appropriate inclusion of the range of complexity found in the standards. E.g. detail about the routing rules, detail of the item selection process for paper forms to ensure it adheres to the blueprint • Evidence of the adequacy of the item pool and item selection procedures to support the multistage adaptive administrations. • Evidence that all the items in the pool are age and grade appropriate **Alternate ACCESS** • Test blueprints • Evidence of Processes to ensure that the Alternate ELP assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in ***the State's ELP standards*** and reflects appropriate inclusion of the range of complexity found in the standards. E.g. detail of the item selection process to ensure forms adhere to the blueprint

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to: • Assess student English language proficiency based on the ***State's ELP standards*** in terms of content and language processes.	**ACCESS** • 2.2-3: conveys the ACCESS Test Development Cycle, which includes steps of item specifications, item development, item reviews, field test • 2.2-4: Sample item specifications for Speaking, L1, 3, 5 • 2.2-5: Sample item specification for SS, Listening, grades 6-8 • 2.2-6: Sample item specification for MA, Reading, grades 9-12 • 2.2-7: Sample item specification for Language, Writing, grades 3-5 • 2.2-9: Center for Applied Linguistics Item development content experts • 2.2-10: Teachers who are standards experts • 2.2-11: Item Writing Handbook for Reading and Listening (confidential) • 2.2-12, 2.2-13: Training Module for item and bias and sensitivity reviews. Not evident the number of reviewers, how they were selected, if they were representative of WIDA states, representative of races and ethnicities, special education, academic content • 2.2-14: procedures for test developers. Information is not provided about how the item writers are trained, if they are content experts, other qualifications. • 2.2-15 Cog Labs for Enhanced Items. This is a sample of one cog lab finding. Information is not provided about the number of cog labs conducted, for what purpose, findings, and implications.	**ACCESS** Detail about the test development process was not included. E.g. • Timeline (across versions, series, domains) • Item writers (Were they the 9 CAL item writing staff?) identification, qualification, representation of special education expertise includingEnglish learner with disabilities expertise • Item writing training • Item review process (how often this was done or what the outcomes were) • Item reviewer qualifications. While 2.2.10 was provided. Detail was lacking with regards to other review groups and the inclusion of Special Education expertise (i.e., ELs with disabilities expertise) • Field test process for each domain including target sample size rationales and the outcomes based on the data • TAC involvement and/or review The Peers were looking for the level of information that is commonly included in the Test Development chapter of a Technical Manual and/or Item Development Manual.

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

	• 2.1-2, pp. 24-25. It is not apparent if the considerably smaller sample size for field **Alternate ACCESS** • Does 2.2-3 apply to Alternate ACCESS? • If not, no evidence was provided.	**Alternate ACCESS** • Evidence was not provided. • It is not evident that experts with knowledge of English language learners with significant cognitive disabilities are included in the development of Alternate ACCESS.

Section 2.2 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

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

ACCESS

- Evidence of reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items, e.g.
    - Timeline (across versions, series, domains)
    - Item writers, identification, qualification, representation of special education expertise including English learner with disabilities expertise
    - Item writing training
    - Item review process including item reviewer qualifications
    - Field test process for each domain including target sample size rationales and the outcomes based on the data
    - Evidence of TAC involvement

Alternate ACCESS

- Evidence of reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items
- Evidence of the involvement of experts with knowledge of English language learners with significant cognitive disabilities in development activities.

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State: • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.	**ACCESS** <u>Communicates clear standardized procedures for administration</u> • 2.3-1 Test Administration Manual • 2.3-3 Script for Administrator • 2.3-4 weekly emails with updates for SEAs and LEAs • The TAM does not define who can be a test administrator. <u>Established procedures for training administrators including on accommodations</u> • 2.3-2 Training materials • 2.216 Accessibility and Accommodations <u>Defined technology requirements</u> • 2.3-5 Technical Readiness Checklist • 2.3-6 Troubleshooting <u>Established contingency plans</u> • 2.3-7 p.12-13 Critical incidents communication plan, not really a contingency plan	**ACCESS** <u>Communicates clear standardized procedures for administration</u> • This WIDA policy handbook does include references about test administrators, "designated testing staff or volunteers who will have access to secure test materials complete TA training for the applicable tests." p. 4. The same criteria appear to apply to those scoring and transcribing student responses. The Peers question the appropriateness of volunteers serving as test administrators. While the States may be responsible for test administrations, WIDA should include guidelines or recommended qualifications of test administrators to ensure test security and protect the validity of scores. • More information about the qualifications and training for the human providers of accommodations (e.g. scribe, reader, sign language interpreter). <u>Training</u> • Additional information regarding the test administrator training is needed (e.g. for each module, the table of contents and outline) • Information about how volunteers access training materials. Do they access it via the secure online system? • Information regarding the training of the test administrator to score the student responses for the paper test. <u>Established contingency plan</u> • Although troubleshooting was addressed, evidence was not provided of a contingency plan to include directions to test administrators in the event of

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

	Alternate ACCESS <u>Training</u> • 2.3-1, pp. 12-13. Explain that training must be completed, preferably 2 weeks prior to test administration and that administrator must pass a quiz with at least 80% correct. • It is not likely that accommodations would be addressed in the training since there are no accommodations, rather all "individualized instructional supports" are permitted.	disruptions or widespread administration challenges. • A communication plan was included; however, there was not information about how test administrators should manage situations like a lockdown or widespread inaccessibility of the assessments. **Alternate ACCESS** <u>Communicates clear standardized procedures for administration</u> • 2.3-1 Test Administrator Manual, Part 1 is for all test administrators; specific test administration procedures are in Part 2. Alternate ACCESS – pp. 140-165 • There is no statement as to who may be a test administrator. • There are no participation guidelines provided. • p. 143. "During the administration of Alternate ACCESS for ELLs, individualized instructional supports that are used by teachers in everyday classroom instruction may be used to meet individual student needs, only if <u>they do change</u> what is being measured on the assessment." Is this an accurate statement? If the wording should be "if they <u>do not change</u> what is being measured," do test administrators understand how to determine this? • It is noted that no examples of permissible "individualized instructional supports that are used by teachers in everyday classroom instruction" are provided. If individualized instructional supports are provided, it is unlikely the administrator will be aware what supports are not permissible.

		• There is no description related to allowable student response modes, e.g., pointing, eye-gaze, etc. This should be included in this section. • Why does the student need a sharpened pencil if another mode of response will be used? • P. 149. "In order to allow the student to demonstrate his or her proficiency, any evidence of engagement that is typical for that student in an instructional setting should be scored as a correct response." How has "evidence of engagement" been validated as a correct response and demonstration of English language proficiency? • There does not appear to be adequate examples of what "approaches" means vs an incorrect response • P. 154 "If a student asks for an explanation of some word or phrase in a task statement, check to make sure that the student understood your pronunciation of the word or phrase." It is a concern that direction for how to do this is not provided. Does this mean repeat the word/phrase? Does it mean to ask the student if he/she understood the pronunciation? • How is the test administered to a student who is deaf or hard of hearing? Blind or visually impaired? Does not have oral speech or has a combination of these disabilities in addition to an intellectual disability? • Are tracing and repeating a sound reflective of ELP standards? Based on the information cited above, the test administration policies and procedures need to more appropriately reflect the characteristics of the students participating in the assessment and the diverse ways they respond to assessment items (e.g. eye gaze, use of assistive technology). Involvement of experts who have experience with assessing English learners with significant cognitive

		disabilities is needed to develop policies and an updated TAM for Alternate ACCESS. <u>Training</u> • Content of the training is not provided. Is scoring practice included (i.e., how to score attending and approaching)? • Training on "individualized instructional supports that are used by teachers in everyday classroom instruction" that are permissible for use during the assessment. WIDA providing resources for training. States will need to provide evidence that administrators completed training.

Section 2.3 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

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

ACCESS

- Evidence that WIDA/State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations
  E.g. guidelines or recommended qualifications of test administrators including volunteers, training of volunteers, and qualifications and training for the human providers of accommodations
- Evidence of established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instruction support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities
  E.g. content of training modules, the way in which volunteers access training materials, and the training of administrators to score the paper test
- Evidence of established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration

Alternate ACCESS

- Evidence that WIDA/State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations
  E.g. response modes, detail about defining correct responses, permissible supports.
- Evidence that the policies and procedures were developed with involvement of experts who have experience with assessing English learners with significant cognitive disabilities

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

- Evidence of established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instruction support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general ELP assessments and the AELPA.	Reviewed by Department Staff Only	Reviewed by Department Staff Only

Section 2.4 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

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

- [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]

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

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
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: • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State's assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. • Application of test security procedures to the general ELP assessments and the AELPA.	**ACCESS** • 2.5-1 District and School Coordinator manual, p. 8-15, outlines security responsibilities • No information about security during development • p, 9. If test security has been compromised in any way, please contact your state education agency to determine remediation steps. • 2.3-1, pp. 11, 16-30. Test Administrator Manual. Limited information related to test security is provided; on p. 16 the statement, "Be aware that any breaches of test security or problems with test administration may result in the invalidation of student scores." Further consequences are not cited. • p. 10, "If test security has been compromised in any way, please contact your Test Coordinator to determine remediation steps." • 2.3-3, pp. 4, 5, 10 Test Administrator's Script – Limited statements related to test security in script; reminding test administrators they must complete training and be certified to administer test and to make sure students only have test materials on desk. • 2.3-7, p. 5 Test Policy Handbook for SEAs, indicates test coordinators can track educators' training completion prior to administering the test. **Alternate ACCESS** • 2.3-1, same as ACCESS, no additional information on test security provided.	**ACCESS** • No delineation of responsibilities of test security between WIDA and the states was provided. • Evidence of security procedures during development • Recommended guidelines or minimum standards for test security for states to implement. Information contained in cited evidence is too general given the impact of test security on the validity of the program. • The following topics related to test security were not located in the evidence provided: requirements for annual training at district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration, detection of test irregularities, remediation, investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities, monitoring test administrations, transcriptions of student dictation, scoring conducted by individual staff or volunteers, who can a test administrator, the volunteers who can have access to secure test materials. • Forensics analysis and plans to address findings should be performed by WIDA to include data across states. 4.7-10, p. 2 Committee notes indicate that leadership acknowledges that forensics analysis has not been conducted for this critical element. **Alternate ACCESS** • No evidence provided beyond that in the ACCESS materials.

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

Section 2.5 Summary Statement
___ No additional evidence is required or _X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: **ACCESS** • Outline the delineation of responsibilities of test security between WIDA and the states, and include recommended guidelines or minimum standards for test security for states to implement • Evidence of security procedures during test development • Evidence of activities that prevent assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Evidence of detection of test irregularities; • Evidence of remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State's assessments; • Evidence of the investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities to include forensic analysis and plans to address findings **Alternate ACCESS** • Evidence related to all aspects of this critical element are needed

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
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: • To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.	**ACCESS** <u>Security of data in research</u> • 2.6-1 WIDA Research IRB Application pp. 20-24. WIDA's process, "...includes provisions to ensure that only those conducting research or evaluating tests have access to test-related data and that only a few key individuals have access to identifying student data." • 2.6-2 Data use agreement, signed by states • 2.6-3 Training completed by UW-Madison staff related to research. • 2.6-4 Technical Assistance Policy. "All data requests are encrypted and delivered via WIDA's STFP site." **Alternate ACCESS** • No evidence specific to Alternate ACCESS was submitted. • 2.6-1 applies to Alternate ACCESS. • 2.6-2 does not reference Alternate ACCESS • 2.6-3 applies to Alternate ACCESS	**ACCESS & Alternate ACCESS** • Evidence has been provided related to research using WIDA data. • The parties involved in handling data for WIDA are unclear. More information related to who is involved and how data are protected by all parties and during handoffs is required. • Additional evidence is required from states to address the remaining aspects of the critical element.

Section 2.6 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

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

ACCESS & Alternate ACCESS

- Information related to who is involved in handling WIDA data and how data are protected by all parties, including during handoffs, is required.
- Additional evidence is required from states to address the remaining aspects of the critical element.

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

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State's validity evidence includes evidence that: ***The State's ELP assessments*** measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State's ELP standards, including: • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State's ELP assessment and the ELP standards the assessment is designed to measure in terms of language knowledge and skills, the depth and breadth of the State's ELP standards, across all proficiency levels, domains, and modalities identified therein; • Documentation of alignment (as defined) between the State's ELP standards and the language demands implied by, or explicitly stated in, the State's academic content standards; • If the State administers an AELPA aligned with alternate ELP achievement standards, the assessment shows adequate linkage to the State's ELP standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and that the breadth of content and linguistic complexity	**ACCESS** Validity evidence • CAL's Validation Framework, Evidence 2.1-5, p. 25-38 Content alignment between standards and assessment • Evidence 3.1-1, 2011 Alignment study for ACCESS, no information regarding how areas identified in the study will be addressed. Standards have been updated since this study.	**ACCESS** Validity evidence • Appreciate the work of the framework. Content alignment • Peers found it challenging to follow the development and subsequent alignment issues over time, especially given the changes that occurred within the program. It seems that some of the studies may be outdated and no longer relevant. • 4.7-10, p. 2 Committee notes indicate leadership is aware that this evidence will not meet the alignment requirement of 3.1 • For the alignment studies that are still relevant (despite program changes), what is the plan to address areas for which alignment was moderate, limited, weak, or no? • Alignment based on 2012 Amplification is needed. • 3.1.2 is an example blueprint but there is limited information regarding how the tests should be specified. For example, there is no indication on the blueprint that would indicate the degree of cognitive complexity (linguistic difficulty level) across the tests by standard. Depth and breadth cannot be determined based on the information in the test blueprint provided. Alignment of language demands • Lack of clarity in the relationship between DOK (for standards) and LDL (for items to 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.

determined in test design is appropriate for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.	Alignment of language demands • Evidence 3.1-1, 2011 Alignment study for ACCESS, no information regarding how areas identified in the study will be addressed. Standards have been updated since this study. **Alternate ACCESS** • Peer Review narrative, 3.1, p. 2. "There has not yet been an independent alignment study between the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs assessment and the alternate model performance indicators (AMPIs), nor has there been a linking study examining the relationship between the AMPIs and WIDA's ELP standards."	**Alternate ACCESS** • Evidence for this critical element including plans to address any issues following the 2019 study.

Section 3.1 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

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

ACCESS

- Documentation of adequate alignment between the State's ELP assessment and the ELP standards the assessment is designed to measure in terms of language knowledge and skills, the depth and breadth of the State's ELP standards, across all proficiency levels, domains, and modalities identified therein;
- Documentation of alignment (as defined) between the State's ELP standards and the language demands implied by, or explicitly stated in, the State's academic content standards

Alternate ACCESS

- Evidence of adequate linkage to the State's ELP standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and that the breadth of content and linguistic complexity determined in test design is appropriate for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Linguistic Processes

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap ***the intended language processes*** appropriate for each grade level/grade-band as represented in the State's ELP standards.	**ACCESS** • 3.2-1 & 3.2-2, Writing try outs • 3.2-3, Recommendation log Unclear how this document was used and to which assessments it is relevant. • 2.1-2, DIF analysis by test, relevance to this critical element is not clear. • Not presented in a user-friendly way. Results are buried. **Alternate ACCESS** • 3.2-4 Report from Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Pilot Testing, November 14–23, 2011. "We gained rich, useful data which informed revisions to the test materials." • Evidence is needed for this critical element.	**ACCESS** • While some evidence related to writing was provided, the validity argument related to this critical element was not provided for any domain. • It is unclear how the item tryouts fit into the item development process. • The relationship between the DIF analysis and this critical element is needed. **Alternate ACCESS** • Evidence is needed for this critical element.

Section 3.2 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

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

ACCESS & Alternate ACCESS

- Adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap ***the intended language processes*** appropriate for each grade level/grade-band as represented in the State's ELP 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.

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State's ***ELP standards*** on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.	**ACCESS** • 3.3-1, Relationship between domains, factor analysis supports reporting 4 domain scores • 2.1-2, p. 93-94, Correlation of domain scores • 2.1-5, p. 69-71, Correlation of domain scores **Alternate ACCESS** • 2.1-4, p. 60-61, 70 Higher for Alternate, might be helpful to include an explanation or rationale for why this is reasonable.	**ACCESS & Alternate ACCESS** • Evidence is provided for this critical element. However, explicit statements of how the statistics lend validity evidence is missing. Were there criteria applied to the various statistical analyses included in this critical element, and if so, what were they and what rationales were there for using them to determine the appropriateness of the results?

Section 3.3 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

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

ACCESS & Alternate ACCESS

• Explanation of how the included statistical analyses relate to the validity framework for the 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.

Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.	**ACCESS** • 3.4-8 Bridge study, 2006 • 3.4-9, factor analysis and SEM exploring language skills and math (year unknown) • 3.1-11 Relationship between ACCESS domain scores and NECAP reading, writing, and math assessments from 2009 • Evidence does not include studies that were done with the current version of the assessment. Evidence here should focus on the relationship with "other variables" and should provide information about how the "scores are related as expected." Therefore, much of the cited evidence is not sufficient. **Alternate ACCESS** • 2.1-4 Annual Technical Report for Alternate ACCESS for ELLs, 2015-16 Administration, pp. 60-61. Correlations among Scale Scores by Grade-level Cluster. • No relevant evidence was provided.	**ACCESS** • To fully address this standard, evidence of how the "scores are related as expected to other variables" is required. • This additional evidence would also link the study findings to the validity framework. • Additional studies are needed with the current version of the assessment. **Alternate ACCESS** • Evidence related to this critical element is needed.

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

Section 3.4 Summary Statement
___ No additional evidence is required or _X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: **ACCESS** • Evidence of how the "scores are related as expected to other variables" is required and how this supports the validity argument • Additional studies are needed with the current version of the assessment. **Alternate ACCESS** • Adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.

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

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State's student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State's assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including: • Test reliability of the State's assessments estimated for its student population (***for ELP assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable***); • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State's assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately	**ACCESS** • 2.1-2, provided by domain • No subgroup information	**ACCESS** • While the various statistics (e.g. Cronbach's alpha, decision consistency, TIF) are provided at the composite and domain levels, they are not computed for any subgroups, such as gender and SES, accommodation type. • Accuracy and consistency measures for some composite scores and domains appeared low (see for example 2.1-2 p.345, p.167-168). If the proficiency levels are used to make decisions for these measures, then this needs to be addressed. The Peers' understanding is that states can make decisions regarding the way in which scores are used to make decisions. Does WIDA provide more guidance given the reliability information? • While it may have been done, the Peers could not locate, for computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of ***an EL's English proficiency.*** Given the multistage adaptive administrations, the Peers were looking for evidence that WIDA has considered the reliability of the forms, or pathways, across students. • A large amount of statistical output was provided; however, there was not information or narrative about how this information is interpreted by WIDA and will be used to guide future development work within the program. For example, are there areas for which WIDA will focus efforts and try to improve in the future? For example, this could include TAC notes from the discussion of these statistics.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
precise estimates of ***an EL's English proficiency***.	**Alternate ACCESS** • 2.1.4 Annual Technical Report for Alternate ACCESS, 2015-16, pp. 73-80. "In general, the reliability and the accuracy and consistency of classification of the Overall Composite are very high for Alternate ACCESS for ELLs." • Reliability information for overall composite scores was located (p. 109, 138, 165, 194).	**Alternate ACCESS** • While various reliability estimates (Cronbach's alpha, decisions consistency) are reported for some composite scores and domains, the Peers could not locate the TIFs for the overall composite scores. • While the various statistics (e.g. Cronbach's alpha, decision consistency, TIF) are provided at the composite and domain levels, they are not computed for any subgroups, such as gender and SES, accommodation type. • Accuracy and consistency measures for some composite scores and domains appeared low (see for example 2.1-4 p.96, p.102). If the proficiency levels are used to make decisions for these measures, then this needs to be addressed. The Peers' understanding is that states can make decisions regarding the way in which scores are used to make decisions. Does WIDA provide more guidance given the reliability information? • A large amount of statistical output was provided; however, there was not information or narrative about how this information is interpreted by WIDA and will be used to guide future development work within the program. For example, are there areas for which WIDA will focus efforts and try to improve in the future? For example, this could include TAC notes from the discussion of these statistics. For future submissions and the benefit of the program, it would be beneficial for WIDA to provide the reliability information in a more user-friendly format. Narrative summaries would be helpful to the Peers and other audiences in addition to the various page number references.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
___ No additional evidence is required or _X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: **ACCESS & Alternate ACCESS** • Reliability by various subgroups • Evidence that the use of scores, including composite and domain, is supported by the reliability statistics and then is used to provide direction to states about the appropriate use of scores in high-stakes decisions (e.g. exit decisions). • Evidence that the reliability results are reviewed by WIDA and used to inform ongoing maintenance and development. **ACCESS** • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of ***an EL's English proficiency***. **Alternate ACCESS** • TIFs for overall composite scores		

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

Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
For all State ELP assessments, assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition[2]). ***For ELP assessments,*** the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all EL students and fair across student groups, including ELs with disabilities, in their design, development, and analysis.	**ACCESS** • 2.2-17 The WIDA Accessibility and Accommodations Framework, p. 4. Examples of universal design in ACCESS test items: Test items with multiple modalities, including supporting prompts with appropriate animations and graphics, Embedded scaffolding, tasks broken into "chunks", modeling using task models and guides • 2.2-17, pp. 11-12. ACCESS also incorporates the use of universal tools that are available to all students, designated supports that are features available to any student, and accommodations for students with disabilities. • 4.2.1 Test and item Design Plan for the Annual Summative and On-demand Screener 2013, p. 14 indicates that items will be developed using the principles of universal design. No elaboration. • 4.2.2 Guidelines for the Use of Accommodations, Accessibility Features, and Allowable Test Administration Procedures for the ACCESS for ELLs • 4.2.3 ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Accommodations, Accessibility Features, and Allowable Test Administration Procedures for Students Participating in Either the Online or Paper –Based Test Administrations • 4.2.4 Graphics Guidelines	**ACCESS** • While information is provided about WIDA's approach to universal design and accessibility, there is limited information about the processes employed to implement the principles during development and review. • DIF was considered for gender and Hispanic/non-Hispanic, but this should be done for other subgroups as well (e.g., accommodated/non-accommodated, SES).

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

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

	• 2.1-2 Annual Technical Report for ACCESS for ELLs, DIF analysis for Hispanic/non-Hispanic and gender. Should include other subgroups. **Alternate ACCESS** • 2.1-4 Technical Report for Alternate ACCESS, p. 72-73. Not clear how this relates to the critical element. • 2.2-16, p. 36. Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Accommodation Selections. Only 3 accommodations indicated. Does not address use of braille, eye gaze, and other modes of communication. • Evidence similar to ACCESS submission is not included for Alternate ACCESS.	**Alternate ACCESS** • Braille and alternate modes of communication are not addressed (e.g. eye gaze, assistive technology). • More guidance is needed about the appropriate instructional supports that can be used during the assessment. Recommend that permitted instructional supports be clearly defined for standardized test administration and for accessibility and fairness. • Evidence related to item development, test design, item reviews for Alternate ACCESS is not provided. • DIF was considered for gender and Hispanic/non-Hispanic, but this should be done for other subgroups as well (e.g., accommodation type, SES).

Section 4.2 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

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

ACCESS & Alternate ACCESS

• Evidence of the implementation of universal design and accessibility principles during development and review.
• Additional DIF analyses to include more student subgroups.

Alternate ACCESS

- Evidence related to braille and alternate modes of communication
- Definitions of and guidance for appropriate instructional supports that can be used during the assessment

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

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for ***ELP assessments***, including performance for EL students with high and low levels of English language proficiency and with different proficiency profiles across the domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing.	**ACCESS** • 2.1-2 Annual Technical Report for ACCESS Online ELP Test 2016-17, pp. 95-110. Presents data from online tests that demonstrate students in each grade are represented at each proficiency level. Levels of item difficulty are presented in tables in subsequent pages. • 2.1-2 TIFs are commonly unexpected, for example p.201. • 2.1-5 Annual Technical Report for ACCESS Paper ELP Test 2016-17, pp. 72-91. Presents data from paper tests that demonstrate students in each grade are represented at each proficiency level. **Alternate ACCESS** • 2.1.4 Annual Technical Report for Alternate ACCESS 2015-16, pp. 62-66. Displays tables demonstrating students in each grade are performing at each proficiency level. • 2.1-4 Frequency distributions show potential ceiling effects for example p.93.	**ACCESS & Alternate ACCESS** • Evidence submitted does not support that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for ***ELP assessments***, including performance for EL students with high and low levels of English language proficiency. For future submissions and the benefit of the program, it would be beneficial for WIDA to provide narrative summaries to the Peers and other audiences. For example, the Peers would have found it to be helpful if WIDA would have provided narrative about the unexpected TIFs in 2.1-2 and the frequency distributions in 2.1-4 as well as any additional analyses WIDA conducted in response to these results.

Section 4.3 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

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

ACCESS & Alternate ACCESS

- Evidence submitted does not support that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for ***ELP assessments***, including performance for EL students with high and low levels of English language proficiency.

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

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments (and ***for ELP assessments, any applicable domain or component sub-tests***) that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State's ***ELP standards***. ***For ELP assessments,*** if an English learner has a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains/components (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) such that there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected domain(s)/component(s), the State must provide a description of how it will ensure that the student is assessed in the remaining domain(s)/component(s) in which it is possible to assess the student, and a description of how this will occur.[3]	**ACCESS** *Standardized scoring procedures and protocols* • 4.4-1 Speaking Scoring Scale • 4.4-2 Writing Scoring Scale • 4.4-3 Writing Anchors • 4.4-4 Training for Paper Speaking. 3 online Modules, 2 are required, 1 is recommended. A quiz must be taken to certify the taker may administer and score the speaking test. It is not indicated if the assessment will be accessible to the test administrator if this person does not pass the quiz. • 4.4-5 It is not indicated the audience for this document, how they receive it, or what training is provided in conjunction with receipt of this document. 4.4-6 Not clear how this relates to the critical element. • 4.4-8 Were the recommendations from this study and report implemented? • 2.1-2, pp. 12-15 Raters for Online Speaking and Writing Scoring: Rater qualifications, training, monitoring. Adjacent scores are considered agreement; raters must demonstrate 70% agreement on a qualifying set prior to scoring live responses. What happens when one is anomalous, for example task 6 on p.202? Writing task scoring statistics are questionable. • 2.1.5 Technical Report for ACCESS paper Administration 2016-17, pp. 18-23. Describes scoring procedures for writing scored by DRC and speaking scored by test administrator.	**ACCESS** • The Peers found the claims of 95%+ agreement questionable for writing tasks. • There was no evidence provided about how WIDA makes use of the results, for example, when agreement rates are lower for one task. • 4.4-8 documented that paper scoring of speaking by the student's teacher results in higher scores. Therefore, why is module 3 not required and how is the rating monitored to ensure reliable results? There are recommendations for monitoring raters who administer the speaking test in 4.4-8, but how are these recommendations implemented and monitored? • WIDA provided evidence of four models for states to consider if an English learner has a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains/components (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) such that there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected domain(s)/component(s). States must provide a description of how it will ensure that the student is assessed in the remaining domain(s)/component(s) in which it is possible to assess the student, and a description of how this will occur.

[3] See full reference in regulation, 34 CFR § 200.6(h)(4)(ii) (online at https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=07e168e9e7a6c5931b4549cc15547ee9&mc=true&node=se34.1.200_16&rgn=div8)
Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

	Less than four domains • 4.4-7 Four models are presented to create a composite score when less than four domains are assessed. No recommendations were made, rather these are suggestions of models that the states could use to report a composite score when a student with a disability is assessed in less than four domains. While this situation is considered, there is limited information provided to states to make defensible decisions for these students particularly with regards to the impact on the validity framework. **Alternate ACCESS** *Standardized Scoring Procedures* • 2.1-4 Scripts and directions for scoring are provided in the TAM and are referenced in the TR for Alternate ACCESS. All assessments are scored by the test administrator. • There is no evidence provided that standardized scoring procedures are applied given the local scoring.	**Alternate ACCESS** • There is no evidence of the implementation of standardized scoring procedures. This could include monitoring of test administration, a second scorer in the room during test administration, analyses of scores to identify test irregularities or qualification of scorers. • Definitions of key terms and test administration and scoring procedures (e.g. cueing, attending, approaching, permissible individualized instructional supports that can be used during assessment) are not included which likely leads to inconsistent administration and scoring. • WIDA provided evidence of four models for states to consider if an English learner has a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains/components (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) such that there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected domain(s)/component(s). States must provide a description of how it will ensure that the student is assessed in the remaining domain(s)/component(s) in which it is possible to assess the student, and a description of how this will occur.

Section 4.4 Summary Statement		
___ No additional evidence is required or _X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: **ACCESS** • The definition of exact agreement for writing is not recommended. This should be redefined and then analyses redone. • Evidence that the recommendations about the paper speaking test are implemented and monitored. **Alternate ACCESS** • Evidence of the implementation of standardized scoring procedures and monitoring and to include definitions of key terms and test administration and scoring procedures. **ACCESS & Alternate ACCESS** • Evidence that if an English learner has a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains/components (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) such that there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected domain(s)/component(s), the State must provide a description of how it will ensure that the student is assessed in the remaining domain(s)/component(s) in which it is possible to assess the student, and a description of how this will occur. (This is expected from States.)		

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

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
If the State administers multiple forms of ***ELP assessments*** within or across grade-spans, ELP levels, or school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State's ***ELP standards*** and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across settings.	**ACCESS** • 2.1-2 p.54 ACCESS Online. Equating summary for year to year analysis. Why isn't Listening refreshed? • 2.1-5 ACCESS paper. Based on ACCESS Online. No equating for Reading and Listening. Aren't the ACCESS 1.0 data out of date? **Alternate ACCESS** • 2.1-4 Alternate ACCESS. No equating. Same items since field test in 2013?	**ACCESS** • The evidence did not include sufficient information for Listening. Specifically, a rationale for why the test was not refreshed, a plan to refresh in the future and an explanation of the year to year use of item parameters (e.g. were item parameters for the domain used from previous years?). • The evidence did not include sufficient information for the paper version of Reading and Listening. Specifically, a rationale for why equating was not done. • No evidence included to demonstrate that the content representativeness of the anchor item sets are considered. Where applicable, a rationale for the use of anchor items over time and potential refreshment. **Alternate ACCESS** • The evidence does not include a rationale for using the same items each year since 2013 and how this does not threaten the validity of the scores.

Section 4.5 Summary Statement
___ No additional evidence is required or _X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: **ACCESS** • Additional evidence that the Listening domain yields consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across settings • Rationales for why equating is not done for the paper versions of the Reading and Listening domains • Additional considerations and rationales related to the anchor item sets. **Alternate ACCESS** • Rationales for why item refreshment is not done and how this does not impact the validity of the scores.

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

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery), grade level, or school year, the State: • 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.	**ACCESS** Online and paper comparability • Comparability studies done, Evidence 4.6-1, 4.6-2, 4.6-6, 4.6-12 • Results shared with TAC, Evidence 4.6-4, 4.6-5, 4.6-8 Based on input from TAC implemented equipercentile equating, Evidence 4.6-10, 4.6-11, 4.6-12, 4.6-13 • Will continue to monitor **Alternate ACCESS** N/A	**ACCESS** • Given the effect sizes found in 4.6-6, there is limited evidence of the degree to which these differences are explained by mode or if other factors may have contributed (e.g. impact of leniency in local scoring for speaking). • The narrative in this section was helpful in understanding how this critical element has been addressed over time including follow up actions taken after studies.

Section 4.6 Summary Statement

_X__ No additional evidence is required or

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

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

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State: • Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and • Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State's website.	**ACCESS** System for monitoring, maintaining, improving • Regular TAC meetings • Subcommittees • Concern about the ability to track all of the issues and address areas of improvement over time. Given the size and complexity of the program and given the evidence submitted for various critical elements, WIDA has not demonstrated that the various analyses and results are tracked over time. Made public • Evidence is not provided. **Alternate ACCESS** • No evidence provided.	**ACCESS** System for monitoring, maintain, improving • The TAC and subcommittees address many issues or topics; however, more broadly for the program, there appears to be a gap between the results of analyses and studies and the way in which that information is used to improve the program. These have been noted in other critical elements for specific analyses and studies. There is no evidence of a complete system (e.g., action plan, timelines, annual work plan).

Section 4.7 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

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

ACCESS & Alternate ACCESS

- 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 (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments),
- Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State's website is not provided.

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students[4] with disabilities in the State's assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student's IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student's individual abilities and needs. • ***For ELP assessments,*** policies that require the inclusion of an EL with a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) such that there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected component (the State must assess the student's English language proficiency based on the remaining components in which it is possible to assess the student).	**ACCESS** 2.2-16 Participation Guidelines, p.4, includes information for students who are deaf **Alternate ACCESS** 2.2-16 Recommended Participation Guidelines, p.27	**ACCESS & Alternate ACCESS** This critical element is primarily addressed by states and informed by the information provided by WIDA.

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

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

Section 5.1 Summary Statement
___ No additional evidence is required or _X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: **ACCESS & Alternate ACCESS** • Evidence to be provided by states.

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• Note: This critical element does not apply to ELP assessments, as the requirements only apply to the inclusion of ELs in **academic assessments**.		

Section 5.2 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
- [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]

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

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State: • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs; • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student's need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. • Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.	**ACCESS** <u>Appropriate accommodations available</u> • 2.2-16 Accessibility and Accommodations Supplement, pp. 13-24. Sixteen accommodations with descriptions provided • pp. 30-32. Procedures to transcribe and scribe. • It is notable that there is a lack of specific qualifications for who can be a test administrator, transcriber and scribe. • 2.2-17 WIDA Accessibility and Accommodations Framework • 2.3-1, 15. Test Administration Manual, lists allowable test accommodations. • 5.3-1 Screenshot of contents of online training modules; accommodations are included • 5.3-2 Screenshot. Not clear how this applies to accommodations • 5.3-6 SEA Accessibility and Accommodations Policies 2018-19. A template for SEA-specific policies. Do SEAs use this? <u>Bullet 2</u> • 5.3-3 Findings from Focus Groups. This study focused on the use of technology and was limited in size. Several recommendations were made related to technology use; did not address alteration of construct being assessed or meaningful interpretation of results. • 5.3-4 Investigating K-12 ELs Use of Universal Tools Embedded in Online Language Assessments. Did not address accommodations, only universal tools. • Evidence here is limited.	**ACCESS** • Evidence that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student's need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. WIDA provided a sample document in support of this, but the process will be implemented by the state. • It is unclear if WIDA requires all states to implement accommodations as outlined in the provided evidence or if states are permitted to alter these.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Exceptional requests • 5.3-7 Unique Accommodations Request Form – SEAs may adopt this form for use Accommodations do not deny swd or ELS opportunity to participate or benefit from participation in assessment • Not addressed directly • No evidence that they are denied. **Alternate ACCESS** • 2.2-16, p. 36. Only three accommodations are listed in the Accessibility and Accommodations Supplement. The use of braille, various response modes, etc. are not identified as accommodations. "Individualized instructional supports" are permitted, but these are not defined. • 2.3-1, p. 143 "During the administration of Alternate ACCESS for ELLs, individualized instructional supports that are used by teachers in everyday classroom instruction may be used to meet individual student needs, *only if they do change what is being measured on the assessment.*" Likely a typo. Permissable individualized instructional supports for use in the assessment need to be defined.	**Alternate ACCESS** • Evidence for all aspects of this critical element are needed. • Evidence that students who need braille and/or alternate response modes are able to participate. • It is strongly recommended that the permissible individualized instructional supports be identified and described in the TAM and/or test administration script to ensure validity of test scores and reduce occurrence of test irregularities.

Section 5.3 Summary Statement
___ No additional evidence is required or _X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: **ACCESS** • Evidence that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student's need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Evidence of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. (Provided by states) **Alternate ACCESS** • Evidence is needed for all aspects of this critical element.

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

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are: • Consistent with the State's policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student's disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student's IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures; • Monitored for administrations of all required ELP assessments, and AELPA.		See states

Section 5.4 Summary Statement
___ No additional evidence is required or _X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: **ACCESS & Alternate ACCESS** • Evidence to be provided by states.

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

SECTION 6: ELP ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
For ELP standards: • The State adopted ELP achievement standards that address the different proficiency levels of ELs; • If the State has developed alternate ELP achievement standards, it has adopted them only for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who cannot participate in the regular ELP assessment even with appropriate accommodations.		See states

Section 6.1 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

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

ACCESS & Alternate ACCESS

• Evidence to be provided by states.

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

Critical Element 6.2 – ELP Achievement Standards Setting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting: • ***ELP achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate ELP achievement standards***, such that: o Cut scores are developed for every grade/grade band, content domain/language domain, and/or composite for which proficiency-level scores are reported.	**ACCESS** • 6.1-1 Assessment Proficiency Level Scores Standard Setting Project Report. This report documents in detail the standard setting plan and rationale for the methodologies, processes used to identify and select panelists, the training provided panelists, and how the final recommendations were determined. The standard setting plan was reviewed by an outside expert; suggestions were made for refining some of the processes. • 6.1-2 Research Memorandum: Recommended Cuts. Standard setting and subsequent analysis resulted in recommendations for cut scores for grades K-12 for the four domains at six proficiency levels as well as composite scores for each proficiency-level score. **Alternate ACCESS** • 6.1-3, p. 12-15. Using Angoff Yes/No method, cut scores for four domain scores and four composite scores were established. • p. 12. The same four cut scores are used for all grades by domain. • 2.1-4 p. 5-6 "As discussed in 1.3.3, because the test blueprints across grade-level clusters by domain are the same, and the Alternate ELP levels and AMPIs for the test tasks across grade-level clusters pose nearly identical linguistic challenges and differ only in the topics presented, common cut scores were set across grade-level clusters by domain."	**ACCESS** Adequate evidence provided of standards setting. **Alternate ACCESS** • 6.1-3 p. 12 "…it appears more appropriate to use the same cut scores for all grade clusters (from grades 1 to 12) by domain. In this way, it will easier to detect growth in English language proficiency from year to year for this population of English learners." The Peers disagree with this approach and feel the same philosophy or theoretical understanding of language development be applied across ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS unless a divergence is supported by the research. This approach calls into question the alignment of the Alternate ACCESS to the ELPs and to the academic content standards. • The Peers noted that the number of cut scores established during standard setting did not correspond

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		to the number of performance levels (despite 6 levels, only 4 cut scores established during standard setting). In 6.4-3, a footnote in the sample score report states that, "… the Listening, Speaking and Reading domains do not include test items targeting proficiency levels P3 and above; therefore, students cannot demonstrate English proficiency at levels P3 and higher…" How was the P3 cut score determined for Writing? And why does WIDA feel that it is reasonable and defensible to exclude the higher level of performance from most domains? • To address the concerns cited here, WIDA should have Cut scores that are developed for every grade/grade band, content domain/language domain, and/or composite for which proficiency-level scores are reported

Section 6.2 Summary Statement

_X__ No additional evidence is required for ACCESS

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

Alternate ACCESS

- Cut scores are developed for every grade/grade band, content domain/language domain, and/or composite for which proficiency-level scores are reported.

Critical Element 6.3 –Aligned ELP Achievement Standards

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
***For ELP achievement standards*:** The State has ensured that ELP assessment results are expressed in terms that are clearly aligned with the State's ELP standards, and its ELP performance-level descriptors. If the State has adopted alternate ELP achievement standards for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate ELP achievement standards should be linked to the State's grade-level/grade-band ELP standards, and should reflect professional judgment of the highest ELP achievement standards possible for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.	**ACCESS** Alignment with ELP Standards and PLDs • 6.1-1 Proficiency Level Scores Standard Setting Project, pp. 26-40 • 6.4-2 Interpretive Guide includes performance level descriptors • It is not clear that the citations provided relate to this critical element. **Alternate ACCESS** <u>Alternate ELP achievement standards are linked to State's grade-level/grade-band ELP standards</u> • 2.1-4, p. 5 "The goal of the Standard Setting Study was to interpret performances on the Alternate ACCESS operational field test form in terms of the WIDA ELD Standards, AMPIs, and the WIDA Alternate ELP levels." • 2.1-4, p. 3 "These language proficiency levels are thoroughly embedded in the WIDA ELD Standards in a two-pronged fashion. First, they appear in the **performance definitions**. According to the WIDA ELD Standards, the performance definitions provide a global overview of the stages of the language acquisition process. As such, they complement the **Alternate Model Performance Indicators** (AMPIs) for each language proficiency level (see the next paragraph for further description of the AMPIs). Second, the language proficiency levels of the WIDA ELD Standards are fully embedded in the accompanying	**ACCESS** • The Peers could not locate evidence to demonstrate that the ELP standards were referenced during the development of the performance level descriptors. **Alternate ACCESS** • Peer Review narrative, 3.1, p. 2. "There has not yet been an independent alignment study between the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs assessment and the alternate model performance indicators (AMPIs), nor has there been a linking study examining the relationship between the AMPIs and WIDA's ELP standards." • Evidence that the achievement standards reflect professional judgment of the highest ELP achievement standards possible for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	AMPIs, which exemplify the Standards. The AMPIs describe the expectations for ELLs with significant cognitive disabilities for each of the four **Standards,** at the four different **grade-level clusters**, across four **language domains**, and at each of the **language proficiency levels**. The sequence of these five AMPIs together describes a logical progression and accumulation of skills on the path from the lowest level of ELP to full proficiency for academic success. This progression is called a 'strand.'" However, based on the statement below, (above?)evidence has yet to be established that there is a link between the AMPIs and WIDAs ELP Standards.	

Section 6.3 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

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

ACCESS

- Evidence to demonstrate that the ELP standards were referenced during the development of the performance level descriptors

Alternate ACCESS

- Evidence that the alternate ELP achievement standards [are] linked to the State's grade-level/grade-band ELP standards, and reflect professional judgment of the highest ELP achievement standards possible for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting

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

The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.
 	
The State reports to the public its assessment results on ***English language proficiency for all ELs including the number and percentage of ELs attaining ELP***.
 	
For the ***ELP assessment***, the State provides coherent and timely information about each student's attainment of the State's ELP standards to parents that:
• Reports the ***ELs' English proficiency*** in terms of the State's grade level/grade-band ELP standards (including performance-level descriptors);
• Are provided in an understandable and uniform format;
• Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian;
	ACCESS
	
	WIDA provides score reports.
	State determines timelines.
	
	<u>Written in a language parents and guardians can understand, or are orally translated</u>
	• 6.4-2 Spring 2018 Interpretive Guide for Score Reports K-12, p. 16. Translations are available in 46 languages; a translated report should accompany the official report in English. List of languages and a Spanish translation is in Appendix B.
	• A reference could not be located about oral translation.
	<u>Provided in a format accessible to a parent with disability</u>
	• A reference could not be located.
	
	Alternate ACCESS
	
	<u>Student reports include ELs English proficiency in terms of State's grade level/grade-band ELP standards including PLDs</u>
	• 6.4-3, p. 14. Individual student's scores for each language domain, and four composites: Oral Language, Literacy, Comprehension, and Overall Score. Reported scores:
	  ○ Raw scores in the Listening and Reading domains
	  ○ scale scores
	  ○ confidence bands
	  ○ language proficiency levels
		ACCESS & Alternate ACCESS
		
		Several aspects of this critical element will need to be addressed by states.
		
		Alternate ACCESS
		
		The performance level descriptors do not appear to be included in the student score report as required by this critical element (6.4-3 p. 19).

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.	• p. 19 Example of a student report with proficiency levels for each domain, oral language, literacy, comprehension, and an overall composite score. • On the example score report, it may be less confusing to report N/A or leave cells blank for Cue C on Listening which was not applicable rather than reporting 0 and 0%. • P. 29 Appendix A: Alternate ACCESS Performance Level Descriptors. Figure A-1 Individual Student Report (p.3) <u>Written in a language parents and guardians can understand, or are orally translated</u> • 6.4-3 Spring 2018 Interpretive Guide for Score Reports Grades 1-12, p. 15. Translations are available in 46 languages; a translated report should accompany the official report in English. • A reference could not be located about oral translation. <u>Provided in a format accessible to a parent with disability</u> • A reference could not be located	

Section 6.4 Summary Statement
___ No additional evidence is required or _X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: **ACCESS & Alternate ACCESS** • The State reports to the public its assessment results on ***English language proficiency for all ELs including the number and percentage of ELs attaining ELP***. (provided by the State) • The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates **timely** interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public. (provided by the State) • the State provides coherent and timely information about each student's attainment of the State's ELP standards to parents that are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian (provided by the State) • the State provides coherent and timely information about each student's attainment of the State's ELP standards to parents that upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent. (provided by the State) **Alternate ACCESS** • Inclusion of performance level descriptors on student score reports

SECTION 7: DOES NOT APPLY TO ELP ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW

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

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

April State ELP Assessment Peer Review Notes

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

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

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS 4
Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of ELP Standards for All English Learners 4
Critical Element 1.2 – Coherent and Progressive ELP Standards that Correspond to the State's Academic Content Standards 5
Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments 8
Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments .. 9
Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments 10

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 11
Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development 11
Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development 14
Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration 16
Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration 21
Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security 22
Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 24

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY 25
Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content 25
Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Linguistic Processes 27
Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 28
Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables 29

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER 31
Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability 31
Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility 34
Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum 36
Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring 37
Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 40
Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 42
Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 43

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 44
Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 44
Critical Element 5.2 – DOES NOT APPLY to ELP Assessment Peer Review 46
Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations 47
Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

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

..... 50

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

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

Critical Element 6.2 – ELP Achievement Standards Setting 53

Critical Element 6.3 –Aligned ELP Achievement Standards 55

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting 57

SECTION 7: DOES NOT APPLY TO ELP ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW 59

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
For English language proficiency (ELP) standards: The State formally adopted K-12 ELP standards for all ELs in public schools in the State.	https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/integrated/title_iii_information_nh.htm#widaccss (page 7 of state submission document)	The state's website states that "In 2004, the New Hampshire State Board of Education adopted the WIDA English language proficiency standards." There is no further evidence provided. Preferred evidence would be a document such as minutes of the relevant Board meeting, letter from the state superintendent, or other formal evidence of adopting the standards.

Section 1.1 Summary Statement

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

- Provide letter from superintendent, document from Board meeting where standards were adopted, or other evidence showing formal adoption of standards. Website notation does not demonstrate formal adoption.

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
For ELP standards: The ELP standards: • are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing; • address the different proficiency levels of ELs; and align to the State academic content standards (see definition[5]). The ELP standards must contain language proficiency expectations that reflect the language needed for ELs to acquire and demonstrate their achievement of the knowledge and skills identified in the State's academic content standards appropriate to each grade-	https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/integrated/title_iii_information_nh.htm#widaccss https://www.education.nh.gov/essa/documents/nh_state_plan_final_011918.pdf https://www.education.nh.gov/state_board/common_core_testing.htm Refer to Consortium provided evidence for the following: 1.2-1 Understanding the WIDA English Proficiency Standards K-12 Figure 2A – The English Language Proficiency Standards 1.2-2 English Language Proficiency Standards K-5 1.2-3 2012 Amplification of the English Language Development Standards K-12: Page 3, WIDA English Language Development Standards Page 3, Figure A, WIDA Standards Framework Page 4, Figure B, The English Language Development Standards Page 5, Performance Definitions Page 5, Figure C, The Features of Academic Language Page 10, Figure I, Doman and Levels of Proficiency 1.2-4 Alignment Study Between the Common Core State Standards in ELA and Mathematics and the WIDA Proficiency Standards Page 6, Assessment to Standards Alignment Methods Page 7, Standards-to-Standards Alignment Criteria Page 10 – Linking Study Page 11 – Standards Aligned to this Study Page 18 – Language Arts Alignment Results Page 29 – Summary of Language Arts Page 30- Mathematics Alignment Results Page 35 – Summary of Mathematics Findings Page 90 – Appendix B, Cases of linked and non-linked standards for mathematics at grade cluster 6-8 1.2-5 – WIDA Consortium Response to the Alignment Study Results Please refer to pages 15-19	Consortium-provided documentation shows evidence of four domains and different proficiency levels, as well as some information about alignment to CCSS. State-provided links show work that the state has done to align WIDA performance levels to state standards. There appear to be two versions of alignment work – one with alignments to older NH standards and one aligned to CCSS. Newer versions don't seem to cover all grade levels (e.g. grades 1,4,6,7,) or all subjects (science seems to be missing, though there is reading/writing in science). It is also not clear from the website if NH is a Common Core-only state, or have they amended their content standards? Are the CCSS the relevant state academic content standards for ELA and math? State should provide clear evidence that its adopted ELP standards align to its academic content standards.

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
level/grade-band in at least reading/language arts, mathematics, and science.	Reference RG 6, RG 7, RG 9, RG 10 Page i, EL Standards, Page iii, Performance Definitions	

Section 1.2 Summary Statement

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

- Clarify if New Hampshire uses Common Core ELA and math standards or if they have state-specific versions (because it appears their alignment work is done to CCSS standards)
- Clarify which alignment work is the correct/most up-to-date version and if they have completed alignment work to all grades and subjects (ELA, math, science, grades K-12)
- See peer review notes for Consortium-provided evidence for additional evidence needed regarding alignment to CCSS (if these are the relevant state academic 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.

Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State's assessment system includes an ***annual general and alternate ELP assessment*** (aligned with State ELP standards) administered to: • All ELs in grades K-12.	https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/accountability/index.htm https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/index.htm https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/ells.htm	State's evidence establishes that the State's assessment system includes a general ELP assessment that should be administered to all ELs in grades K-12. However, it is unclear if ELs with significant cognitive disabilities that cannot take the general ELP assessment are included in the State's ELP assessment results. There is evidence that points to an AELPA on the State's website, but there are no related documents or evidence that directs LEAs in NH to administer an AELPA. The State will need to provide evidence that is including these ELs in Statewide ELP assessment. Furthermore, the WIDA Alternate ACCESS is not available for students in kindergarten.

Section 1.3 Summary Statement

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

- Evidence that the State includes ELs with the most significant cognitive disabilities in grades K-12 in Statewide ELP 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.

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• The State has policies that require the inclusion ***of all public elementary and secondary ELs in the State's ELP assessment***, including ELs with disabilities.	https://wida.wisc.edu/assess/alt-access https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/integrated/esol/documents/esol_guidance_revised_9-8-15.pdf https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/ells.htm https://wida.wisc.edu/sites/default/files/resource/Alt-Access-Participation-Criteria-Diagram.pdf	State's evidence establishes that the State's assessment system includes all ELs in grades K-12, including ELs with disabilities. The exception is that is unclear if ELs with significant cognitive disabilities that cannot take the general ELP assessment are included in the State's ELP assessment results. There is evidence that points to an AELPA on the State's website, but there are no related documents or evidence that directs LEAs in NH to administer an AELPA. The State will need to provide evidence that is including these ELs in Statewide ELP assessment, either through the general ELP assessment or an AELPA.

Section 1.4 Summary Statement

X As also noted in critical element 1.3, the following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Evidence that the State includes ELs with the most significant cognitive disabilities in grades K-12 in Statewide ELP assessment.

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
If the State has developed or amended challenging ***ELP*** standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with: • State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education). • Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas). • Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State. • Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents.	The State adopted ELP standards prior to the passage of the ESSA, so this critical element does not apply.	This critical element does not apply to NH.
Section 1.5 Summary Statement		
The State adopted ELP standards prior to the passage of the ESSA, so this critical element does not apply.		

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State's test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to ***the depth and breadth of the State's ELP standards,*** and includes: • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of ***the State's ELP standards***, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. • Processes to ensure that the ELP assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in ***the State's ELP standards*** and reflects appropriate inclusion of the range of complexity found in the standards. • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and intended uses and interpretations of results. • If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the	State submission on page 9 cites "Coordinated Evidence submitted by WIDA" but chart on page 5 suggests there will be state evidence provided.	Peers recommend the state consider providing additional evidence on state-specific aspects of purpose and intended use of results. State should also clarify if it intended to provide state evidence or if this was an error in the state submission document. In addition, the state should refer to the peer review notes for the Consortium-provided evidence.

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

student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting. If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be *entirely* administered through a portfolio.		
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • Clarify if state intends to rely on Consortium-provided evidence alone • Provide information about intended uses of assessments and interpretations of results within the state context • Please refer to peer review of Consortium-provided evidence for additional evidence needed on this element		

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to: • Assess student English language proficiency based on the ***State's ELP standards*** in terms of content and language processes.	State submission on page 10 cites "Coordinated Evidence submitted by WIDA" but chart on page 5 suggests there will be state evidence provided.	The state should either provide additional evidence on state-specific aspects of item development or clarify that it is relying solely on Consortium-provided evidence for this element.

Section 2.2 Summary Statement

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

- Clarify if state is relying on Consortium-provided evidence alone or if additional state-specific information is available or will be provided
- Refer to peer review notes on Consortium-provided evidence for additional evidence needed

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

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State: • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.	Coordinated Evidence: 2.3-1 WIDA Test Administration Manual Listed but not accessible to state peer reviewers: 2.3-2, ACCESS Paper and Pencil Training for Test Administrators 2.3-3, Online Test Administrators Script grades 4-12 2.3-4, Copy of the October 3, 2018 email of WIDA Wednesday - NH elects to have this email sent directly to all educators who are active in the DRC testing portal so that they receive these timely updates from WIDA at the same time as the SEA. 2.3-5, Site Technology Readiness Checklist for Deploying WIDA Online Assessments with Timeline 2.3-6, WIDA Test Administrator Troubleshooting guide 2.3-7, WIDA Test Policy Handbook for State Education Agencies 2018-19 State Evidence: https://wida.wisc.edu/sites/default/files/checklists/NH-online-checklist.pdf https://wida.wisc.edu/sites/default/files/checklists/NH-paper-checklist.pdf https://wida.wisc.edu/sites/default/files/id-placement/NH-ID-Placement-Guidance.pdf https://wida.wisc.edu/memberships/consortium/nh https://nh.portal.airast.org/core/fileparse.php/2173/urlt/NH-SAS-Accommodations-Guide_18-19.pdf https://wida.wisc.edu/sites/default/files/resource/ACCESS-Accessibility-Accommodations-Supplement.pdf	State-specific checklists and Consortium manuals show evidence of plans for standardized procedures. The checklist links describe guides for administering ACCESS for ELLs Online and on paper, including steps related to Kindergarten and Alternate ACCESS assessments. Each checklist highlights all tasks that need to be completed before, during, and after testing within a school or district. The links to administer the assessment with accommodations (Assessment Accommodations Guide and its Supplement) provide evidence of accommodations available to all students, including English learners identified with a disability, who are taking either the computer-based or paper-based assessments. They also provide information on administrative considerations and Universal Tools. State should clarify if this is the full set of procedures and how or if they are codified in policy. For example, could they be changed from year to year depending on who manages assessment? State should clarify how they communicate about standardized procedures. It appears information about test administration is available to test coordinators and administrators through the WIDA portal; it is unclear if any is pushed out or mailed to administrators to ensure they receive or view it. Checklists show that test administrators are required to complete training and have links to online training modules; no information is provided on numbers of test administrators who actually completed training and administered assessments or who test administrators can be. It also is not clear if test administration training includes information on how to administer tests with

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

	https://portal.wida.us/client/index.aspx - This link provides all certified ACCESS test administrators access to the training they need to take in order to effectively administer the test.	accommodations (though there is information on what accommodations are and how to assign them in an online testing system). A technology-readiness checklist is linked in the state-specific checklist but is inaccessible, so it is not possible to assess those requirements or contingency plans for technology challenges.

Section 2.3 Summary Statement

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

- Clarify if the evidence provided by state and Consortium is the full set of standardized procedures and how/if they are codified in policy.
- Provide evidence of how established standardized procedures for testing and use of accommodations (e.g. manuals, checklists, training documents) are ***communicated*** to districts and from district staff to educators who will actually administer assessments.
    - For example, does the state send links, emails, or hard copies of documents? Does the state (or Consortium) hold information meetings or webinars to communicate this information or demonstrate how to access information? How does the state build awareness of the established standardized procedures?
- Provide evidence of established procedures to ensure that all appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments and how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all EL students with disabilities
    - For example, does the state track who administered assessments and whether or not they attended training? Is it possible to administer a test without having attended training? Does the training include information on how to administer with accommodations?
- Provide evidence of its technology-related requirements and contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during testing
- Please refer to peer review of Consortium-provided evidence for additional evidence needed on this element

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general ELP assessments and the AELPA.	https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/documents/nh_statewide_assessment_monitoring_guide_final_032019.pdf	The State provided evidence of procedures for monitoring of ELP assessments. The State did provide evidence of a systematic plan for selecting schools for monitoring visits. There was evidence of guidance given to LEAs about conducting local monitoring of ELP test administrations. However, no evidence was provided (e.g., a redacted observation report, a summary of monitoring activities) that monitoring of ELP test administration had occurred.

Section 2.4 Summary Statement

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

- Evidence that monitoring of ELP test administration was implemented (e.g., a summary of monitoring activities, or redacted samples of completed test monitoring visits).

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

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
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: • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State's assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. • Application of test security procedures to the general ELP assessments and the AELPA.	https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/documents/test_security_assurances_2019.pdf 2018-19 WIDA District and School Test Coordinator Manual Section 2, 2.2, page 10; Section 3, 3.6, page 50	Page 5 claims multistate evidence will be provided and there is a reference to WIDA manuals (which are inaccessible from this part of the state submission). Page 12 of the state submission points to a state website. The page appears to be a test security agreement for personnel to sign, but there are no associated policy documents requiring this form or approved policy documents supporting the rules of the agreement. It is unclear how exactly this document is disseminated and tracked to be sure that all relevant individuals have signed. Peers could not find information about (1) periodic reports of irregularities and how State responds and tracks, (2) more explicit procedures concerning how State addresses security incidents in the context of English learners (e.g., reopen, restart, invalidate, etc.), (3) how State communicates with schools and district concerning irregularities, and (4) procedures for detecting, remediating and/or investigating test irregularities.

Section 2.5 Summary Statement

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

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

- Provide evidence of explicit procedures concerning how state addresses security incidents in the context of English learners (e.g., reopen, restart, invalidate, etc.)
- Provide information on how test security documents are disseminated, tracked, and monitored to be sure that all relevant individuals are aware of test security requirements
- Provide evidence of the investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities to include forensic analysis and plans to address findings
- Provide evidence of remediation following any test security incidents involving the state's ELP assessment
- Provide evidence of periodic reports of irregularities and how state responds and tracks
- Provide evidence of how State communicates with schools and district concerning irregularities
- Provide evidence of requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration (it appears to be every other year)
- Please refer to peer review of Consortium-provided evidence for additional evidence needed on this element

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
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: • To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.	Consortium Evidence: 2.6-1, 2.6-2, 2.6-3, 2.6-4 State evidence: Refer to: Table 1 of the NH DOE Data Use and Student Privacy, page 5. Refer to page 8 of the NH DOE Data Use and Student Privacy Guide 1 NH DOE Data Use and Student Privacy. https://www.education.nh.gov/data/documents/minimum-standards-privacy.pdf 2 NH FERPA99 30 Subpart D.docx Refer to page 8 of the NH DOE Data Use and Student Privacy Guide	The state-provided documentation offers evidence of general policies and procedures related to protecting personally identifiable data and other student information, but these do not appear to be state policies or procedures (they appear to be informational). The link to the "Minimum Standards for Privacy and Security of Student and Employee Data. New Hampshire Department of Education" enumerates the systems, policies and procedures for protecting the integrity of student and employee data, including such features as access control, identification and authentication, storage, risk assessment, and several others. The embedded NH DOE Data Use and Student Privacy document provides evidence of procedures to collect and protect personally identifiable student-level data via secure systems as well as guidelines for the use of systems and of data. This includes a definition of the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for student groups. The NH FERPA document provides evidence of policies and procedures related to the disclosure of protected, private data, record keeping requirements concerning requests and disclosures (pp. 1-15) State-provided documentation does not address confidentiality of test materials (though test security is described in critical element 2.5). It is unclear from the documentation provided how the Consortium or the state protects information during test administration and reporting of results (for example, how is information transferred from WIDA to state to districts for reporting? How do districts maintain and disseminate this information to parents and students while maintaining privacy?). No information was provided regarding the minimum number

		of students required for reporting in this particular documentation.

Section 2.6 Summary Statement

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

- Provide adopted policy or procedure documents that demonstrate the state has policies and procedures to:
  - To protect integrity and confidentiality of test materials
  - To secure and protect student-level data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results (information related to who is involved in handling WIDA data and how data are protected by all parties, including during handoffs, should be provided)
    - Evidence should include guidelines for districts and schools about ELP assessment data
  - To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number and percentage of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State's validity evidence includes evidence that: ***The State's ELP assessments*** measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State's ELP standards, including: • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State's ELP assessment and the ELP standards the assessment is designed to measure in terms of language knowledge and skills, the depth and breadth of the State's ELP standards, across all proficiency levels, domains, and modalities identified therein; • Documentation of alignment (as defined) between the State's ELP standards and the language demands implied by, or explicitly stated in, the State's academic content standards; • If the State administers an AELPA aligned with alternate ELP achievement standards, the assessment shows adequate linkage to the State's ELP standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and that the breadth of content and linguistic complexity	Coordinated Evidence submitted by WIDA	

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

determined in test design is appropriate for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.		

Section 3.1 Summary Statement

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

- Please refer to peer review of Consortium-provided evidence for additional evidence needed

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Linguistic Processes

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap ***the intended language processes*** appropriate for each grade level/grade-band as represented in the State's ELP standards.	Coordinated Evidence submitted by WIDA	

Section 3.2 Summary Statement

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

- Please refer to peer review of Consortium-provided evidence for additional evidence needed

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

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State's ***ELP standards*** on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.	Coordinated Evidence submitted by WIDA	

Section 3.3 Summary Statement

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

- Please refer to peer review of Consortium-provided evidence for additional evidence needed

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

Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.	Coordinated Evidence submitted by WIDA	

Section 3.4 Summary Statement

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

- Please refer to peer review of Consortium-provided evidence for additional evidence needed

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

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State's student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State's assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including: • Test reliability of the State's assessments estimated for its student population (***for ELP assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable***); • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State's assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately	Coordinated Evidence submitted by WIDA	No state-specific evidence 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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
precise estimates of ***an EL's English proficiency***.		
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
_x__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • Please refer to peer review of Consortium-provided evidence for additional evidence needed		

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

Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
For all State ELP assessments, assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition[6]). ***For ELP assessments,*** the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all EL students and fair across student groups, including ELs with disabilities, in their design, development, and analysis.	Coordinated Evidence submitted by WIDA	No state-specific evidence provided.

Section 4.2 Summary Statement

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

- Please refer to peer review of Consortium-provided evidence for additional evidence needed

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

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

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for ***ELP assessments***, including performance for EL students with high and low levels of English language proficiency and with different proficiency profiles across the domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing.	Coordinated Evidence submitted by WIDA	No state-specific evidence provided.

Section 4.3 Summary Statement

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

- Please refer to peer review of Consortium-provided evidence for additional evidence needed

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

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments (and ***for ELP assessments, any applicable domain or component sub-tests***) that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State's ***ELP standards***. ***For ELP assessments,*** if an English learner has a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains/components (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) such that there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected domain(s)/component(s), the State must provide a description of how it will ensure that the student is assessed in the remaining domain(s)/component(s) in which it is possible to assess the student, and a description of how this will occur.[7]	Coordinated Evidence submitted by WIDA	No state-specific evidence provided.

Section 4.4 Summary Statement

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

- Please refer to peer review of Consortium-provided evidence for additional evidence needed

[7] See full reference in regulation, 34 CFR § 200.6(h)(4)(ii) (online at https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=07e168e9e7a6c5931b4549cc15547ee9&mc=true&node=se34.1.200_16&rgn=div8)
Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
If the State administers multiple forms of ***ELP assessments*** within or across grade-spans, ELP levels, or school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State's ***ELP standards*** and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across settings.	Coordinated Evidence submitted by WIDA	No state-specific evidence provided.

Section 4.5 Summary Statement

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

- Please refer to peer review of Consortium-provided evidence for additional evidence needed

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

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery), grade level, or school year, the State: • 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.	Coordinated Evidence submitted by WIDA	No state-specific evidence provided.

Section 4.6 Summary Statement

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

- Please refer to peer review of Consortium-provided evidence for additional evidence needed

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

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State: • Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and • Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State's website.	Coordinated Evidence submitted by WIDA	No state-specific evidence provided.

Section 4.7 Summary Statement

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

- Make evidence of the technical quality of its assessment public, including on its website
- Provide evidence of how state will, in collaboration with the Consortium, monitor, maintain, and improve the quality of its assessments (for example, does the state of Consortium solicit input from technical reviewers, from policymakers or other stakeholders about quality of assessments?)
- Please refer to peer review of Consortium-provided evidence for additional evidence needed

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

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students[8] with disabilities in the State's assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student's IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student's individual abilities and needs. • ***For ELP assessments,*** policies that require the inclusion of an EL with a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) such that there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected component (the State must assess the student's English language proficiency based on the remaining	https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special_ed/englishlearnerswithdisabilities.htm (slides 4,6,7,10) https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/ells.htm https://wida.wisc.edu/assess/alt-access (Please refer to Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Participation Criteria Decision Tree) https://portal.wida.us/get.aspx?id=2405 https://wida.wisc.edu/assess/alt-access (Sections 1.3 page 4; 2.4 page 14;2.6 page 27 and Appendix A page 28 of the WIDA Accessibility and Accommodations Supplement)	Evidence provided does not appear to be adopted policy documents related to inclusion of EL students with disabilities in ELP assessments, but rather informational documents. State-provided documentation (slides 4,5,7,10 from Addressing English Learners with Disabilities at the Local Level Presentation) provides information on who should determine accommodations and how, though it is unclear how this information was provided to districts and it is not a policy but rather just informational. State-provided participation criteria decision tree for Alternate Access shows how to determine eligibility for Alt ACCESS, but again, this appears informational and it is not clear how it is communicated. The state-provided website says "Under federal education law (Title I and Title III), ALL students who are identified as Limited English Proficient (LEP) are required to be assessed each year with this approved assessment. The ACCESS 2.0 English language proficiency test is given yearly from mid-January to mid-March." This does not specifically refer to EL students with disabilities, nor is it a formal state policy. Also, it is unclear how students with significant cognitive disabilities participate in the state's ELP assessment (alternate assessment was not submitted for review).

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
components in which it is possible to assess the student).		Peers could not find evidence among the links submitted describing how the State assess English learners with disabilities in domains in which the student may be exempted, such as in the context of the listening or speaking domains or some other domain or combination of domains.

Section 5.1 Summary Statement

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

- Provide adopted policy or procedure documents that demonstrate that the State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all EL public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State's assessment system and that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities are made by the appropriate teams
    - Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student's IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student's individual abilities and needs.
- Provide evidence of how the state's policies and procedures regarding including EL students with disabilities are ***communicated*** and implemented
- Provide evidence of how the state assesses English learners with disabilities if there are domains in which the student may be exempted, such as in the context of the listening or speaking domains or some other domain or combination of domains when the student cannot be assessed
- Provide evidence for how students with significant cognitive disabilities are to be assessed for English language proficiency (alternate ELP assessment was not included in this submission)

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• Note: This critical element does not apply to ELP assessments, as the requirements only apply to the inclusion of ELs in **academic assessments**.		

Section 5.2 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
- [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]

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

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State: • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs; • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student's need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. • Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the	Consortia Evidence: 5.3-1, Accessibility Overview 5.3-2, Quick Start Guide for Preparing Students for the ACCESS test 5.3-3, 2016 Focus Groups on ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Accommodations and Universal Tools 5.3-4, Investigating Grades 1-12 English Learners' Use of Universal Tools in ACCESS for ELLs 5.3-5, WIDA subcommittees 5.3-6, SEA Accessibility and Accommodations Policies 5.3-7, ACCESS for ELLs Unique Accommodations Request Form https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/documents/nhdoe_sasc_2018_19.pdf (pages 14, 15, 17) WIDA Test Administration Manual WIDA District and School Test Coordinator Manual https://wida.wisc.edu/sites/default/files/resource/ACCESS-Accessibility-Accommodations-Supplement.pdf https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/accountability/documents/digital_sat_accommodated_manual.pdf https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/accountability/documents/sat_collegeboard_approved_glossaries.pdf https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/integrated/esol/documents/esol_guidance_revised_9.15..pdf: https://nh.portal.airast.org/core/fileparse.php/2173/urlt/NH-SAS-Accommodations-Guide_18-19.pdf Please see page 16 – Full Spanish Translation available this year on NH SAS ELA, Mathematics and Science tests. Please refer to pages 18 -19, 20, 35 and 37 in ESSA plan.	State- and Consortium-provided evidence shows a variety of accommodations available for EL students with disabilities on its ELP assessments. No evidence appears to be available regarding whether or not the accommodations are appropriate and effective or change relevant constructs. State has a way for districts to request an exemption from testing in exceptional circumstances, but this does not address exceptional types of accommodations that may be required. This appears to be a part of Consortium-provided evidence (ACCESS for ELLs Unique Accommodations Request Form) though this document is not accessible for ELP assessment peer reviewer. It is unclear how students with severe cognitive disabilities would participate in the state's ELP assessment (i.e. that they are not denied the opportunity to participate).

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.	New Hampshire's ESSA Consolidated St ESSA Plan Proposed Amendments Letter (	

Section 5.3 Summary Statement

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

- Provide evidence of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed
- Provide evidence about how students with severe cognitive disabilities would participate in the state's ELP assessment (i.e. that they are not denied the opportunity to participate)
- Provide evidence about whether or not allowable accommodations are appropriate and effective and do not alter the constructs being measured
- Provide evidence about state's specific accommodations **policies** for ELP assessments (information is provided about types of accommodations available, but not policies)
- See peer review notes for Consortium-provided evidence for additional evidence needed

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are: • Consistent with the State's policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student's disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student's IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures; • Monitored for administrations of all required ELP assessments, and AELPA.	https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special_ed/englishlearnerswithdisabilities.htm https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special_ed/documents/addressing_english_learners_with_disabilities.pdf https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special_ed/documents/chap6.pdf https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/alt_assess/documents/final_dlm_nh_powerpoint_2018.pptx https://nh.portal.airast.org/core/fileparse.php/2173/urlt/NH-SAS-Accommodations-Guide_18-19.pdf https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/accountability/documents/digital_sat_accommodated_manual.pdf https://digitaltesting.collegeboard.org/resources Please refer to page 6, recommendation 1 and page 20 and 21 recommendations 7 &8 of the CCSSO English Learners with Disabilities Guide A Guide for States Creating Policies on the Identification of and Service Provision for English Learners with Disabilities Please refer to the USED English Learner Tool Kit Chapter 6: Tools and Resources for Addressing English Learners with Disabilities page 6, Tool #2. Resources posted on NH Department of Ed. Website. Available to LEAs.	The state-provided links are to non-binding policy advice or informational documents. These links provide access to a variety of sources of information related to assessing English learners with disabilities, including 1) Guides to help State and local education agencies meet their legal obligations to English Learners under civil rights laws and other federal requirements; and 2) procedures to ensure that accommodations are consistent with the State's policies for accommodations. The links also provide evidence of staff training for proper administration of NH assessments, with emphasis on test accessibility and accommodations, appropriateness of the accommodation for addressing a student's disability or language need, and consistency with the assessment accommodations identified by the IEP or 504 process. There is no information available about how the state monitors ELP test administration, including whether or not it follows up on what accommodations are provided and how.

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

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

Section 5.4 Summary Statement

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

- Provide evidence that state monitors test administration, such as adopted policies and procedures for monitoring and/or reports of monitoring
- Provide evidence that accommodations are being offered in accordance with state polices or expectations
- Provide evidence of monitoring that identified and appropriate accommodations (in IEP 504, LEP plans) are being provided in instruction, and that these same accommodations are made available to the student during assessment. This monitoring should include documentation from most authoritative source (for example, to check for alignment of IEP-required accommodations and test-provided accommodations, source should be IEP and records of test administration; comparisons of IEPs to classroom-provided accommodations based on information from teachers and IEP documents).
- Provide evidence that accommodations are being implemented correctly (i.e. provided during assessment and how problems with accommodations during assessment are handled)

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

SECTION 6: ELP ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
For ELP standards: • The State adopted ELP achievement standards that address the different proficiency levels of ELs; • If the State has developed alternate ELP achievement standards, it has adopted them only for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who cannot participate in the regular ELP assessment even with appropriate accommodations.	https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/integrated/title_iii_information_nh.htm https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/integrated/title_iii_information_nh.htm#widaccss	The provided resource page does not provide evidence that an authorized person or body has formally adopted ELP standards for the state. No discussion exists of alternate ELP standards. The state's website states that "In 2004, the New Hampshire State Board of Education adopted the WIDA English language proficiency standards." There is no further evidence provided. Preferred evidence would be a document, minutes of the relevant Board meeting, letter from the state superintendent or other formal evidence of adopting the standards.

Section 6.1 Summary Statement

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

- Provide letter from superintendent, document from Board meeting where standards were adopted, or other evidence showing formal adoption of standards that address the different proficiency levels of ELs. Website notation does not demonstrate formal adoption.

Critical Element 6.2 – ELP Achievement Standards Setting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting: • ***ELP achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate ELP achievement standards***, such that: o Cut scores are developed for every grade/grade band, content domain/language domain, and/or composite for which proficiency-level scores are reported.	Consortium Evidence Provided by WIDA	No state-specific evidence provided.

Section 6.2 Summary Statement

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

- See peer review notes for Consortium-provided evidence for additional evidence needed

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

Critical Element 6.3 –Aligned ELP Achievement Standards

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
***For ELP achievement standards*:** The State has ensured that ELP assessment results are expressed in terms that are clearly aligned with the State's ELP standards, and its ELP performance-level descriptors. If the State has adopted alternate ELP achievement standards for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate ELP achievement standards should be linked to the State's grade-level/grade-band ELP standards, and should reflect professional judgment of the highest ELP achievement standards possible for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.	Consortium Evidence Provided by WIDA	No state-specific evidence provided.

Section 6.3 Summary Statement

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

- See peer review notes for Consortium-provided evidence for additional evidence needed

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

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public. The State reports to the public its assessment results on ***English language proficiency for all ELs including the number and percentage of ELs attaining ELP***. For the ***ELP assessment***, the State provides coherent and timely information about each student's attainment of the State's ELP standards to parents that: • Reports the ***ELs' English proficiency*** in terms of the State's grade level/grade-band ELP standards (including performance-level descriptors); • Are provided in an understandable and uniform format; • Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English	Consortium Evidence: 6.4-2, Spring 2018 Interpretive Guide for ACCESS Score Reports 6.4-3, Spring 2018 Interpretive Guide for Alternate ACCESS Score Reports Score Reports are available to teachers as well as school and district test coordinators in the Data Recognition Corporation (DRC) portal as soon at the end of May of each year. Schools are expected to print their students' Individual Score Report and send home to parents. Score Reports are able to be printed in different languages so that parents are able to access the contents of the report https://ireport.education.nh.gov/ https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/results.htm NH School and District Report Card and EL Breakdown NH 2017-18 Statewide Assessment Results including subgroups.	The state's assessment results website does not provide information on ACCESS or Alt ACCESS scores. The state report card website provides the percentage of students on track to achieve EL proficiency only. State should report English language proficiency for all ELs including number and percentage of ELs attaining ELP. Consortium-provided information provides some evidence to address requirement to facilitate credible and defensible interpretations of results (though this is through written documentation only). Peers could not find evidence indicating (1) the schedule of public reporting, (2) clear description of materials (including trainings) to assist school and district personnel who access the secure online portal on how to use and interpret ELP assessment results, (3) schedule and delivery of individual student reports to parents, and (4) materials to assist parents on how to interpret the individual student reports. No information about the specific timelines for reports or formats of reports is provided other than the state's assertion about schools printing out reports and score reports being available in May in the peer review submission itself. This statement does not address availability of alternative formats of reports, nor is any evidence provided about state policy or procedure that addresses reporting requirements, including formats or languages of reports.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian; • Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.		

Section 6.4 Summary Statement

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

- Provide evidence that state reports to the public its assessment results on ***English language proficiency for all ELs including the number and percentage of ELs attaining ELP***.
- Provide evidence indicating (1) the schedule of public reporting, (2) materials (including trainings) to assist school and district personnel who access the secure online portal on how to use and interpret ELP assessment results, (3) schedule and delivery of individual student reports to parents, and (4) materials to assist parents on how to interpret the individual student reports.
- Provide evidence about state policy or procedure that addresses reporting requirements, including availability of formats or languages of reports for parents who might have a disability or require reports in other languages (such policy would indicate that the state commits to making information accessible and is not subject to changes by vendors or assessment managers)

SECTION 7: DOES NOT APPLY TO ELP ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW

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