



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Chris Reykdal  
Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Old Capitol Building  
P.O. Box 47200, 600 Washington St. SE  
Olympia, WA 98504-7200

September 19, 2019

Dear Superintendent Reykdal:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (the Department's) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). I appreciate the efforts of the Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) to prepare for the English language proficiency (ELP) peer review that occurred in April 2019. Specifically, OSPI submitted evidence regarding the English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (ELPA21) and the Alternate ACCESS for English learners (Alternate ACCESS).

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

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

- General ELP assessment (ELPA21): **Partially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by ESSA.**
- Alternate ELP assessment (Alternate ACCESS): **Partially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by ESSA.**

400 MARYLAND AVE., SW, WASHINGTON, DC 20202  
<http://www.ed.gov/>

*The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.*

An assessment that partially meets requirements does not meet a number of the requirements of the statute and regulations and OSPI 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 assessment for peer review and recognizes that it may take some time to address all of the required items. The specific list of items required for OSPI to submit is enclosed with this letter. Within 30 days, OSPI must provide a plan and timeline outlining when it will submit all required documentation for ELPA21 and alternate ACCESS. Resubmission should occur once all necessary evidence is complete (rather than in multiple submissions). The Department is placing a condition on OSPI's Title I, Part A grant award. The condition shall remain until OSPI's ELP and alternate ELP assessments have been determined to meet all requirements. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action.

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

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

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

If you have any questions, please contact my staff at: [ESEA.Assessment@ed.gov](mailto:ESEA.Assessment@ed.gov).

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan  
Assistant Secretary for  
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Debra A. Came, Ph.D., Assistant Superintendent for Assessment and Student Information

**Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed to Meet the Requirements for Washington’s Use of the ELPA21 and the Alternate ACCESS as an English Language Proficiency Assessment**

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<p><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p>	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of ELPA21 test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results such as unredacted blueprints and test form construction guides or evidence that includes but is not limited to the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Information on how many standards each test form is assessing and how many standards are not assessed by form and grade or grade band.</li> <li>○ The proportion of hand-scored items by grade-band domain versus the proportion of machine-scored items.</li> <li>○ A rationale for assessing/not assessing standards.</li> <li>○ Documentation and a description of how the test blueprints support the intended interpretation and uses of the results.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence of processes to ensure that the ELPA21 assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s ELP standards and reflects appropriate inclusion of the range of complexity found in the standards (e.g., strong, independent evidence of alignment).</li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that both assessments are aligned to the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Statement of the purposes and intended uses of results.</li> <li>○ Test blueprints.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
<p><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p>	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that ELPA21 uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student ELP based on the State’s ELP standards in terms of content and language processes (e.g., evidence that ensures that future item development will address gaps identified in the alignment study, specifically the relative lack of items in terms of language and content processes, the lack of items that measure certain standards, and the production of more difficult items for some test forms).</li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<p><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p>	<p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all ELs with disabilities.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></p>	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that OSPI has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results, specifically practices or procedures for maintaining the security of test materials during ELPA21 test development.</li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of policies and procedures that prevent assessment irregularities, specifically, policies and procedures to protect the integrity of the test given that the test form is unchanged for the past several years.</li> </ul>
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p>	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation of adequate alignment between ELPA21 and the ELP standards the assessment is designed to measure in terms of language knowledge and skills and the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards across all proficiency levels, domains, and modalities identified therein (e.g., unredacted blueprints and test form construction guides; strong evidence of alignment; checklists for reviewing items; item development plans; field test plans).</li> <li>Documentation of alignment between the State’s ELP standards and the language demands implied by, or explicitly stated in, the State’s academic content standards (e.g., evidence to support the use of the ELPA21 for exit decisions in EL programs).</li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Linguistic Processes</b></p>	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that ELPA21 taps the intended language processes appropriate for each grade level/grade-band as represented in the State’s ELP standards (e.g., results of an independent external alignment study after previous identified gaps have been addressed; or cognitive labs to demonstrate that test items assess the intended linguistic processes).</li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b>	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s ELP standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based (e.g., evidence that there are sufficient numbers of high difficulty items on all domains of the lower grade band tests and on the writing, listening and speaking domains in grade 6-8 and 9-12).</li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b>	<p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</li> </ul>
<b>4.1 – Reliability</b>	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reliability evidence, specifically evidence of conditional standard error of measurement of ELPA21 (e.g., for students of higher abilities).</li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of test reliability, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reliability by subgroups.</li> <li>○ Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results.</li> <li>○ Evidence that reliability statistics are used to inform ongoing maintenance and development.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence of reliability, including test information functions (TIFs) for overall composite scores.</li> </ul>
<b>4.2 – Fairness and accessibility</b>	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that ELPA21 has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all EL students and fair across student groups, including ELs with disabilities, in the design, development, and analysis (e.g., evidence of item writer training materials that address accessibility; and evidence of processes in the development of accommodated forms of the tests that ensure accessibility for ELs with disabilities).</li> </ul>
<b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b>	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that ELPA21 provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including performance for EL students with high and low levels of English language proficiency and with different proficiency profiles across the domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing (e.g., item maps</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>showing difficulty and student ability across the performance continuum in each domain and overall).</p> <p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
<b>4.4 – Scoring</b>	<p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the implementation of standardized scoring procedures and protocols (e.g., definitions of key terms and test administration and scoring procedures).</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
<b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b>	<p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
<b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b>	<p>For ELPA21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the paper and Braille versions of the ELPA21: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments.</li> <li>○ Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b>	<p>For ELPA21 and the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a system for monitoring and maintaining the quality of the assessments, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of the assessment (e.g., evidence that the ELPA21 2013 plan for quality assurance has been implemented).</li> <li>• Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.</li> </ul>
<b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b>	<p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned ELP Achievement Standards</b>	<p>For the Alternate ACCESS:</p> <p>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</p>

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Additional Evidence Needed</b>
	highest ELP achievement standards possible for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.
<b>6.4 – Reporting</b>	For ELPA21: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence that the State reports its assessment results for all students assessed in a timely fashion (e.g., provide a timeline for reporting results).</li></ul> For the Alternate ACCESS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence that performance level descriptors are included on student score reports.</li></ul>

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## April State ELP Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

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..... 6**

**Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments .. 8**

**Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments..... 9**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS.....10**

**Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development ..... 10**

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development ..... 13**

**Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration..... 14**

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration ..... 16**

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security..... 17**

**Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 19**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY .....20**

**Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content20**

**Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Linguistic Processes..... 22**

**Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 23**

**Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables..... 24**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER.....25**

**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability ..... 25**

**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility ..... 27**

**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum ..... 28**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 29**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 30**

**Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment..... 31**

**Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance ..... 32**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS.....33**

**Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 33**

**Critical Element 5.2 – DOES NOT APPLY to ELP Assessment Peer Review34**

**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations ..... 35**

**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.

..... 37

**SECTION 6: ELP ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING.....39**

**Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of ELP Achievement Standards for All Students..... 39**

**Critical Element 6.2 – ELP Achievement Standards Setting ..... 40**

**Critical Element 6.3 –Aligned ELP Achievement Standards ..... 41**

**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting ..... 42**

**SECTION 7: DOES NOT APPLY TO ELP ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW .....43**

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For English language proficiency (ELP) standards:</i></p> <p>The State formally adopted K-12 ELP standards for all ELs in public schools in the State.</p>		<p>N/A: See state-specific evidence</p>
<p><b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>N/A: See state-specific evidence.</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>For ELP standards:</b> The ELP standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing;</li> <li>• address the different proficiency levels of ELs; and</li> </ul> <p>align to the State academic content standards (see definition<sup>1</sup>). The ELP standards must contain language proficiency expectations that reflect the language needed for ELs to acquire and demonstrate their achievement of the knowledge and skills identified in the State’s academic content standards appropriate to each grade-level/grade-band in at least reading/language arts, mathematics, and science.</p>	<p><b>EL 1.2.1</b> <i>Council of Chief State School Officers English Language Proficiency Standards Development (2013)</i>, pp. 4, 12-19.</p> <p><b>EL 1.2.2</b> <i>English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards (2014)</i>, pp. 31-210.</p> <p><b>EL 1.2.3</b> <i>Framework for English Language Proficiency Development Standards Corresponding to the Common Core State Standards and the Next Generation Science Standards (CCSSO, 2012)</i>.</p>	<p>ELPA21 provided evidence about the development of the ELP standards that show that they are derived from the four domains and address different proficiency levels of ELs.</p> <p>The evidence provides support for alignment between the ELP standards and the academic content practices (EL 1.2.2, p. 32-34) rather than between the ELP standards and academic content standards.</p> <p>For States that have adopted the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics and ELA/Literacy and Next Generation Science Standards, peers believe that sufficient evidence is provided that academic content practices correspond to the ELP standards.</p> <p>States that have adopted different standards than Common Core and Next Generation would need to provide additional alignment evidence.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>If a member State has adopted standards other than Common Core and Next Generation, they will need to provide additional alignment evidence.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required (for States with common core reading/language arts and mathematics; and next generation science content standards)</p>		

<sup>1</sup> see page 24 of “*A State’s Guide to the U.S. Department of Education’s Assessment Peer Review Process*”, September 24, 2018 available at: [www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html](http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html)

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

**Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s assessment system includes an <i>annual general and alternate ELP assessment</i> (aligned with State ELP standards) administered to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All ELs in grades K-12.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>ELPA21’s Evidence:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>EL 1.3.1</b> <i>White Paper: Developing an Alternate ELPA21 for English Learners with the Most Significant Cognitive Disabilities</i></li> <li><b>EL 1.3.2</b> <i>Alt-ELPA21 Theory of Action</i></li> <li><b>EL 1.3.3</b> <i>Alt-ELPA Participation Guidelines</i></li> <li><b>EL 1.3.4</b> <i>Accessibility and Accommodations Wish List</i></li> <li><b>EL 1.3.5</b> <i>Addendum to the ELPA21 Peer Review Submission – January 2019: Alternate ELPA21 (Alt-ELPA21)</i></li> <li><b>EL 1.3.6</b> <i>Classroom Perspectives Report</i></li> <li><b>EL 1.3.7</b> <i>ICQ - Report</i></li> <li><b>EL 1.3.8</b> <i>Standards Prioritization Evaluation</i></li> <li><b>EL 1.3.9</b> <i>Talking Points for State Leaders: Alternate English Language Proficiency Standards and Assessments</i></li> <li><b>EL 1.3.10</b> <i>Final CCSSO ELP Standards for ELWSCDs Agenda May 2018</i></li> <li><b>EL 1.3.11</b> <i>ELP Standards for ELWSCD Meeting Participant List</i></li> <li><b>EL 1.3.12</b> <i>Work group 3 ELWSCD language and CCR_CCSSO Project 040618</i></li> </ul>	<p>The ELPA21 Consortium provides an annual general ELP assessment, ready to be delivered to ELs in grades K-12, to member states. States will provide evidence of their use of the assessment.</p> <p>Currently, the ELPA21 Consortium is laying the groundwork for the Alternate ELPA21 (Alt-ELPA21) so that member states may include the assessment in their statewide assessment programs.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

### **Section 1.3 Summary Statement**

N/A: for consortium review, but evidence may support individual State submissions for ELPA-21. Consortium acknowledges that AELPA is currently not an operational assessment.

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21**

**Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State has policies that require the inclusion <i>of all public elementary and secondary ELs in the State’s ELP assessment</i>, including ELs with disabilities.</li> </ul>	Reviewed by Department Staff Only	Reviewed by Department Staff Only
<b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement</b>		
N/A: for consortium review		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>If the State has developed or amended challenging <i>ELP</i> standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education).</li> <li>• Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas).</li> <li>• Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State.</li> <li>• Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents.</li> </ul>	<p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>	<p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>N/A for consortium review</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

**Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <i>the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards</i>, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <i>the State’s ELP standards</i>, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that the ELP assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <i>the State’s ELP standards</i> and reflects appropriate inclusion of the range of complexity found in the standards.</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and intended uses and interpretations of results.</li> <li>• If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement of purposes and intended interpretations and uses: <b>EL2.1.2</b> (ELPA21 Theory of Action, p. 3 and p. 10)</li> <li>• Technically sound test blueprints that measure depth and breadth of ELP standards: <b>EL2.1.2.1</b>, <i>ELPA21 Assessment Framework - Summative School Year 2015-2016</i>, p. 7-13  <b>EL2.1.2.3a-h</b> <i>Field Test Slots All Form 1A ELPA21 ONLINE Summative Test Form (2017), Kindergarten - grade 12</i>  <b>EL2.1.2.4</b> <i>Blueprint Drafts Phase 3 (2016)</i></li> <li>• Tailored to knowledge and skills in the ELP standards and includes the range of complexity: <b>EL2.1.3.1</b> <i>Independent Evaluation of the English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century [ELPA21] Item Pool Alignment</i>  <b>EL 2.1.3.1.1</b> <i>ELPA21 Internal Memo: ELPA21 2019-2020 Activities</i> (This document is a bullet-point to-do list to address deficiencies in the alignment.)</li> <li>• Computer-adaptive assessments: N/A</li> <li>• Portfolio assessment: N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement of purposes and intended interpretations and uses: Peers found the evidence for the statement of purposes and intended interpretations and uses to be sufficient.</li> <li>• Technically sound test blueprints that measure depth and breadth of ELP standards: Peers reviewed the test blueprint evidence but noted that it was so heavily redacted that it was virtually impossible to determine the extent to which it results in the development of assessments that are technically sound and measure the depth and breadth of ELP standards.  Test blueprint, EL 2.1.2.1, Table 5.1 – it is not clear how tasks/points are distributed across standards within a domain. Information is redacted and makes interpretation of tables nearly impossible.  Test form planner documents, EL.2.1.2.3a-h heavily redacted so that interpretation is made virtually impossible.  EL.2.1.2.4, Blueprint – document heavily redacted. It’s not possible to evaluate.</li> <li>• Tailored to knowledge and skills in the ELP standards and includes the range of complexity: The consortium describes an alignment study that they refer to as “independent” and “external” (EL 2.1.3.1) but it was conducted by CRESST staff.</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21**

<p>student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting.                  If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be <i>entirely</i> administered through a portfolio.</p>		<p>Although it is stated that the staff working on the alignment were not part of the test development, it is certainly not external and an in-house alignment study gives reviewers pause about its independence. The study highlights insufficient alignment in a number of areas. A quote from this document (p. 74) "...showed moderate to large amounts of under-representation for Standards 2, 5, and 6. The only exception was for Standard 2 for Grade Band 4–5, which had adequate coverage. Standard 2 also showed large proportions of potential false negative ratings, both within and across grade bands. Not surprisingly, based on the blueprint results, this was particularly problematic for Grade Band 4–5 as well as the two secondary grade bands.</p> <p>EL 2.1.3.1.1 is a memo indicating how some of the deficiencies reported will be corrected in 2019 and 2020, although no specific timeline is listed, and peers request evidence that the changes remedy the deficiencies. Peers also recommend that future alignment studies be conducted by an external group rather than CRESST.</p> <p>The evidence submitted and in particular the alignment study itself does not provide evidence that shows that each assessment form supports the assertion that each test form contains items that are well aligned to the breadth and depth of the ELP standards, across all proficiency levels, domains, and modalities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computer-adaptive assessments: N/A</li> <li>• Portfolio assessment: N/A</li> </ul>
---	--	--

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

### Section 2.1 Summary Statement

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

- Provide test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of *the State's ELP standards*, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. This could take the form of *unredacted* blueprints or, in the case the consortium does not want to provide unredacted documents, evidence that includes but is not limited to the following:
  - *Information on how many standards each test form is assessing and how many standards are not assessed by form and grade or grade band.*
  - *The proportion of hand-scored items by grade-band domain versus the proportion of machine-scored items.*
  - *Rationale for assessing/not assessing standards.*
  - *Description of cognitive complexity of the ELP standards as designed/measured on the assessments.*
  - *Documentation and description of how the test blueprints support the intended interpretation and uses of the results as expressed in ELPA21's mission, vision and score reporting specifications (see above).*
- Peers request the results of a new, truly external and independent, alignment study once the changes in EL 2.1.3.1.1 have been implemented. Peers noted that there are additional areas of misalignment indicated in the study that are not addressed in EL 2.1.3.1.1 that should also be rectified. The existing alignment study is also by item pool rather than by form and peers suggest that the alignment evidence submitted in the future be by test form.

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21**

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess student English language proficiency based on the <i>State’s ELP standards</i> in terms of content and language processes.</li> </ul>	<p><b>EL 2.1.2.1</b> <i>ELPA21 Assessment Framework - Summative School Year 2015-2016</i> (pp. 19-25)  <b>EL 2.2.1</b> <i>ELPA21 Item Development Plan Version 2.0 (2014)</i>  <b>EL 2.2.2a-f</b> <i>ELPA21 Task and Item Specifications, Kindergarten through Grades 9-12 (2016)</i>  <b>EL 2.2.3</b> <i>ELPA21 Item Writer Training Plan (2014)</i>  <b>EL 2.2.4</b> <i>Editorial Review Plan (2014)</i>  <b>EL 2.2.5</b> <i>Editorial Style Guide (2019)</i>  <b>EL 2.2.6</b> <i>Item Development Process Report (2015)</i>  <b>EL 2.2.7</b> <i>Item Cognitive Laboratory Report (2015)</i> – related to technology-enhanced items only  <b>EL 2.2.8</b> <i>Spring 2015 ELPA21 Field Test Technical Report (2016)</i>, pp. 13-16.  <b>EL 2.2.9</b> <i>Item Analysis and Calibration (2017)</i></p>	<p>Peers found item development procedures sufficient; however, in light of the alignment study results described in critical element 2.1 above, peers have concerns about selection and inclusion of more difficult items, lack of items in terms of language and content processes, and lack of items measuring certain standards.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence showing how the consortium will address the lack of difficult items, items measuring certain standards, and items on some language and content processes (e.g., there were no interactive items in some grade bands, and all grade bands had under-representation of items testing the interactive modality.) Analyses also revealed that alignment “met or exceeded the Grade Band 4–5 blueprint specifications for only nine of the 17 traits.” (EL 2.1.3.1, p. 50). Peers recommend that the consortium identify the cause(s) of these issues and determine whether their item writing process needs to be modified accordingly.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21**

**Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities;</li> <li>• If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>EL 2.3.1.1a-f</b> <i>Assessment Guides, Kindergarten through Grades 9-12</i></li> <li><b>EL 2.3.1.2</b> <i>Accessibility and Accommodations Manual (2018-19)</i></li> <li><b>EL 2.3.1.3</b> <i>Quick Start Checklists (2016)</i></li> <li><b>EL 2.3.1.4</b> <i>Test Coordinator's Manual (2016)</i></li> <li><b>EL 2.3.1.5a-f</b> <i>Directions for Administration, Paper and Pencil, Kindergarten through Grades 9-12</i></li> <li><b>EL 2.5.1.2a-f</b> <i>Directions for Administration, Braille Version, Kindergarten through Grades 9-12</i></li> <li><b>EL 2.5.1.3a-b</b> <i>Directions for Administration ELPA21 Summative Writing Supplement (Spring 2018, Kindergarten and Grade 1)</i></li> <li><b>EL 2.5.1.4</b> <i>ELPA21 Spring 2018 Summative Test Administration Manual (TAM) for Online Testing (2018)</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Procedures to ensure that appropriate teachers and personnel can administer the assessments and use appropriate accommodations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>EL 2.3.2.1</b> <i>Training Webinar Plan (2016)</i></li> <li><b>EL 2.3.2.2</b> <i>Accessibility Features and Accommodations (2016)</i></li> <li><b>EL 2.3.2.3</b> <i>Administration Site Overview (2016)</i></li> <li><b>EL 2.3.2.4</b> <i>Student Testing Experience (2016)</i></li> <li><b>EL 2.3.2.5</b> <i>Student Testing Session (2016)</i></li> <li><b>EL 2.3.2.6</b> <i>Testing Lab Management (2016)</i></li> <li><b>EL 2.3.2.7</b> <i>Platform Overview (2016)</i></li> <li><b>EL 2.3.2.8</b> <i>Troubleshooting (2016)</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations: <p>ELPA 21 established clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations. Peers commend the consortium for the detailed documentation for all versions of the assessment. The participating states are responsible for communicating these procedures to educators.</p> <p>However, see comments on section 5.3.</p> </li> <li>• Procedures to ensure that appropriate teachers and personnel can administer the assessments and use appropriate accommodations: <p>ELPA 21 presented sufficient evidence demonstrating that teachers (including teachers of SWDs and ELs) and other appropriate personnel can be provided with a variety of training materials necessary to administer the ELP assessment including the use of appropriate accommodations. The participating states are responsible for providing such training to appropriate personnel; state-specific evidence will be needed to complement the consortium evidence in this regard.</p> </li> <li>• Defined requirements and contingency plans for technology-based assessments: <p>ELPA 21 created documents addressing technology requirements (hardware, headsets) as well as a</p> </li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21**

	<p><b>EL 2.3.2.9</b> <i>Workstation Preparation (2016)</i>  <b>EL 2.3.2.10</b> <i>Interactive Demos Access Instructions (2016)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Defined requirements and contingency plans for technology-based assessments:</li> </ul> <p><b>EL 2.3.3.1</b> <i>Operational Hardware Specifications</i>  <b>EL 2.3.3.2</b> <i>Operational Headset Specifications</i>  <b>EL 2.3.2.8</b> <i>Troubleshooting (2016)</i>  <b>EL 2.5.1.4</b> <i>ELPA21 Spring 2018 Summative Test Administration Manual (TAM) for Online Testing (2018), pp. 7, 24, and 41.</i></p>	<p>document addressing possible technology challenges (troubleshooting). In addition, the TAM for online testing addresses the possible issues that may arise during the online testing session.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required          No additional evidence is required from the consortium. However, State-specific evidence should be reviewed regarding 1) how test administration procedures are communicated to educators and 2) how appropriate personnel are trained to administer the test.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21**

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general ELP assessments and the AELPA.</p>	<p><b>EL 2.4.1</b> <i>ELPA21 2017-18 Summative Alerts</i></p>	<p>The online administration of ELPA21 is monitored by the testing vendor, which receives and processes alerts of test irregularities. The state in which the irregularity occurs, the date of the occurrence, item identification, grade level, language domain, and student identification number, as well as the recorded response the reflects the irregularity are noted.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A for consortium review. This evidence can support a State specific submission for use of the ELPA21, but in and of itself is not sufficient to meet the requirements for this critical element. States will need to supplement this evidence.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21**

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> <li>• Application of test security procedures to the general ELP assessments and the AELPA.</li> </ul>	<p><b>EL 2.5.1.1</b> <i>ELPA21 Implementation Manual (2017-18)</i>, pp. 14-27, 35-36, 40-41, 44, Appendices A, B, C, and D.  <b>EL 2.3.1.5a-f</b> <i>Directions for Administration, Paper and Pencil, Kindergarten through Grades 9-12 (2017-18)</i>  <b>EL 2.5.1.2a-f</b> <i>Directions for Administration, Braille Version, Kindergarten through Grades 9-12 (2017-18)</i>  <b>EL 2.5.1.3a-b</b> <i>Directions for Administration ELPA21 Summative Writing Supplement, Kindergarten and Grade 1 (Spring 2018)</i>  <b>EL 2.3.1.2</b> <i>Accessibility and Accommodations Manual (2018-19)</i>, Appendix E.  <b>EL 2.5.1.4</b> <i>ELPA21 Spring 2018 Summative Test Administration Manual (TAM) for Online Testing</i>, pp. 2, 36.  <b>EL 2.5.1.5</b> <i>Data Sharing Agreement (2017)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of assessment irregularities: Submitted documents focus on prevention of assessment irregularities during test administration. There is a lack of evidence/description of how security of test materials is maintained during test development. States will need to provide evidence of the use/application of the ELPA21-prepared documents and guidelines or alternate processes for the prevention of assessment irregularities during test administration.</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities: Peers could not locate a description or recommendation for the application of data forensics for the detection of test irregularities. Routine data analytics to detect test irregularities should be conducted. This is possibly conducted at the State level and State-specific evidence should be reviewed.</li> <li>• Remediation following test security incidents: For the remediation following any test security incidents, examples of actions following a breach should be provided. Peers did not see evidence of the availability of breach forms. Also, if an item is breached, are tests rescored without that item? It would be helpful to provide documentation of how breaches are handled at the consortium level.</li> </ul> <p>ELPA 21 states that test security is a matter to be supervised by each member State. However, there are instances where test security breaches can cross state borders. As such, there appears to be the need for consortium-wide oversight of some matters. For example, if there is a breach in one state, it could be expected that the consortium assists in evaluating whether the assessment</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21**

		<p>item should be deactivated (or some other action taken) for all states. Consortium-wide data analyses after test administration can also assist in ensuring that a possible irregularity or breach of an item, did not impact test results.</p> <p>It was not clear to peers whether all scoring is centralized or is State-specific. State-provided scoring evidence should be reviewed with test security in mind.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investigation of irregularities: This is left to the States; no consortium-provided documentation was provided. State-specific evidence will need to be reviewed.</li> <li>N/A: there is not currently an AELPA in place.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>x</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The consortium should provide evidence of test security during the test development process.</li> <li>Member States will need to provide evidence regarding scoring and test security, data forensics that may be conducted, and processes for investigating and remedying irregularities.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21**

**Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results;</li> <li>To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protect integrity of test-related data in test administration: <b>EL 2.5.1.1 ELPA21 Implementation Manual (2017-18)</b>, pp. 14-27, 35-36, 40-41, 44, Appendices A, B, C, and D.</li> <li>Secure student-level assessment data:  <b>EL 2.5.1.1 ELPA21 Implementation Manual (2017-18)</b>, pp. 17-27, Appendix A <b>EL 2.5.1.4 ELPA21 Spring 2018 Summative Test Administration Manual (TAM) for Online Testing</b>, p. 1. <b>EL 2.5.1.5 Data Sharing Agreement (2017)</b></li> <li>Protect personally identifiable information: The consortium’s narrative states, “Additionally, states are able to configure their reports of ELPA21 scores to suppress and/or de-identify data to protect students' PII as required by state policies.” Minimum N sizes are determined by the State.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protect integrity of test-related data in test administration: ELPA21 provided evidence of sample procedures for protecting data integrity to member States; State-specific evidence should be reviewed.</li> <li>Secure student-level assessment data: ELPA21 provided some guidance on student-level data security to member States; State-specific evidence should be reviewed as well, to determine to what extent this guidance is transmitted to districts and schools and followed.</li> <li>Protect personally identifiable information: State-specific evidence regarding individual student data and minimum N sizes should be reviewed.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  x  </u> No additional evidence is required from the consortium; however, State-specific evidence should be reviewed regarding all of the points of this critical element.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><i>The State’s ELP assessments</i> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s ELP standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s ELP assessment and the ELP standards the assessment is designed to measure in terms of language knowledge and skills, the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards, across all proficiency levels, domains, and modalities identified therein;</li> <li>• Documentation of alignment (as defined) between the State’s ELP standards and the language demands implied by, or explicitly stated in, the State’s academic content standards;</li> <li>• If the State administers an AELPA aligned with alternate ELP achievement standards, the assessment shows adequate linkage to the State’s ELP standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and that the breadth of content and linguistic complexity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>EL 1.3.5</b> <i>Addendum to the ELPA21 Peer Review Submission – January 2019: Alternate ELPA21 (Alt-ELPA21)</i></li> <li>• <b>EL 2.1.2</b> <i>ELPA21 Theory of Action (2014)</i>, pp. 5, 10</li> <li>• <b>EL 3.1.1</b> <i>A Quality Assurance Plan for ELPA21</i></li> <li>• <b>EL 2.1.2.1</b> <i>ELPA21 Assessment Framework-Summative School Year 2015-2016</i></li> <li>• <b>EL 2.1.2.1</b> <i>ELPA21 Assessment Framework-Summative School Year 2015-2016</i>, pp. 7-13, 16, 24-25</li> <li>• <b>EL 2.1.3.1</b> <i>Independent Evaluation of the English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century (ELPA21) Item Pool Alignment (2019)</i>,</li> <li>• <b>EL 2.2.2 a-f</b> <i>ELPA21 Task and Item Specification Guidelines</i></li> <li>• <b>EL 2.2.3</b> <i>Item Writer Training Plan</i></li> <li>• <b>EL 2.2.6</b> <i>Item Development Process Report</i>, pp. 49-50, Appendix A</li> <li>• <b>EL 2.1.3.1.1</b> <i>ELPA21 Internal Memo: ELPA21 2019-2020 Activities (2019)</i></li> <li>• N/A: There is no AELPA.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See comments in section 2.1 above.</li> </ul> <p>EL 2.2.1, p. 3 references an appendix that peers could not locate: “See Appendix A for the Checklist for Reviewing Items.”</p> <p>The ELPA narrative indicates that EL 2.2.1 “shows item development and field test plan to ensure coverage of, and alignment to, ELP Standards (p. 8)” but p. 8 is a table of deliverables rather than an item development and field test plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peers could not locate validity evidence supporting the use of the assessment results for arguably its most important use: an exit from the EL program.</li> </ul> <p>The quality assurance plan (EL 3.1.1) is just that, a plan. Has it been implemented? Documentation to this effect should be provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A: There is no AELPA.</li> </ul>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21**

**Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Linguistic Processes**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap <i>the intended language processes</i> appropriate for each grade level/grade-band as represented in the State’s ELP standards.</p>	<p><b>EL 2.1.3.1</b>, <i>Independent Evaluation of the English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (ELPA21) Item Pool Alignment</i></p> <p><b>EL 2.1.3.1.1</b>, <i>ELPA 21 Internal Memo: ELPA21 2019-2020 Activities</i></p>	<p>See comments in critical element 2.1 above. The alignment study (EL 2.1.3.1) clearly shows that the assessments do not tap some intended language processes successfully, and EL 2.1.3.1.1 indicates some steps the consortium plans to take to address these deficiencies. Deficiencies listed not only in 2.1.3.1.1 but also more broadly in 2.1.3.1 need to be addressed. An independent and external alignment study after changes have been made or more complete cognitive labs (other than just of the technology-enhanced items in EL 2.2.7) could address this critical element.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results of an independent and external alignment study after deficiencies are addressed or more complete cognitive labs (not limited to the technology-enhanced items in EL 2.2.7).</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21**

**Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s <i>ELP standards</i> on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p><b>EL 3.3.1</b>, <i>ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report, Part 1</i>  <b>EL 3.3.2</b>, <i>ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 2_Nebraska Example</i></p>	<p>EL 3.3.1 (p. 32) states, “The pooled analysis results are included in Section 11 in the appendix for pooled analysis. It shows that the student abilities are generally higher than the test difficulties in all domain tests, except the grades 6–8 and grades 9–12 reading tests where the test difficulties well match student abilities.” This issue must be addressed.</p> <p>Peers also could not locate Table S24.1 (referenced in EL 3.3.1).</p>
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peers request that the consortium address the issues raised above (e.g., by developing more difficult items in domains and grade levels where those are lacking) and provide data of their quality in a subsequent technical report.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21**

**Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p><b>EL 3.4.1</b> <i>ELPA21 Summative Assessment Validity Evidence Regarding Relationships of Test Results with Other Variables (2019), pp. 2-14</i></p>	<p>EL 3.4.1 provides some evidence of a relationship between ELPA scores and teacher ratings as well as between assessment scores of EL and English only students.</p> <p>The data from the teacher rating study indicates a mismatch between proficiency levels on the ELP and teacher ratings. EL 3.4.1, p.13: “Across all grade bands, teachers judged a higher proportion of students to be proficient. The differences between teachers and ELPA21 are particularly large in the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands”.</p> <p>A quote from the ELPA 21 submission (p. 51): “ELPA21’s first operational administration was the spring of 2016, with item calibrations finalized in the spring of 2017. Therefore, there are few data available to examine the relationship between the scores on ELPA21 with other assessments. In addition, there are not data yet available to investigate the relationship between ELPA21 scores and college entrance and performance outcomes.”</p> <p>Peers request evidence showing the relationship between ELP scores and other measures (e.g., content tests, college entrance exams, etc.)</p>
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although the consortium provided some limited evidence about the relationship between ELP scores and teacher ratings, peers request additional evidence showing the relationship between ELP scores and other measures (e.g., content tests, college entrance exams, etc.) The consortium’s submission indicates that research was underway at the time of submission (p. 52 of the narrative states, “Research that has studied how ELPA21 scores relate to other variables with similar constructs, growth on the same construct, and how one score scale can predict outcomes on other assessments is in progress across consortium member states.” Peers request the results of such research.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population (<i>for ELP assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable</i>);</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability:  <b>EL 3.3.1 ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 1</b>, p. 17.  <b>EL 3.3.2 ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 2_Nebraska Example</b>, Section 6 Figures S6.1 – S6.10, Section 7 Figures S7.1 – S7.6, Section 8 Figures S8.1, S8.2.</li> <li>• Overall and conditional SEMs:  <b>EL 3.3.1 ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 1</b>, p. 18.  <b>EL 3.3.2 ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 2</b>, Section 6 Figures S6.1 – S6.10, Section 7 Figures S7.1 – S7.6.</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy estimates:  <b>EL 3.3.1 ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 1</b>, pp.18-20.  <b>EL 3.3.2 ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 2_Nebraska Example</b>, Section 8 Figures S8.1, S8.2.</li> <li>• N/A: ELPA21 is not computer-adaptive.</li> </ul>	<p>General note: The consortium references EL 3.3.2 “Nebraska Example”. It is unclear the extent to which the sample data from Nebraska is representative of the consortium as a whole.</p> <p>Peers noted that many of the figures in the Technical Report rely on color distinctions that render them not universally accessible (e.g., EL 3.3.2, p. 100). The consortium might want to consider adding text and tables or redesigning figures to address this accessibility concern.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability: Reliability information is provided for the online assessment, which is the majority of the administrations, by domain. It is unclear whether Braille and paper versions are based on the same items. Data on the reliability of those alternate forms is not provided.</li> </ul> <p>Although marginal reliabilities are generally in the acceptable range, there are some instances in the EL 3.3.2 report that are lower (e.g., grade 1 listening, p. 100).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall and conditional SEMs are included by domain (EL 3.3.2, p. 111-116)</li> </ul> <p>Peers noted that there is more measurement error among higher ability students based on the CSEMs. Peers believe this is likely a result of the lack of a sufficient number of difficult items. See comments in critical element 2.1.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>precise estimates of <i>an EL's English proficiency</i>.</p>		<p>A quote from EL 3.3.1 (p. 27), "Classification accuracy (CA) analysis investigates how precisely students are classified into each performance level. By definition, classification consistency (CC) analysis investigates how consistently students are classified into each performance level across two independent administrations of equivalent forms. Since obtaining test scores from two independent administrations is not feasible due to issues such as logistics and cost constraints, the CC index is computed with the assumption that the same test is independently administered twice to the same group of students. For information on classification accuracy and consistency see p. 27-30."</p> <p>Peers recommend that the consortium conduct a study to get classification consistency data based on two independent administrations of equivalent forms.</p> <p>Regarding the CCs provided, they seem low (dropping below .7 and at times, below .5 or .6). Classification accuracy and consistency is in general lower for cuts 3 and 4 than for cuts 1 and 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A: ELPA21 is not computer-adaptive.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refer to comments in critical element 2.1 related to test development, especially related to students at higher proficiency levels and its potential impact on CSEMs.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

### Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>For all State ELP assessments,</b> assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition<sup>2</sup>).</p> <p><b>For ELP assessments,</b> the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all EL students and fair across student groups, including ELs with disabilities, in their design, development, and analysis.</p>	<p><b>EL 3.1.1,</b> <i>A Quality Assurance Plan for ELPA21: Gathering the Evidence to Evaluate Validity, Reliability, Fairness, and Utility</i> (2013)</p> <p><b>EL 2.1.2</b> <i>ELPA21 Theory of Action</i> (2014), p. 5.</p> <p><b>EL 2.1.2.1</b> <i>ELPA21 Assessment Framework-Summative School Year 2015-2016</i>, pp. 14-15.</p> <p><b>EL2.2.1</b> <i>Item Development Plan</i> (2014), pp. 1-4.</p> <p><b>EL 2.3.1.2</b> <i>Accessibility and Accommodations Manual (2018-2019)</i></p>	<p>Peers identified evidence of steps to ensure the accessibility of the online assessment. However, peers could only locate a statement regarding item writer training and Universal Design (EL 2.2.1, p. 1-4), not the contents of such training. Peers request item writer training materials to better be able to determine how central this is in the test design.</p> <p>Regarding fairness, peers note that DIF statistics are provided for the online assessment, but could not locate them for Braille and paper versions. This is probably the result of small N sizes for those versions, but this should be indicated clearly.</p> <p>Peers noted that there is relatively less documentation of the development of Braille and paper versions of the test, as well as the extent to which accommodations do (or do not) make the test accessible.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u><sub>x</sub> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peers request item writer training materials to better be able to determine how central UDL is in the test design.</li> <li>• Further documentation that specifically addresses the fairness and accessibility of the ELP assessment for ELs with disabilities.</li> </ul>		

<sup>2</sup> see page 28 of “*A State’s Guide to the U.S. Department of Education’s Assessment Peer Review Process*”, September 24, 2018 available at: [www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html](http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html)

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21**

**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for <b>ELP assessments</b>, including performance for EL students with high and low levels of English language proficiency and with different proficiency profiles across the domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing.</p>	<p><b>EL 2.2.8</b> <i>Spring 2015 ELPA21 Field Test Technical Report (2016)</i>, Table 3.3, p. 16; pp. 19-25.  <b>EL 3.1.1.2</b> <i>ELPA21 Standard Setting Technical Report (2016)</i>  <b>EL 3.1.1.3a-f</b> <i>Standard Setting Workshop Materials (IOIBs)</i>  <b>EL 2.1.1.1</b> <i>2017-18 Summative Score Reporting Specifications</i>  <b>EL 3.3.1</b> <i>ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 1</i>  <b>EL 3.3.2</b> <i>ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 2_Nebraska Example</i></p>	<p>Peers could not locate item maps showing item difficulty and student ability across the continuum in each domain and overall. The CSEMs (addressed in critical element 4.1) would suggest that there is not adequate precision, at least at higher levels of student proficiency.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Item maps showing item difficulty and student ability across the continuum in each domain and overall (by grade/grade span).</li> </ul>		

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>If the State administers multiple forms of <i>ELP assessments</i> within or across grade-spans, ELP levels, or school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s <i>ELP standards</i> and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across settings.</p>	<p>The consortium’s narrative indicates that the three forms (A, B, and C) of the online assessment are “nearly identical” because they use the same items in different orders.  <b>EL 2.2.9</b> <i>Item Analysis and Calibration (2017)</i>  <b>EL 4.5.2</b> <i>ELPA21 Internal Memo: IRT Calibration Implications (2019)</i>.</p>	<p>EL 4.5.2, p. 1: “The total of 2113 items were concurrently calibrated...”</p> <p>In spite of concurrent calibration procedures, some peers thought that item ordering could potentially affect student ability estimates.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p><b>EL 2.1.2.1</b> <i>ELPA21 Assessment Framework - Summative School Year 2015-2016</i> (p. 15)  <b>EL 2.1.2.3 a-f</b> <i>Field Test Slots All Form 1A ELPA21 ONLINE Summative Test Form (2017)</i>  <b>EL 2.2.2a-f</b> <i>ELPA21 Task and Item Specifications (2016)</i>  <b>EL 2.2.6</b> <i>Item Development Process Report (2015)</i>, pp. 53-56  <b>EL 2.2.9</b> <i>Item Analysis and Calibration (2017)</i>  <b>EL 3.3.3</b> <i>ELPA21 AAA TMT Review of Items Showing Differential Item Functioning for English Language Learners with Disabilities</i>  <b>EL 4.6.1</b> <i>ELPA21 Summative and Screener PP Style Guide TB 020218</i>  <b>EL 4.6.2</b> <i>Examples of Paper-based Representation of Online Items</i>  <b>EL 4.6.3 a-f</b> <i>ELPA21 Paper and Pencil Summative Test Form Planners (2017)</i>  <b>EL 4.6.4</b> <i>A Data-informed, Judgment-based Procedure for Linking Cut Scores on Alternative Assessment Formats</i>  <b>EL 4.6.5 a-f</b> <i>ELPA21 Braille Summative Test Form Planners (2017)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Peers could not locate sufficient evidence about the design and development process of paper and Braille forms to determine whether they support comparable interpretations of results across versions.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence could include data such as whether the same blueprint is used, what number of items from the online version must be modified for paper/Braille versions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Peers could not locate adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. This could be achieved with further details about the test design and development of the Braille and paper/pencil versions.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Details about the design and development process of paper and Braille forms to justify the comparability of different versions.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21**

**Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and</li> <li>Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The consortium’s narrative indicates, “At its inception, ELPA21 developed a quality assurance plan that outlined the required steps to evaluate the technical quality of its assessment system including test development, implementation, interpretation, and use of results (EL 3.1.1 <i>A Quality Assurance Plan for ELPA21 (2013)</i>). This plan serves as a conceptual framework for identifying, collecting, and evaluating evidence concerning the fairness of testing procedures, the reliability of test scores, and the validity of test-based interpretations. The development of a continuous quality assurance plan would follow the general approach of EL 3.1.1.” (p. 83).</li> <li>Consortium-provided evidence in this section was not relevant:  <b>EL 4.7.2.1</b> <i>Alt-ELPA A Path Forward (ASES-ELL SCASS) October 2017</i>  <b>EL 4.7.2.2</b> <i>Fairness in Testing ELs and ELSWDs_MC</i>  <b>EL 4.7.2.3</b> <i>Fairness in Testing ELs and ELSWDs_NS</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Peers could not locate evidence that the plan outlined in EL 3.1.1 has been implemented, although the timeline (p. 19) indicates that the plan should have been implemented in 2016. Consultation with the governing bodies as outlined in the consortium’s narrative is appropriate, but it does not constitute a systematic plan.</li> <li>Although the consortium provided some evidence in this section of presentations to CCSSO and some public documents on the ELPA21 website, it is not evidence of technical quality. State-provided evidence should be reviewed for this portion of critical element.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The consortium should provide a systematic quality control plan or data showing that a plan like the one in EL 3.1.1 has in fact been implemented.</li> <li>State-specific evidence should be reviewed to determine whether information about technical quality of the test is made public, including on the State’s website.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

**Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students<sup>4</sup> with disabilities in the State’s assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>For ELP assessments</b>, policies that require the inclusion of an EL with a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) such that there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected component (the State must assess the student’s English language proficiency based on the remaining components in which it is possible to assess the student).</li> </ul>		<p>N/A: State-specific (although the consortium provided some additional evidence)</p>
<p><b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>No additional evidence is required for the consortium.</p>		

<sup>4</sup> For ELP peer review, this refers to ELs with disabilities.

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note: This critical element does not apply to ELP assessments, as the requirements only apply to the inclusion of ELs in <b>academic assessments</b>.</li> </ul>		N/A
<b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21**

**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs;</li> <li>• Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> <li>• Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>EL 2.3.1.2</b> <i>Accessibility and Accommodations Manual</i> (2018-19), pp. 2-3, 6-15, Figure 1, Appendices C-E</li> <li>• <b>EL 2.3.1.2</b> <i>Accessibility and Accommodations Manual</i> (2018-19), p. 9, Appendix B</li> <li>• <b>EL 2.2.8</b> <i>Spring 2015 ELPA21 Field Test Technical Report</i> (2016), pp. 13-16.</li> <li>• <b>EL 3.3.3</b> (Redacted) <i>ELPA21 AAA TMT Review of Items Showing Differential Item Functioning for English Language Learners with Disabilities</i></li> <li>• According to the consortium’s narrative (p. 93), exceptional requests are handled by the States.</li> <li>• From the consortium’s narrative: “ELPA21 acknowledges that each member state, consistent with its state policy and practice, is responsible for ensuring accommodations for all assessments do not deny students the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.” (p. 93).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peers believe that the consortium has made available an appropriate list of accommodations for ELs on the ELPA21.</li> <li>• Some peers believe that insufficient evidence was provided showing the effectiveness of accommodations and that the accommodations “allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.”</li> </ul> <p>EL 2.3.1.2 indicates that some accommodations may not be used consistently across member States, rendering comparisons of ELPA21 scores problematic. Specifically, some vendors allow unlimited replays in the Listening domain (p. 14) and unlimited re-recordings in the Speaking domain (p. 13) as a normal part of test administration, while for others it is an accommodation. Peers suggest that the consortium have a standardized policy that would help ensure consistency. Also, some vendors allow all universal features to be disabled (p. i) whereas others do not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State-provided evidence should be reviewed regarding exceptional requests.</li> </ul> <p>The consortium does not currently play a role in reviewing or allowing exceptional requests. Peers recommend that the consortium have a mechanism by which any exceptional accommodations that occur multiple times can be discussed at the consortium level and be added to the standard list of accommodations as deemed appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State-provided evidence should be reviewed regarding the extent to which accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students the opportunities to</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.
<b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peers request that the consortium consider providing a standardized policy that would help ensure consistency regarding the use of re-plays and re-recordings as part of the normal test administration or as an accommodation.</li> <li>• State-provided evidence should be reviewed regarding exceptional requests.</li> <li>• State-provided evidence should be reviewed regarding the extent to which accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students the opportunities to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21**

**Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures;</li> <li>• Monitored for administrations of all required ELP assessments, and AELPA.</li> </ul>	<p>Although the responsibility for monitoring test administration for special populations falls largely to the member States, the consortium provided some evidence in this critical element (but this is just general documentation produced by ELPA21 to ensure consistent administration procedures across States):</p> <p><b>EL 2.3.1.1a-f</b> <i>Assessment Guides (2016)</i>  <b>EL 2.3.1.4</b> <i>Test Coordinator's Manual (2016)</i>  <b>EL 2.3.2.5</b> <i>Student Testing Session (2016)</i>  <b>EL 2.3.2.9</b> <i>Workstation Preparation (2016)</i>  <b>EL 2.3.1.2</b> <i>Accessibility and Accommodations Manual (2018-2019)</i>, p. 3, Appendices C, D, E.  <b>EL 2.3.2.2</b> <i>Accessibility Features and Accommodations (2016)</i></p>	<p>State-provided evidence regarding monitoring test administration for special populations should be reviewed.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<u>  x  </u>	No additional evidence is required from the consortium. However, State-specific evidence regarding monitoring test administration for special populations should be reviewed.	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b><i>For ELP standards:</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State adopted ELP achievement standards that address the different proficiency levels of ELs;</li> <li>• If the State has developed alternate ELP achievement standards, it has adopted them only for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who cannot participate in the regular ELP assessment even with appropriate accommodations.</li> </ul>		<p>N/A: State-specific</p>
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>N/A: State-specific evidence should be reviewed for this critical element.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>ELP achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate ELP achievement standards</i></b>, such that:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Cut scores are developed for every grade/grade band, content domain/language domain, and/or composite for which proficiency-level scores are reported.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>EL 3.1.1.2 ELPA21 Standard Setting Technical Report</b></p> <p>N/A: There are no alternate ELP achievement standards at this time.</p>	<p>The bookmark standard setting method was used and panelists had appropriate diversity and expertise.</p> <p>Cut scores were developed for every grade/grade band and language domain for which proficiency-level scores are reported.</p> <p>As peers noted in section 4.1, some evidence (e.g., CSEMs) suggests that some cut scores may have been set too high, especially at cuts 3 and 4. Peers request that the consortium evaluate the cut scores.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluate the cut scores, particularly at cuts 3 and 4.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>For ELP achievement standards:</b> The State has ensured that ELP assessment results are expressed in terms that are clearly aligned with the State’s ELP standards, and its ELP performance-level descriptors.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate ELP achievement standards for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate ELP achievement standards should be linked to the State’s grade-level/grade-band ELP standards, and should reflect professional judgment of the highest ELP achievement standards possible for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p><b>EL 1.2.2</b> <i>English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards</i>, p. 10  <b>EL 2.1.1.1</b> <i>ELPA21 2017-18 Summative Score Reporting Specifications</i>, pp.13-18  <b>EL 2.2.6</b> <i>Item Development Process Report</i>, p.20  <b>EL 3.1.1.1</b> <i>ELP Standards at a Glance</i>, p. 1  <b>EL 3.1.1.2</b> <i>ELPA21 Standard Setting Technical Report</i>, pp. 11-20, 26-27, 73-75, 79  <b>EL 3.2.3</b> <i>Achievement Level Descriptors K-12</i>.</p> <p>The State has not adopted alternate ELP achievement standards for ELs with the most significant cognitive disabilities. According to the timeline in EL 1.3.1 (p. 23), the Alt ELP standards were being created between January and December 2018 and will be “acknowledged” by States in 2019, and implemented in 2020.</p>	<p>Peers found the consortium-provided evidence shows that ELPA21 assessment results are clearly aligned with the consortium’s ELP standards.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21

**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on <i>English language proficiency for all ELs including the number and percentage of ELs attaining ELP</i>.</p> <p>For the <i>ELP assessment</i>, the State provides coherent and timely information about each student’s attainment of the State’s ELP standards to parents that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports the <i>ELs’ English proficiency</i> in terms of the State’s grade level/grade-band ELP standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>• Are provided in an understandable and uniform format;</li> <li>• Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian;</li> </ul>	<p>Primary responsibility for score reporting falls to the member States, but the consortium provided some documentation of “guidance for member states to provide to vendors for incorporating ELPA21 into state scoring, reporting, and data systems.” (EL 2.1.1.1, p. 6)</p> <p><b>EL 2.1.1.1</b> <i>ELPA21 2017-18 Summative Score Reporting Specifications</i>, pp. 22 -27.  <b>EL 3.3.1</b> <i>ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 1</i>  <b>EL 6.4.1</b> <i>Issue Brief Reporting_4-9-14 (v2)</i>, pp. 1, 2, 4.</p> <p><b>EL 2.1.1.2</b> <i>Summative Score Reporting Specifications</i>, pp. 22-25  <b>EL 3.3.1</b> <i>ELPA21 2017-18 Technical Report Part 1</i>, p. 28  <b>EL 6.4.1</b> <i>Issue Brief Reporting_4-9-14 (v2)</i>, pp. 4-7</p> <p><b>EL 4.7.1.13</b> was not cited in this section but it discusses ongoing research that ELPA is doing to make score reports more useful and informative for teachers and parents.</p> <p><b>EL 4.7.1.12</b> <i>Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Notes</i> was not cited in this critical element either, but peers found that it contained relevant information since there were recommendations for improving score reports (p. 21).</p>	<p>Sample score reports were not provided in the consortium submission. Therefore, State-provided evidence should be reviewed for all aspects of this critical element.</p> <p>Peers recommend that the consortium develop score report templates in consultation with member States and taking into consideration evidence from its ongoing research (EL 4.7.1.13) and TAC (EL 4.7.1.12).</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ELPA21**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> </ul>		
<b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required from the consortium. However, State-provided evidence should be reviewed for all aspects of this critical element.		

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

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

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..... 6**

**Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments .. 8**

**Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments..... 9**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS..... 10**

**Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development ..... 10**

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development ..... 13**

**Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration..... 14**

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration ..... 16**

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security..... 17**

**Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 19**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY .....20**

**Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content20**

**Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Linguistic Processes..... 22**

**Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 23**

**Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables..... 24**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER.....25**

**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability ..... 25**

**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility ..... 27**

**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum ..... 28**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 29**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 30**

**Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment..... 31**

**Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance ..... 32**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS.....33**

**Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 33**

**Critical Element 5.2 – DOES NOT APPLY to ELP Assessment Peer Review34**

**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations ..... 35**

**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.

..... 37

**SECTION 6: ELP ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING.....39**

**Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of ELP Achievement Standards for All Students..... 39**

**Critical Element 6.2 – ELP Achievement Standards Setting ..... 40**

**Critical Element 6.3 –Aligned ELP Achievement Standards ..... 41**

**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting ..... 42**

**SECTION 7: DOES NOT APPLY TO ELP ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW .....43**

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For English language proficiency (ELP) standards:</i></p> <p>The State formally adopted K-12 ELP standards for all ELs in public schools in the State.</p>		<p>See states</p>
<p><b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  <b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence to be provided by states.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>For ELP standards:</b> The ELP standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing;</li> <li>• address the different proficiency levels of ELs; and</li> </ul> <p>align to the State academic content standards (see definition<sup>5</sup>). The ELP standards must contain language proficiency expectations that reflect the language needed for ELs to acquire and demonstrate their achievement of the knowledge and skills identified in the State’s academic content standards appropriate to each grade-level/grade-band in at least reading/language arts, mathematics, and science.</p>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <p>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?</p>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

<sup>5</sup> see page 24 of “*A State’s Guide to the U.S. Department of Education’s Assessment Peer Review Process*”, September 24, 2018 available at: [www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html](http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html)

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only

<b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b>
--------------------------------------

<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>
---

- |   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul> |
|---|

<b>Alternate ACCESS</b>
-------------------------

- |   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Alignment of AMPIs to ELP standards</li></ul> |
|---|

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

**Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
The State’s assessment system includes an <i>annual general and alternate ELP assessment</i> (aligned with State ELP standards) administered to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All ELs in grades K-12.</li> </ul>	Reviewed by Department Staff Only	Reviewed by Department Staff Only
<b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

**Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State has policies that require the inclusion <i>of all public elementary and secondary ELs in the State’s ELP assessment</i>, including ELs with disabilities.</li> </ul>	Reviewed by Department Staff Only	Reviewed by Department Staff Only
<b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>If the State has developed or amended challenging <i>ELP</i> standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education).</li> <li>• Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas).</li> <li>• Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State.</li> <li>• Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents.</li> </ul>	<p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>	<p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

**Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <i>the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards</i>, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <i>the State’s ELP standards</i>, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that the ELP assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <i>the State’s ELP standards</i> and reflects appropriate inclusion of the range of complexity found in the standards.</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and intended uses and interpretations of results.</li> <li>• If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <p><u>Statement of purpose</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.1-3, p. 3 and 2.1-4, p. 1.</li> </ul> <p><u>Test blueprints</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.”</li> <li>• However, blueprints were not provided.</li> </ul> <p><u>Range of complexity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence provided.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <p><u>Test blueprints</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence provided.</li> </ul> <p>No evidence of Processes to ensure that the ELP assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <i>the State’s ELP standards</i> and reflects appropriate inclusion of the range of complexity found in the standards.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

<p>student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting. If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be <i>entirely</i> administered through a portfolio.</p>		
--	--	--

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only

### Section 2.1 Summary Statement

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

#### 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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess student English language proficiency based on the <i>State’s ELP standards</i> in terms of content and language processes.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does 2.2-3 apply to Alternate ACCESS?</li> <li>If not, no evidence was provided.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence was not provided.</li> <li>It is not evident that experts with knowledge of English language learners with significant cognitive disabilities are included in the development of Alternate ACCESS.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items</li> <li>Evidence of the involvement of experts with knowledge of English language learners with significant cognitive disabilities in development activities.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only

**Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities;</li> <li>• If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <p><u>Training</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• It is not likely that accommodations would be addressed in the training since there are no accommodations, rather all “individualized instructional supports” are permitted.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <p><u>Communicates clear standardized procedures for administration</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• There is no statement as to who may be a test administrator.</li> <li>• There are no participation guidelines provided.</li> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• There is no description related to allowable student response modes, e.g., pointing, eye-gaze, etc. This should be included in this section.</li> <li>• Why does the student need a sharpened pencil if another mode of response will be used?</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• There does not appear to be adequate examples of what “approaches” means vs an incorrect response</li> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• Are tracing and repeating a sound reflective of ELP standards?</li> </ul> <p>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.</p> <p><u>Training</u></p>
--	--	--

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Content of the training is not provided. Is scoring practice included (i.e., how to score attending and approaching)?</li> <li>• Training on “individualized instructional supports that are used by teachers in everyday classroom instruction” that are permissible for use during the assessment.</li> </ul> <p>WIDA providing resources for training. States will need to provide evidence that administrators completed training.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Evidence that the policies and procedures were developed with involvement of experts who have experience with assessing English learners with significant cognitive disabilities</li> <li>• 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</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
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
<b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> <li>• Application of test security procedures to the general ELP assessments and the AELPA.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.3-1, same as ACCESS, no additional information on test security provided.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence provided beyond that in the ACCESS materials.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  <b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence related to all aspects of this critical element are needed</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

**Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results;</li> <li>• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>• To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence specific to Alternate ACCESS was submitted.</li> <li>• 2.6-1 applies to Alternate ACCESS.</li> <li>• 2.6-2 does not reference Alternate ACCESS</li> <li>• 2.6-3 applies to Alternate ACCESS</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence has been provided related to research using WIDA data.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Additional evidence is required from states to address the remaining aspects of the critical element.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information related to who is involved in handling WIDA data and how data are protected by all parties, including during handoffs, is required.</li> <li>• Additional evidence is required from states to address the remaining aspects of the critical element.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><i>The State’s ELP assessments</i> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s ELP standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s ELP assessment and the ELP standards the assessment is designed to measure in terms of language knowledge and skills, the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards, across all proficiency levels, domains, and modalities identified therein;</li> <li>• Documentation of alignment (as defined) between the State’s ELP standards and the language demands implied by, or explicitly stated in, the State’s academic content standards;</li> <li>• If the State administers an AELPA aligned with alternate ELP achievement standards, the assessment shows adequate linkage to the State’s ELP standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and that the breadth of content and linguistic complexity</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.”</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence for this critical element including plans to address any issues following the 2019 study.</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

<p>determined in test design is appropriate for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>		
<p><b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  <b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

**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
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap <i>the intended language processes</i> appropriate for each grade level/grade-band as represented in the State’s ELP standards.</p>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.”</li> <li>• Evidence is needed for this critical element.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence is needed for this critical element.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  <b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap <i>the intended language processes</i> appropriate for each grade level/grade-band as represented in the State’s ELP standards</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

**Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s <i><b>ELP standards</b></i> on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1-4, p. 60-61, 70 Higher for Alternate, might be helpful to include an explanation or rationale for why this is reasonable.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  <b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explanation of how the included statistical analyses relate to the validity framework for the assessments.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

**Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• No relevant evidence was provided.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence related to this critical element is needed.</li> </ul>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only

### Section 3.4 Summary Statement

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

#### 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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population (<i>for ELP assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable</i>);</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.”</li> <li>• Reliability information for overall composite scores was located (p. 109, 138, 165, 194).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p>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</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
precise estimates of <i>an EL's English proficiency</i> .		audiences in addition to the various page number references.
<b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reliability by various subgroups</li> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• Evidence that the reliability results are reviewed by WIDA and used to inform ongoing maintenance and development.</li> <li>• TIFs for overall composite scores</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For all State ELP assessments,</i> assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition<sup>6</sup>).</p> <p><i>For ELP assessments,</i> the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all EL students and fair across student groups, including ELs with disabilities, in their design, development, and analysis.</p>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.1-4 Technical Report for Alternate ACCESS, p. 72-73. Not clear how this relates to the critical element.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Evidence similar to ACCESS submission is not included for Alternate ACCESS.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Braille and alternate modes of communication are not addressed (e.g. eye gaze, assistive technology).</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Evidence related to item development, test design, item reviews for Alternate ACCESS is not provided.</li> <li>• DIF was considered for gender and Hispanic/non-Hispanic, but this should be done for other subgroups as well (e.g., accommodation type, SES).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the implementation of universal design and accessibility principles during development and review.</li> <li>• Additional DIF analyses to include more student subgroups.</li> <li>• Evidence related to braille and alternate modes of communication</li> <li>• Definitions of and guidance for appropriate instructional supports that can be used during the assessment</li> </ul>		

<sup>6</sup> see page 28 of “*A State’s Guide to the U.S. Department of Education’s Assessment Peer Review Process*”, September 24, 2018 available at: [www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html](http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html)

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for <b>ELP assessments</b>, including performance for EL students with high and low levels of English language proficiency and with different proficiency profiles across the domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing.</p>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 2.1-4 Frequency distributions show potential ceiling effects for example p.93.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence submitted does not support that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for <b>ELP assessments</b>, including performance for EL students with high and low levels of English language proficiency.</li> </ul> <p>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.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence submitted does not support that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for <b>ELP assessments</b>, including performance for EL students with high and low levels of English language proficiency.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments (and <i>for ELP assessments, any applicable domain or component sub-tests</i>) that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s <i>ELP standards</i>.</p> <p><i>For ELP assessments</i>, if an English learner has a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains/components (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) such that there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected domain(s)/component(s), the State must provide a description of how it will ensure that the student is assessed in the remaining domain(s)/component(s) in which it is possible to assess the student, and a description of how this will occur.<sup>7</sup></p>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <p><i>Standardized Scoring Procedures</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• There is no evidence provided that standardized scoring procedures are applied given the local scoring.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the implementation of standardized scoring procedures and monitoring and to include definitions of key terms and test administration and scoring procedures.</li> </ul>		

<sup>7</sup> See full reference in regulation, 34 CFR § 200.6(h)(4)(ii) (online at [https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=07e168e9e7a6c5931b4549cc15547ee9&mc=true&node=se34.1.200\\_16&rgn=div8](https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=07e168e9e7a6c5931b4549cc15547ee9&mc=true&node=se34.1.200_16&rgn=div8) )

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only

- 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.

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>If the State administers multiple forms of <i>ELP assessments</i> within or across grade-spans, ELP levels, or school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s <i>ELP standards</i> and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across settings.</p>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.1-4 Alternate ACCESS. No equating. Same items since field test in 2013?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only

<b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b>
--------------------------------------

<b>Alternate ACCESS</b>
-------------------------

- |  |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Rationales for why item refreshment is not done and how this does not impact the validity of the scores.</li></ul> |
|--|

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>• Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b> N/A</p>	
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

**Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and</li> <li>• Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence provided.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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),</li> <li>• Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website is not provided.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

**Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students<sup>8</sup> with disabilities in the State’s assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>For ELP assessments</b>, policies that require the inclusion of an EL with a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) such that there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected component (the State must assess the student’s English language proficiency based on the remaining components in which it is possible to assess the student).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <p>2.2-16 Recommended Participation Guidelines, p.27</p>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <p>This critical element is primarily addressed by states and informed by the information provided by WIDA.</p>

<sup>8</sup> For ELP peer review, this refers to ELs with disabilities.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only

**Section 5.1 Summary Statement**

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

**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.

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note: This critical element does not apply to ELP assessments, as the requirements only apply to the inclusion of ELs in <b>academic assessments</b>.</li> </ul>		
<b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs;</li> <li>• Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> <li>• Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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, <u>only if they do change what is being measured on the assessment.</u>” Likely a typo. Permissible individualized instructional supports for use in the assessment need to be defined.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence for all aspects of this critical element are needed.</li> <li>• Evidence that students who need braille and/or alternate response modes are able to participate.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only

### Section 5.3 Summary Statement

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

#### 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.

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

**Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures;</li> <li>• Monitored for administrations of all required ELP assessments, and AELPA.</li> </ul>		<p>See states</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only

### Section 5.4 Summary Statement

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

#### 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.

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>For ELP standards:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State adopted ELP achievement standards that address the different proficiency levels of ELs;</li> <li>• If the State has developed alternate ELP achievement standards, it has adopted them only for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who cannot participate in the regular ELP assessment even with appropriate accommodations.</li> </ul>		<p>See states</p>
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  <b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence to be provided by states.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>ELP achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate ELP achievement standards</i></b>, such that:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Cut scores are developed for every grade/grade band, content domain/language domain, and/or composite for which proficiency-level scores are reported.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6.1-3, p. 12-15. Using Angoff Yes/No method, cut scores for four domain scores and four composite scores were established.</li> <li>• p. 12. The same four cut scores are used for all grades by domain.</li> <li>• 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.”</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• The Peers noted that the number of cut scores established during standard setting did not correspond 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?</li> <li>• 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</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p data-bbox="191 321 997 358">_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p data-bbox="191 358 430 386"><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul data-bbox="191 386 1890 418" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="191 386 1890 418">• Cut scores are developed for every grade/grade band, content domain/language domain, and/or composite for which proficiency-level scores are reported.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>For ELP achievement standards:</b> The State has ensured that ELP assessment results are expressed in terms that are clearly aligned with the State’s ELP standards, and its ELP performance-level descriptors.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate ELP achievement standards for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate ELP achievement standards should be linked to the State’s grade-level/grade-band ELP standards, and should reflect professional judgment of the highest ELP achievement standards possible for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <p><u>Alternate ELP achievement standards are linked to State’s grade-level/grade-band ELP standards</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.”</li> <li>• 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 <b>performance definitions</b>. 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 <b>Alternate Model Performance Indicators (AMPIs)</b> 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 AMPIs, which exemplify the Standards. The AMPIs describe the expectations for ELLs with significant cognitive disabilities for each of the four <b>Standards</b>, at the four different <b>grade-level clusters</b>, across four <b>language domains</b>, and at each of the <b>language proficiency levels</b>. 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</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.”</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	'strand.'" However, based on the statement <b>below</b> , (above?)evidence has yet to be established that there is a link between the AMPIs and WIDAs ELP Standards.	
<b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  <b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only

**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on <i>English language proficiency for all ELs including the number and percentage of ELs attaining ELP</i>.</p> <p>For the <i>ELP assessment</i>, the State provides coherent and timely information about each student’s attainment of the State’s ELP standards to parents that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports the <i>ELs’ English proficiency</i> in terms of the State’s grade level/grade-band ELP standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>• Are provided in an understandable and uniform format;</li> <li>• Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <p><u>Student reports include ELs English proficiency in terms of State’s grade level/grade-band ELP standards including PLDs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Raw scores in the Listening and Reading domains</li> <li>○ scale scores</li> <li>○ confidence bands</li> <li>○ language proficiency levels</li> </ul> </li> <li>• p. 19 Example of a student report with proficiency levels for each domain, oral language, literacy, comprehension, and an overall composite score.</li> <li>• 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%.</li> <li>• P. 29 Appendix A: Alternate ACCESS Performance Level Descriptors. Figure A-1 Individual Student Report (p.3)</li> </ul> <p><u>Written in a language parents and guardians can understand, or are orally translated</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• A reference could not be located about oral translation.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate ACCESS</b></p> <p>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).</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Provided in a format accessible to a parent with disability</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A reference could not be located</li> </ul>	

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WIDA-Alt ACCESS Only

### Section 6.4 Summary Statement

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

#### 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)
- 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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON

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..... 6**  
**Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments .. 8**  
**Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments..... 9**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS.....10**  
**Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development ..... 10**  
**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development ..... 13**  
**Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration..... 14**  
**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration ..... 16**  
**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security..... 17**  
**Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 19**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY .....20**  
**Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content20**  
**Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Linguistic Processes..... 22**  
**Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 23**  
**Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables..... 24**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER.....25**  
**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability ..... 25**  
**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility ..... 27**  
**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum ..... 28**  
**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 29**  
**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 30**  
**Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment..... 31**  
**Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance ..... 32**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS.....33**  
**Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 33**  
**Critical Element 5.2 – DOES NOT APPLY to ELP Assessment Peer Review34**  
**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations ..... 35**  
**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.

..... 37

**SECTION 6: ELP ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING.....39**

**Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of ELP Achievement Standards for All Students..... 39**  
**Critical Element 6.2 – ELP Achievement Standards Setting ..... 40**  
**Critical Element 6.3 –Aligned ELP Achievement Standards ..... 41**  
**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting ..... 42**

**SECTION 7: DOES NOT APPLY TO ELP ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW .....43**

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For English language proficiency (ELP) standards:</i> The State formally adopted K-12 ELP standards for all ELs in public schools in the State.</p>	<p>Evidence for both ELP and AELPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA001 – WA-ELP-Standards-K12</li> <li>• Evidence #WA002 – Press Release ELP Standards</li> <li>• Evidence #WA003 – Memo ELP Standards</li> </ul>	<p>The evidence submitted included a set of K-12 ELP standards (Evidence #WA001) and announcements of the adoption of the same (Evidence #WA002, 003).</p>
<p><b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For ELP standards:</i> The ELP standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing;</li> <li>• address the different proficiency levels of ELs; and</li> <li>• align to the State academic content standards (see definition<sup>9</sup>). The ELP standards must contain language proficiency expectations that reflect the language needed for ELs to acquire and demonstrate their achievement of the knowledge and skills identified in the State’s academic content standards appropriate to each grade-level/grade-band in at least reading/language arts, mathematics, and science.</li> </ul>	<p>See consortium evidence, plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA004 – CCSS Press Release</li> <li>• Evidence #WA005 – NGSS Web Announcement</li> <li>• Evidence #WA006 – Alternate ACCESS for ELLs_WIDA webpage).</li> <li>• Evidence #WA007 – Alternate ACCESS Scores and Reports_WIDA webpage</li> <li>• Evidence #WA008 – Alt-ACCESS-Sample-ISR-English, p. 3).</li> <li>• Evidence #WA009 – WIDA 2012-ELD-Standards.</li> </ul>	<p>The ELP standards are constructed in functional terms, reflecting a communicative, language-in-use approach to English language ability (Evidence WA#002, p. 4). Nevertheless, it is shown that the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing are covered by these standards (p. 5) for every grade (p. 35, 46, 57, 68, 79, 90, 101, 112, 123, 134, 145, 156, 167, 178, 189).</p> <p>The ELP standards address the different proficiency levels of ELs at every grade (p. 6-29).</p> <p>The CELP standards are aligned to State academic content standards for language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies (in brief, p. 34, in detail, p. 36-210).</p>
<p><b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See WIDA notes for Alternate ACCESS Peer recommendations.</li> </ul>		

<sup>9</sup> see page 24 of “*A State’s Guide to the U.S. Department of Education’s Assessment Peer Review Process*”, September 24, 2018 available at: [www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html](http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html)

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

**Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State’s assessment system includes an <i>annual general and alternate ELP assessment</i> (aligned with State ELP standards) administered to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All ELs in grades K-12.</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA010 – B059-15</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA011 – AssessmentWebinar-092915 (slides 56 and 57)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA012 – ELPA21UpdateWebinar-110515</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA013 – State Testing Calendars 2018 (p. 3)</li> <li>Evidence #WA014 – AssesmentWebinar-101817 (slide 17)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA015 – Message to ELP Assessment-101817</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA016 – WAW-102317 (p. 9-10)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA017 – Message to Migrant Bilingual-110317</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA013 – State Testing Calendars 2018, (p. 3)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA018 – AssesmentWebinar-011618 (slide 29)</li> </ul>	<p>The State’s evidence established that the State’s assessment system includes a general ELP assessment that should be administered to all ELs in grades K-12.</p> <p>The State does administer an alternate ELP assessment (AELPA) for ELs with significant cognitive disabilities who cannot take the general ELP assessment, even with accommodations.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>x No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

**Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State has policies that require the inclusion <i>of all public elementary and secondary Els in the State’s ELP assessment</i>, including Els with disabilities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA019 – RCW 28A.655.070</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA020 – RCW 28A.150.210</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA021 – RCW 28A.180.090</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA022 –TCM_Spring-2018 (p. 12)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA019 – RCW 28A.655.070</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA020 – RCW 28A.150.210</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA021 – RCW 28A.180.090</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA023 – IEP Team Decision Making Guidelines</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA024 – AltACCESS Overview Webinar-2018 (slides 6 and 7)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA025 – AltELPA Participation Guidelines</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA026 – IEP-Team-Guidelines-Assess (p. 5–7, 10–12)</li> </ul>	<p>The State’s evidence established that the assessment system included all ELs in grades K-12, including ELs with disabilities.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>If the State has developed or amended challenging <i>ELP</i> standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education).</li> <li>• Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas).</li> <li>• Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State.</li> <li>• Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents.</li> </ul>	<p>Does not apply as the State adopted ELP standards prior to the December, 2015 passage of the ESSA.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</b>		
N/A		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <i>the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards</i>, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <i>the State’s ELP standards</i>, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that the ELP assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <i>the State’s ELP standards</i> and reflects appropriate inclusion of the range of complexity found in the standards.</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and intended uses and interpretations of results.</li> <li>• If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the</li> </ul>	<p>See consortium evidence, plus the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Washington uses the ELPA21 summative assessment for progress, reclassification, and accountability               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Evidence #WA027 – Test Development Timeline_webpage),</li> <li>• in brochures designed for families (Evidence #WA028 – Family Brochure and Evidence #WA029 – YCP_Grade5),</li> <li>• in the Washington School Improvement Framework (WSIF) section of our State Report Card website (Evidence # WA030 – WSIF HighlightsandUpdates and Evidence #WA031 – WSIF EnglishLearnerProgress).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>For AELPA:</p> <p>See consortium evidence, plus the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA015 – Message to ELP Assessment-101817 explains Washington’s use of the Alternate ACCESS.</li> <li>• January 7, 2015 Dear Colleague Letter (Evidence #WA032 – ED DCL-010715)</li> <li>• Questions and Answers Regarding Inclusion of English Learners with Disabilities in English Language Proficiency Assessments and Title III Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives document (Evidence #WA033 – QandA ELSWD)</li> </ul> <p>OSPI has begun discussions with our National Technical Advisory Committee (NTAC) about what processes could be used to determine alternate ELP achievement standards for the Alternate ACCESS, in anticipation of</p>	<p>See concerns noted in the ELPA21 Peer review notes.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON

<p>student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting. If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be <i>entirely</i> administered through a portfolio.</p>	<p>continued use of the assessment beyond the 2018-19 school year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA034 – NTAC Membership and</li> <li>• Evidence #WA035 – NTAC discussion WIDA-090618).</li> <li>• The NTAC suggested that OSPI collect more data from a variety of sources to help inform them about the student population before the NTAC could make further recommendations (Evidence #WA036 – NTAC Meeting Minutes-090618p1).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>See</del> ELPA21 notes for Peer recommendations</li> <li>• See WIDA notes for Alternate ACCESS Peer recommendations.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess student English language proficiency based on the <i>State’s ELP standards</i> in terms of content and language processes.</li> </ul>	Consortium provides the evidence	See concerns noted in the ELPA21 peer review notes.
<p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See ELPA21 notes for Peer recommendations</li> <li>• See WIDA notes for Alternate ACCESS Peer recommendations</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

**Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities;</li> <li>• If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p>See consortium evidence, plus additional, as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Washington Comprehensive Assessment Program Portal (WCAP Portal). The WCAP Portal is the access point for the Washington assessment system tools and resources (Evidence #WA037 – WCAP Portal website).</li> <li>• Evidence #WA022 – TCM_Spring-2018 incorporates ELPA21 information with WA general assessments in the Test Coordinators Manual (TCM).</li> <li>• Evidence #WA038 – ELPA21-TAM-Spring-Summative-2018 is a customized Test Administration Manual (TAM) for Washington.</li> <li>• Evidence #WA039 – Test-Administrator-User-Guide-2017-2018, Evidence #WA040 – TDS-TA-Interface-Module_2017-2018, and Evidence #WA041 – TDS-Student-Interface-Module_2018.</li> <li>• Evidence #WA042 – ELPA21-Tool-Button-Sheet.</li> <li>• Evidence #WA043 – GTSA_2017-18 is a customized Guidelines on Tools, Supports, &amp; Accommodations for State Assessments document for Washington.</li> <li>• User guide and training module are available for the DEI (Evidence #WA044 – DEI-User-Guide-2017-2018 and Evidence #WA045 – DEI AdminTraining_042618).</li> <li>• Appendix E of the GTSA (Evidence #WA043 – GTSA_2017-18, p. 58-61).</li> <li>• Evidence #WA046 – Checklists is a customized version of the consortium provided Quick Start Checklists EL 2.3.1.3.</li> <li>• OSPI notifies LEAs about these materials being posted to the WCAP Portal via monthly Assessment Update webinars (Evidence #WA047 –</li> </ul>	<p>The State has provided a wealth of evidence regarding test administration resources. There is a web portal containing resources (Evidence WA #037) related to test administration that are available to educators, and manuals detailing consistent test administration procedures (e.g. Evidence WA #022, #038, #039).</p> <p>Evidence is provided that appropriate staff received resources for training in test administration (Evidence WA #014, #049, #050) and there is a log of those who have received such training (Evidence WA#051).</p> <p>Evidence is provided that information and procedures related to the use of computers in testing is provided to relevant staff (Evidence WA#058, #059, #060), including contingency plans for technology related challenges during test administration (Evidence WA#022, #063).</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON

	<p>AssessmentWebinar-011618, slide 14) and bi-weekly email messages sent to DCs from our Assessment Operations office (Evidence #WA048 – WAWemail-screenshot-011718).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monthly Assessment Update webinars (for an example, see Evidence #WA014 – AssesmentWebinar-101817)</li> <li>• Annual training PowerPoint slide deck specifically designed for district level staff and posted on the WCAP Portal (Evidence #WA049 – TestCoord-Training-ELPA21).</li> <li>• Model training PowerPoint slide deck provided by the state (Evidence #WA050 – TA-Training-ELPA21).</li> <li>• Evidence #WA051 – Training-Log-for-State-Assessments).</li> <li>• Test Security Assurance Form before and after testing (Evidence #WA052 – Test Security Staff-Assurance-Form).</li> <li>• Instructions for the use of AIR systems are provided for LEA use including:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ TIDE—How to set accommodations for students (Evidence #WA053 – TIDE-User-Guide-2017-2018, p. 43-51 and Evidence #WA054 – TIDE-Module_2017-2018, slides 25-28).</li> <li>○ TA Interface—How to confirm that accommodations are set correctly at the start of student testing (Evidence #WA039 – Test-Administrator-User-Guide-2017-2018, Figure 15 on p. 20, and Evidence #WA040 – TDS-TA-Interface-Module_2017-2018, slides 11-12).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Washington requires schools to prepare a Test Security and Building Plan (Evidence #WA055 – TSBP-Template).</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA056 – School Site Admin-Security-Report</li> <li>• Evidence #WA057 – District Admin-Security-Report.</li>   <li>• Washington has defined the technology requirements for all online tests, including ELPA21, in the following manuals:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence #WA058 – System-Requirements-for-Online-Testing_2017-2018</li> <li>○ Evidence #WA059 – Secure-Browser-Installation-Manual_2017-18</li> <li>○ Evidence #WA060 – Technical-Specifications-Manual-for-Online-Testing_2017-18</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence #WA061 – Braille-Requirements-and-Testing-Manual Procedures for technology-based test administration included in the TCM and the ELPA21 TAM (Evidence #WA022 – TCM_Spring-2018 and Evidence #WA038 – ELPA21-TAM-Spring-Summative-2018).</li> <li>• Evidence #WA062 – AIR Contingency plan</li> <li>• Washington provides established contingency plans as follows:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence #WA022 – TCM_Spring-2018 (p. 6 and 8)</li> <li>○ Evidence #WA063 – PIRG (p. 12-18)</li> <li>○ Evidence #WA049 – TestCoord-Training-ELPA21 (slide 25 with notes)</li> <li>○ Evidence #WA050 – TA-Training-ELPA21 (slide 26 with notes)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	---	--

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Professional Standards and Security, Incident, and Reporting Guidelines (PIRG) details how LEAs are to report perceived item errors, including using the Test Question Ambiguity Form (Evidence #WA063 – PIRG, p.12 and 19 and Evidence #WA064 – Test Question Ambiguity Form).</li> <li>• Evidence #WA034 – ELPA21-TAM-Spring-Summative-2018, p.6).</li>   <li>• Evidence #WA043 – GTSA_2017-18 is Washington’s Guidelines on Tools, Supports, &amp; Accommodations for State Assessments document.</li> <li>• Monthly Assessment Update webinars (Evidence #WA065 – AssessmentWebinar-031418, slides 9-11)</li> <li>• Bi-weekly email messages sent to DCs (Evidence #WA066 – WAWemail-030818, p. 8-10)</li> <li>• Regular newsletters sent to lists of LEA staff (example Evidence #WA067 – ELP Assessment Updates March 2018).</li>   <li>• Washington provides TAs with training on test administration and security expectations (Evidence WA024 – AltACCESS Overview Webinar-2018).</li> <li>• Starting in 2018-19, the training is available on OSPI’s Moodle site (Evidence WA068 – ELP Assessment Updates Nov 2018, and Evidence #WA069 – Alternate ACCESS webpage).</li> <li>• Evidence #WA051 – Training-Log-for-State-Assessments.</li> <li>• Test Security Assurance Form before and after testing (Evidence #WA052 – Test Security Staff-Assurance-Form).</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Test Security and Building Plan (TSBP), and submit it to their DC for review and approval in advance of testing (Evidence #WA055 – TSBP-Template).</li><li>• Evidence #WA056 – School Site Admin-Security-Report.</li><li>• Evidence #WA057 – District Admin-Security-Report).</li></ul>	
<b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• See WIDA notes for Alternate ACCESS Peer recommendations.</li></ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general ELP assessments and the AELPA.</p>	<p>Evidence:  <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA063 – PIRG  <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA022 – TCM_Spring-2018, p. 26  <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA050 – TA-Training-ELPA21 (slide 12)  <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA038 – ELPA21-TAM-Spring-Summative-2018  <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA070 – Monitoring Desk and On-site Screener 2018  <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA071 – Monitoring Schedule 2019  <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA072 – Monitoring Desk and On-site Screener 2019  <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence #WA073 – Preliminary Monitoring Results 2019                      Evidence #WA063 – PIRG</p>	<p>The evidence submitted by the State described a thorough program of monitoring of the ELP assessment. The evidence also demonstrated that test monitoring of test administration is a combined SEA/LEA responsibility. Examples of test observation protocols were provided. Overall, the evidence did sufficiently demonstrate a system of test administration monitoring for ELP test administrations.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> <li>• Application of test security procedures to the general ELP assessments and the AELPA.</li> </ul>	<p>See consortium evidence, plus the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA038 – ELPA21-TAM-Spring-Summative-2018</li> <li>• Evidence #WA063 – PIRG</li> <li>• Evidence #WA049 – TestCoord-Training-ELPA21 (slides 22-25)</li> <li>• Evidence #WA050 – TA-Training-ELPA21 (slides 13-14 and 26-27)</li> <li>• Evidence #WA055 – TSBP-Template</li> <li>• Evidence #WA051 – Training-Log-for-State-Assessments</li> <li>• Evidence #WA052 – Test Security Staff-Assurance-Form</li> <li>• Evidence #WA043 – GTSA_2017-18 (p. 58-61)</li> <li>• Evidence #WA074 – TestMaterialProcessing-ELPA21</li> <li>• Evidence #WA075 – Materials Receipt Instructions</li> <li>• Evidence #WA076 – Materials Return Instructions</li> <li>• Evidence #WA063 – PIRG (p. 3-9, 21)</li> <li>• Evidence #WA077 – Testing Incident Report</li> <li>• Evidence #WA078 – Testing Incident Log Template (TestIncidentLog tab)</li> <li>• Evidence #WA079 – ARMS-Training-Module</li> <li>• Evidence #WA080 – ARMS-ELPA21-TestIncident-Homepage</li> <li>• Evidence #WA081 – ARMS-ELPA21-TestIncident-ViewFormsPage</li> <li>• Evidence #WA082 – TestIncidents-ELPA21-Summary</li> <li>• Evidence #WA083 – TestIncidents-ELPA21-Outcomes</li> </ul>	<p>For ELP assessment:</p> <p>While the main evidence is being submitted by the consortium, the State has provided documentation (WA #063) which details steps for the prevention of assessment irregularities, including maintaining proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures (p. 10-11), incident-reporting procedures (p. 12-14), consequences for confirmed violations of test security under State law (p. 10-13, 20), and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration (Evidence WA #049, #050, #051, #052).</p> <p>Regarding the detection of test irregularities, Evidence WA #063 details some steps for various administrators to take, but the bulk of test irregularity detection should be in the consortium submission.</p> <p>The evidence indicates that there are standard protocols for remediation following security incidents (Evidence WA #03, p. 12-18; Evidence WA #084).</p> <p>The evidence indicates that there are standard protocols for investigating test irregularities (Evidence WA #063, p. 19-20).</p> <p>For the AELPA:</p> <p>In addition to the foregoing, evidence has been submitted regarding training for administering AELPA (Evidence WA #024, #043, #051, #052).</p> <p>In addition to the foregoing, procedures did detect irregularities (Evidence WA #086).</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA063 – PIRG (p. 15-18)</li> <li>• Evidence #WA083 – TestIncidents-ELPA21-Outcomes</li> <li>• Evidence #WA084 – Testing Incident Response Letter Template</li> </ul> <p>AELPA:</p> <p>Washington’s Response for AELPA: See consortium evidence plus the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA063 – PIRG</li> <li>• Evidence #WA024 – AltACCESS Overview Webinar-2018 (slides 8, 9 and 16)</li> <li>• Evidence #WA055 – TSBP-Template</li> <li>• Evidence #WA051 – Training-Log-for-State-Assessments</li> <li>• Evidence #WA052 – Test Security Staff-Assurance-Form</li> <li>• Evidence #WA043 – GTSA_2017-18 (p. 58-61)</li> </ul> <p>Detection of test irregularities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA063 – PIRG (p. 3-9)</li> <li>• Evidence #WA077 – Testing Incident Report</li> <li>• Evidence #WA078 – Testing Incident Log Template (TestIncidentLog tab)</li> <li>• Evidence #WA079 – ARMS-Training-Module</li> <li>• Evidence #WA085 – ARMS-WIDA-TestIncident-Homepage</li> <li>• Evidence #WA086 – TestIncidents-WIDA-Outcomes</li> </ul> <p>Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA084 – Testing Incident Response Letter Template</li> </ul>	<p>See notes from ELPA21 peer review.</p>
--	--	---

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON

	Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence #WA063 – PIRG (p. 19-20)</li></ul>	
<b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b>		
<u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• See ELPA21 notes for Peer recommendations.</li><li>• See WIDA notes for Alternate ACCESS Peer recommendations.</li></ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

**Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results;</li> <li>• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>• To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul>	<p>(See consortium evidence, plus additional evidence as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA053 – TIDE-User-Guide-2017-2018</li> <li>• Evidence #WA087 – ORS-User-Guide (p. 4-5)</li> <li>• Evidence #WA088 – SRMAAG-2017-2018 (p. 1-4)</li> <li>• Evidence #WA089 – Model Interdistrict Agreement</li> <li>• Evidence #WA059 – Secure Browser Installation Manual</li> <li>• Evidence #WA038 – ELPA21-TAM-Spring-Summative-2018 (p. 23)</li> <li>• Evidence #WA076 – Materials Return Instructions (p. 1)</li> <li>• Evidence #WA063 – PIRG (p. 10-11)</li> <li>• Evidence #WA055 – TSBP-Template (p. 3)</li> <li>• Evidence #WA052 – Test Security Staff-Assurance-Form (p. 1)</li> </ul> <p>(CE.2.6.2) To secure student-level assessment data and protecting student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA087 – ORS-User-Guide (p. 4-5)</li> <li>• Evidence #WA090 – Quick Start Guide</li> <li>• Evidence #WA091 – EDS User Role Matrix</li> <li>• Evidence #WA092 – OSPI IT Security Training 2018</li> <li>• Evidence #WA093 – Process for onboarding IT contractors</li> <li>• Evidence #WA094 – OSPI Confidentiality of Student Data Policy</li> <li>• Evidence #WA095 – OSPI Data and Information Handling and Disposal</li> <li>• Evidence #WA096 – 2018DE-009 ELPA21 Executed</li> </ul>	<p>For ELP assessment:</p> <p>While this critical element includes evidence from the consortium, the integrity of test-related data is secured by the State through a system (Evidence WA #053) which provides appropriate levels of access for different users and which interacts with systems (Evidence WA #087) from other providers.</p> <p>Student-level assessment data is protected via secure systems (Evidence WA #053, #087) with level of access controlled (Evidence WA #091) for users who are duly trained (Evidence WA #092, #093, #094, #095).</p> <p>There is a definition of the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for student groups or the suppression thereof (Evidence WA #097-#104).</p> <p>For AELPA:</p> <p>While this critical element includes evidence from the consortium, the State has a secure system (Evidence WA #091) for accessing data with control for levels of access for different users who have been duly trained (Evidence WA #052).</p> <p>Student-level assessment data is protected via secure systems with level of access controlled (Evidence WA #091) for users who are duly trained (Evidence WA #092, #093, #094, #095).</p> <p>There is a definition of the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for student groups or the suppression thereof (Evidence WA #097-#104).</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

	<p>(CE.2.6.3) Protecting personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA097 – RCW 28A.655.090</li> <li>• Evidence #WA098 – Issue Paper-Suppression</li> <li>• Evidence #WA099 – Report Card FAQp1</li> <li>• Evidence #WA100 – Data Sharing webpage</li> <li>• Evidence #WA101 – Data Sharing Agreement_Form</li> <li>• Evidence #WA102 – Data Sharing Policy</li> <li>• Evidence #WA103 – Protecting Student Privacy webpage</li> <li>• Evidence #WA104 – Privacy and Data pdf</li> </ul> <p>AELPA</p> <p>(CE.2.6.1.A) To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring and use of results;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA091 – EDS User Role Matrix</li> <li>• Evidence #WA105 – ELP Assessment Updates Aug 2018 (p. 2)</li> <li>• Evidence #WA063 – PIRG (p. 10-11)</li> <li>• Evidence #WA055 – TSBP-Template (p. 3)</li> <li>• Evidence #WA052 – Test Security Staff-Assurance-Form (p. 1)</li> </ul> <p>(CE.2.6.2.A) To secure student-level assessment data and protecting student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA090 – Quick Start Guide (p. 4-5)</li> <li>• Evidence #WA091 – EDS User Role Matrix</li> <li>• Evidence #WA092 – OSPI IT Security Training 2018</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA093 – Process for onboarding IT contractors</li> <li>• Evidence #WA094 – OSPI Confidentiality of Student Data Policy</li> <li>• Evidence #WA095 – OSPI Data and Information Handling and Disposal</li> </ul> <p>(CE.2.6.3.A) Protecting personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA097 – RCW 28A.655.090</li> <li>• Evidence #WA098 – Issue Paper-Suppression</li> <li>• Evidence #WA099 – Report Card FAQp1</li> <li>• Evidence #WA100 – Data Sharing webpage</li> <li>• Evidence #WA101 – Data Sharing Agreement_Form</li> <li>• Evidence #WA102 – Data Sharing Policy</li> <li>• Evidence #WA103 – Protecting Student Privacy webpage</li> <li>• Evidence #WA104 – Privacy and Data pdf</li> </ul>	
<b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See WIDA notes for Alternate ACCESS Peer recommendations.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><i>The State’s ELP assessments</i> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s ELP standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s ELP assessment and the ELP standards the assessment is designed to measure in terms of language knowledge and skills, the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards, across all proficiency levels, domains, and modalities identified therein;</li> <li>• Documentation of alignment (as defined) between the State’s ELP standards and the language demands implied by, or explicitly stated in, the State’s academic content standards;</li> <li>• If the State administers an AELPA aligned with alternate ELP achievement standards, the assessment shows adequate linkage to the State’s ELP standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and that the breadth of content and linguistic complexity</li> </ul>	<p>See common evidence for consortium</p>	

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON

determined in test design is appropriate for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.		
<b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• See notes for ELPA21 for Peer recommendations.</li><li>• See WIDA notes for Alternate ACCESS Peer recommendations.</li></ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

**Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Linguistic Processes**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap <i>the intended language processes</i> appropriate for each grade level/grade-band as represented in the State’s ELP standards.	See common evidence for consortium.	
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See ELPA21 notes for Peer recommendations</li> <li>• See WIDA notes for Alternate ACCESS Peer recommendations</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

**Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s <i>ELP standards</i> on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>See common evidence for consortium.</p>	<p>While the ELPA21 test is structured along the lines of the four-skills approach (listening, reading, speaking, and writing), the state standards are structured according to 10 multi-modal approaches to language use. That being the case, there is a lack of alignment between the test and the state’s ELP standards.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See WIDA notes for Alternate ACCESS Peer recommendations.</li> <li>• See ELPA21 notes for Peer recommendations.</li> <li>• Plan and timeline for a test and score reporting that is according to the state’s ELP standards.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

**Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>See consortium evidence, plus the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA106 – RCW 28A.180.020</li> <li>• Evidence #WA107 – 2019-02-TBIP Update_draft (p. 9-10)</li> <li>• Note: Evidence #WA107 is the 2018 report prepared by the program staff listed on the cover page. The document is labeled as a draft to acknowledge that it is still undergoing review by OSPI’s government relations and communications staff.</li> </ul> <p>AELPA:</p> <p>No additional evidence</p>	<p>The additional evidence presented by the State (Evidence WA #107, p. 9, Table 2) shows the proportion of ELs who meet the standard in ELA compared to the statewide number. While EL and ELA are of course not strictly comparable, the fact that the proportions show a greater difference at some grades (4, 5, 6, 8) indicates that the achievement standards on either the EL assessment or the ELA assessment at those grades warrant further review. Similarly, Table 3 showing a lag in meeting ELA achievement standards may potentially indicate that the ELP achievement standards are not appropriately placed. (This concern was also raised by peers who reviewed the ELPA21, and more detail can be found in those notes.)</p>
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See ELPA21 notes for Peer recommendations</li> <li>• See WIDA notes for Alternate ACCESS Peer recommendations.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population (<i>for ELP assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable</i>);</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately</li> </ul>	<p>See consortium evidence, plus the following additional evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA108 – Tech Report Appendix for WA contains the reliability results for Washington’s overall student population in Section 6 (p. 117-128).</li> <li>• Evidence #WA108 – Tech Report Appendix for WA contains the overall and conditional standard error of measurement results for Washington’s student population in Section 7 (p. 129-134).</li> <li>• Evidence #WA108 – Tech Report Appendix for WA contains the classification consistency and accuracy results for Washington’s student population in Section 8 (p. 135-137).</li> </ul> <p>AELPA: No additional evidence.</p>	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
precise estimates of <i>an EL's English proficiency</i> .		
<b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See ELPA21 notes for Peer recommendations</li> <li>• See WIDA notes for Alternate ACCESS Peer recommendations.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For all State ELP assessments,</i> assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition<sup>10</sup>).</p> <p><i>For ELP assessments,</i> the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all EL students and fair across student groups, including ELs with disabilities, in their design, development, and analysis.</p>	<p>See consortium evidence.</p>	
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See ELPA21 notes for Peer recommendations</li> <li>• See WIDA notes for Alternate ACCESS Peer recommendations.</li> </ul>		

---

<sup>10</sup> see page 28 of “*A State’s Guide to the U.S. Department of Education’s Assessment Peer Review Process*”, September 24, 2018 available at: [www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html](http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html)

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for <b><i>ELP assessments</i></b>, including performance for EL students with high and low levels of English language proficiency and with different proficiency profiles across the domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing.</p>	<p>See consortium evidence, plus the following additional evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA108 – Tech Report Appendix for WA presents student performance information across the full performance continuum in Washington’s student population in Sections 1-5 (p. 8-117).</li> </ul> <p>AELPA:</p> <p>No additional evidence</p>	
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u> <u>  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See ELPA21 notes for Peer recommendations</li> <li>• See WIDA notes for Alternate ACCESS Peer recommendations.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments (and <i>for ELP assessments, any applicable domain or component sub-tests</i>) that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s <i>ELP standards</i>.</p> <p><i>For ELP assessments</i>, if an English learner has a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains/components (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) such that there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected domain(s)/component(s), the State must provide a description of how it will ensure that the student is assessed in the remaining domain(s)/component(s) in which it is possible to assess the student, and a description of how this will occur.<sup>11</sup></p>	<p>See consortium evidence, plus the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence #WA043 – GTSA_2017-18, includes a section about domain exemptions in Appendix M (p. 80).</li> <li>Evidence #WA109 – All About Domain Exemptions 2018 is a presentation posted on OSPI’s ELPA21 training webpage as a recorded webinar.</li> </ul> <p>AELPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence #WA043 – GTSA_2017-18, includes a section about domain exemptions in Appendix M (p. 80).</li> <li>Evidence #WA109 – All About Domain Exemptions 2018 is a presentation posted on OSPI’s ELP assessment training webpage as a recorded webinar.</li> </ul>	<p>There is documentation around exemption from particular domains of the ELP test (Evidence WA #043) and the requirement to continue being assessed on the other unaffected domains.</p> <p>While the ELPA21 test reports scores along the lines of the four-skills approach (listening, reading, speaking, and writing), the state standards are structured according to 10 multi-modal approaches to language use. That being the case, there is a lack of alignment between the test and the state’s ELP standards.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See ELPA21 notes for Peer recommendations</li> <li>See WIDA notes for Alternate ACCESS Peer recommendations.</li> <li>Plan and timeline for score reporting according to the state’s ELP standards.</li> </ul>		

<sup>11</sup> See full reference in regulation, 34 CFR § 200.6(h)(4)(ii) (online at [https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=07e168e9e7a6c5931b4549cc15547ee9&mc=true&node=se34.1.200\\_16&rgn=div8](https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=07e168e9e7a6c5931b4549cc15547ee9&mc=true&node=se34.1.200_16&rgn=div8) )

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>If the State administers multiple forms of <i>ELP assessments</i> within or across grade-spans, ELP levels, or school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s <i>ELP standards</i> and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across settings.</p>	<p>See consortium evidence.</p>	
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See WIDA notes for Alternate ACCESS Peer reviews.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>• Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p>See consortium evidence, plus the following for AELPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSPI assessment staff worked with the Washington School for the Blind to develop an adapted version of the Alternate ACCESS - Evidence #WA110 – Process for Adaptations.</li> </ul>	<p>In the matter of adapting the assessment for students who are blind, a document is presented (Evidence WA #110) which details the process for adaptations, but it reads like a description of prospective work rather than of completed work. Thus, it would be good for the State to provide evidence in relation to actual work undertaken and an evaluation of the results and success of the adaptation.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See ELPA21 notes for Peer recommendations</li> <li>• Plan and timeline for adaptation of Alternate ACCESS for students with visual impairments and blindness.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

**Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and</li> <li>Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.</li> </ul>	<p>See consortium evidence, plus the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence #WA034 – NTAC Membership</li> <li>Evidence #WA111 – NTAC Agenda Jan2019</li> <li>Evidence #WA112 – NTAC Meeting Minutes Jan2019 (p. 4)</li> <li>Evidence #WA113 – STAC Agenda Nov2018</li> <li>Evidence #WA114 – STAC Membership</li> <li>Evidence #WA115 – Post Admin ELPA21 Survey</li> <li>Evidence #WA116 – ELP Assessment Update May2018</li> <li>Evidence #WA122 – WIDA Broadcast email-051818 (p. 7)</li> <li>Evidence #WA117 – Technical Reports_webpage is the webpage where the public can request the technical reports associated with Washington’s assessment system.</li> </ul> <p>AELPA</p> <p>See consortium evidence, plus the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Technical Advisory Committee (NTAC) to assist in monitoring and improving our alternate ELP assessment. (Evidence #WA034 – NTAC Membership).</li> <li>(Evidence #WA118 – NTAC Agenda May2018 and Evidence #WA119 – NTAC Meeting Minutes May2018, p. 4).</li> <li>Washington also convenes a State Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) (Evidence #WA113 – STAC Agenda Nov2018).</li> </ul>	<p>For ELP assessment and AELPA:</p> <p>The State has technical advisory committees (Evidence WA #111, #112 #113) composed of suitably qualified individuals (Evidence WA #034, #114) to monitor, maintain and improve the quality of its assessment system. There is a post-administration survey (EvidenceWA #115) in support of this.</p> <p>The State has a website (Evidence WA #117) where technical reports are published, though it should be noted that the most recent such reports made readily available date to 2015 and users are asked to write for copies of newer reports. The newer reports should, like the older ones, be made accessible on the website.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence #WA114 – STAC Membership is contains the names and titles of the members through our use of the Alternate ACCESS.</li><li>• Evidence #WA120 – Post Admin WIDA Survey</li><li>• Evidence #WA121 – Message to Migrant Bilingual-052318, p. 2).</li></ul>	
<b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence that the latest technical reports are/will be made available on the website.</li><li>• See ELPA21 notes for Peer recommendations</li><li>• See WIDA notes for Alternate ACCESS Peer recommendations.</li></ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

**Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students<sup>12</sup> with disabilities in the State’s assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>For ELP assessments</b>, policies that require the inclusion of an EL with a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) such that there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected component (the State must assess the student’s English language proficiency based on the remaining components in which it is possible to assess the student).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA023 – IEP Team Decision Making Guidelines.</li> <li>• Student Participation in Statewide Assessments for Accountability and Graduation was published in November 2018 for use starting in the 2018-19 school year (Evidence #WA026 – IEP-Team-Guidelines-Assess). Pages 5–7.</li> <li>• Evidence #WA043 – GTSA_2017-18 is the customized Guidelines on Tools, Supports, &amp; Accommodations for State Assessments document for Washington.</li> <li>• Evidence #WA123 – Special Education Resource Library webpage shows that Evidence #WA026 and Evidence #WA043 are available to parents and educators along with other special education resources.</li> <li>• Evidence #WA124 – B067-15 lists resources available to support districts.</li> <li>• Evidence #WA125 – Forms and Translated Material webpage contains resources for districts to use as they communicate with parents and families about English language proficiency assessments and the bilingual education program.</li> <li>• Evidence #WA126 – Parent Communication and Engagement document details how districts are to communicate with the families of ELs in Washington.</li> </ul>	<p>The State has provided good documentation of the guidelines and procedures (Evidence WA #043) for including students with disabilities in the assessment system that is compliant with IDEA (Evidence WA #023, #026).</p> <p>The State has also provided evidence regarding inclusion of students with disability in those domains that don’t preclude assessment (Evidence WA #043, #109).</p>

<sup>12</sup> For ELP peer review, this refers to ELs with disabilities.

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA127 – WSSDA Policy and Procedure 4218 contains a model policy and procedure written by the Washington State School Directors’ Association.</li> <li>• Evidence #WA043 – GTSA_2017-18, includes a section about domain exemptions in Appendix M (p. 80).</li> <li>• Evidence #WA109 – All About Domain Exemptions 2018, presentation posted on OSPI’s ELPA21 training webpage as a recorded webinar.</li> <li>• Evidence #WA128 – FAQ_ELPA21 answers commonly asked questions about the ELP assessments. This document is posted on the main ELPA21 page on OSPI’s website (Evidence #WA129 – ELPA21 webpage) for parents and educators to view.</li> <li>• For the ELP administrations from 2016-2018, the state’s expectation was that this decision was made by the IEP team in accordance with Evidence #WA023 – IEP Team Decision Making Guidelines.</li> <li>• Updated Guide: Student Participation in Statewide Assessments for Accountability and Graduation was published in November 2018 for use starting in the 2018-19 school year (Evidence #WA026 – IEP-Team-Guidelines-Assess). Pages 5–7 and 10–12 of this new document explain required participation in that state assessment system and specifically in the alternate assessments.</li> <li>• Evidence #WA043 – GTSA_2017-18 and the consortium provided Accessibility and Accommodations Supplement document 2.2-16 are used together to provide guidance about specific accommodations for the Alternate ACCESS.</li> <li>• Evidence #WA123 – Special Education Resource Library webpage shows that Evidence #WA026 and Evidence #WA043 are available to parents and</li> </ul>	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>educators along with other special education resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA124 – B067-15 lists resources available to support districts.</li> <li>• Evidence #WA125 – Forms and Translated Material webpage contains resources for districts to use as they communicate with parents and families about English language proficiency assessments and the bilingual education program.</li> <li>• Evidence #WA126 – Parent Communication and Engagement document details how districts are to communicate with the families of ELs in Washington.</li> <li>• Evidence #WA127 – WSSDA Policy and Procedure 4218 contains a model policy and procedure written by the Washington State School Directors’ Association.</li> </ul> <p>AELPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA043 – GTSA_2017-18, includes a section about domain exemptions in Appendix M (p. 80).</li> <li>• Evidence #WA109 – All About Domain Exemptions 2018</li> <li>• Evidence #WA128 – FAQ_ELPA21 answers commonly asked questions about the ELP assessments</li> <li>• This document is posted on the main ELP page on OSPI’s website (Evidence #WA129 – ELPA21 webpage) for parents and educators to view.</li> </ul>	
<b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<u>X</u> No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note: This critical element does not apply to ELP assessments, as the requirements only apply to the inclusion of ELs in <b>academic assessments</b>.</li> </ul>		
<b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs;</li> <li>• Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> <li>• Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</li> </ul>	<p>See Consortium evidence, plus the following evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA026 – IEP-Team-Guidelines-Assess (p. 8-9).</li> <li>• Evidence #WA043 – GTSA_2017-18 includes all elements of the consortium provided EL 2.3.1.2 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual (2018-19), as described in section EL.5.3.1. Read aloud guidelines (Appendix C), information about the use of assistive technology (examples on pages 14, 21, 31, 33, and 35), and scribe guidelines (Appendix E) are included in the GTSA.</li> <li>• Evidence #WA130 – Model IEP Form includes the annual ELP assessment, and details of accommodations for use during assessment as well as instruction (p. 5-6).</li> <li>• Evidence #WA131 – Non-Standard-Request-2018-2019 allows districts to request accommodations that are not presently addressed in the GTSA or the Accessibility and Accommodations Manual.</li> <li>• Evidence #WA053 – TIDE-User-Guide-2017-2018 details how to set accommodations for students in TIDE so they are made available to students in the Test Delivery System (TDS). (p. 43-51).</li> <li>• Evidence #WA108 – Tech Report Appendix for WA contains the total number of Universal Tools, Designated Supports, and Accommodations made available to students via TDS in Section 1 (p. 9-14).</li> <li>• IEP teams use the guidance provided in Evidence #WA026 – IEP-Team-Guidelines-Assess, and the detailed descriptions and explanations of use in Evidence #WA043 – GTSA_2017-18 when constructing individual student IEPs based on Evidence #WA130 – Model IEP Form.</li> <li>• Evidence #WA132 – Non Standard Requests Tracking 2018</li> </ul>	<p>For ELP assessment and AELPA:</p> <p>In addition to the consortium’s submission, the State has published information regarding assessment accommodations for ELs (Evidence WA #026, #043, #131).</p> <p>The State has a thoughtful approach to the provision of accommodations (Evidence WA #043), helping to ensure that these are appropriate and allow for meaningful interpretation of outcomes.</p> <p>There is a mechanism for requesting accommodations beyond those usually available (Evidence WA #131), and there is evidence that the State is trying to make as many accommodations possible as is feasible (Evidence WA #110).</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations so that students with disabilities have the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in it (Evidence WA #043, #131).</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>AELPA:</p> <p>See consortium evidence, plus the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA026 – IEP-Team-Guidelines-Assess (p. 8-9)</li> <li>• Evidence #WA043 – GTSA_2017-18</li> <li>• Evidence #WA122 – Model IEP Form (p. 5-6)</li> <li>• Evidence #WA120 – Post Admin WIDA Survey</li> <li>• Evidence #WA131 – Non-Standard-Request-2018-2019 is the “Non-Standard Accommodation or Designated Support Request” form for the current school year.</li> </ul>	
<b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See ELPA21 notes for Peer recommendations.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON

### Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures;</li> <li>• Monitored for administrations of all required ELP assessments, and AELPA.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA133 – WA Monitoring Plan Revised rev Sept 2018</li> <li>• Evidence #WA134 – Risk Matrix Questions.</li> <li>• Evidence #WA135 – Individual Service Provider Interview Protocol</li> <li>• Guidance resulting from the 2017-18 review was presented at the annual Special Education conference in August 2018 (Evidence #WA136— WASA Statewide Assessments and SWDs Final, slides 12-20).</li> <li>• Evidence #WA137 – Student Achievement Focus Group Questions.</li> <li>• Evidence #WA043 – GTSA_2017-18 - customized Guidelines on Tools, Supports, &amp; Accommodations for State Assessments document for Washington.</li> <li>• Evidence #WA053 – TIDE-User-Guide-2017-2018, pages 43-51, and Evidence #WA054 – TIDE-Module_2017-2018, slides 25-28,</li> <li>• Evidence #WA063 – PIRG, the Professional Standards and Security, Incident, and Reporting Guidelines</li> <li>• Evidence #WA022 – TCM_Spring-2018, the Test Coordinators Manual, provides a checklist on page 26 that includes monitoring during testing.</li> <li>• Evidence #WA050 – TA-Training-ELPA21, the model TA training slide deck provided by the state includes training about test monitoring (slide 12 with notes).</li> <li>• Evidence #WA038 – ELPA21-TAM-Spring-Summative-2018</li> <li>• Evidence #WA056 – School Site Admin-Security-Report</li> </ul>	<p>The State has a plan for monitoring test administrations (Evidence WA #133) as well as instruments to support such activities (Evidence WA #134-138). However, the frequency of monitoring (Evidence WA #071) seems less than adequate. State should provide evidence as to how they plan to systematically sample schools to ensure adequate monitoring, and also how they plan to use the evidence from monitoring visits to improve the implementation of the assessment.</p> <p>The State’s evidence indicates that all the points under Critical Element 5.4 are consistent with state policies and are being monitored (Evidence WA #043).</p> <p>State must provide evidence of a plan and timeline for systematically sampling schools to ensure adequate monitoring, and a plan and timeline for use of the evidence from monitoring visits to improve the implementation of the assessment.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA070 – Monitoring Desk and On-site Screener 2018</li> <li>• Evidence #WA071 – Monitoring Schedule 2019</li> <li>• Evidence #WA072 – Monitoring Desk and On-site Screener 2019 is the updated observation document used by OSPI staff during the ELP testing in winter 2019.</li> <li>• A summary of the preliminary findings is available in Evidence #WA073 – Preliminary Monitoring Results 2019.</li> </ul> <p>AELPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA133 – WA Monitoring Plan Revised rev Sept 2018</li> <li>• Evidence #WA134 – Risk Matrix Questions). As part of these reviews, an Individual Service Provider Interview (Evidence #WA135 – Individual Service Provider Interview Protocol)</li> <li>• Evidence #WA136 – WASA Statewide Assessments and SWDs Final, slides 12-20).</li> <li>• Evidence #WA137 – Student Achievement Focus Group Questions).</li> <li>• Evidence #WA043 – GTSA_2017-18 (p. 15-39).</li> <li>• Evidence #WA043 – GTSA_2017-18 introduction sections on page 17 and page 28</li> <li>• Evidence #WA043 – GTSA_2017-18, page 28,</li> <li>• Evidence #WA063 – PIRG, the Professional Standards and Security, Incident, and Reporting Guidelines (p. 3-9).</li> <li>• Evidence #WA022 – TCM_Spring-2018, the Test Coordinators Manual, provides a checklist on page 26 that includes monitoring during testing.</li> <li>• Evidence #WA070 – Monitoring Desk and On-site Screener 2018</li> <li>• Evidence #WA071 – Monitoring Schedule 2019</li> </ul>	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA072 – Monitoring Desk and On-site Screener 2019</li> </ul>	
<b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a plan and timeline for systematically sampling schools to ensure adequate monitoring, and a plan and timeline for use of the evidence from monitoring visits to improve the implementation of the assessment.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>For ELP standards:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State adopted ELP achievement standards that address the different proficiency levels of ELs;</li> <li>If the State has developed alternate ELP achievement standards, it has adopted them only for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who cannot participate in the regular ELP assessment even with appropriate accommodations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence #WA139 – M045-16M, announcing the upcoming release of the first set of ELPA21 scores.</li> <li>Evidence #WA140 – AssessmentWebinar-083116 , includes details about the data (slide 37), the five different domain performance levels and the three proficiency status categories (slide 38), and a reference to the memo (slide 39).</li> <li>Evidence #WA141 – AssessmentWebinar-092916 provides the final text of the definitions for the five different domain performance levels (slide 21), and the final text of the three proficiency status definitions (slide 20).</li> </ul> <p>AELPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence #WA142 – AssessmentWebinar-081518 presented the Alternate ACCESS scores to district assessment staff (slides 37 and 38).</li> <li>Evidence #WA105 – ELP Assessment Updates Aug 2018 announced the adoption of the WIDA scores for students in grades 1-12, and the use of the same scale for kindergarten scores (p. 1).</li> <li>Evidence #WA143 – FAQ_altELPA states that the Alternate ACCESS is “designed to test [only] those English learners in grades 1 to 12 with significant cognitive disabilities who cannot meaningfully participate in the ELPA21 with accommodations.”</li> </ul>	<p>The state adopted ELP achievement standards that address the different proficiency levels of ELs (Evidence WA #139, 140, 141), as well as Alternate ELP achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities (Evidence WA#142).</p>
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>ELP achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate ELP achievement standards</i></b>, such that:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Cut scores are developed for every grade/grade band, content domain/language domain, and/or composite for which proficiency-level scores are reported.</li> </ul> </li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p>See consortium evidence.</p>	
<p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See ELPA21 notes for Peer recommendations.</li> <li>• See WIDA notes for Alternate ACCESS Peer recommendations.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>For ELP achievement standards:</b> The State has ensured that ELP assessment results are expressed in terms that are clearly aligned with the State’s ELP standards, and its ELP performance-level descriptors.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate ELP achievement standards for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate ELP achievement standards should be linked to the State’s grade-level/grade-band ELP standards, and should reflect professional judgment of the highest ELP achievement standards possible for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>See consortium evidence.</p>	<p>While the ELPA21 test reports scores along the lines of the four-skills approach (listening, reading, speaking, and writing), the state standards are structured according to 10 multi-modal approaches to language use. That being the case, there is a lack of alignment between score reporting on the test and the state’s ELP standards, and its ELP performance level descriptors.</p>

**Section 6.3 Summary Statement**

<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan and timeline for reporting scores in terms of the state’s 10 ELP standards.</li> </ul>
--

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON

**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on <i>English language proficiency for all ELs including the number and percentage of ELs attaining ELP</i>.</p> <p>For the <i>ELP assessment</i>, the State provides coherent and timely information about each student’s attainment of the State’s ELP standards to parents that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports the <i>ELs’ English proficiency</i> in terms of the State’s grade level/grade-band ELP standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>• Are provided in an understandable and uniform format;</li> <li>• Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian;</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence #WA097 – RCW 28A.655.090 (Evidence WA090 – Quick Start Guide, p. 5).            Evidence #WA087 – ORS-User-Guide-2017-18 contains the instructions for use of the Online Reporting System (ORS) in Washington.            Summative ELPA21 scores and reports are available in ORS by mid-May (Evidence #WA146 – ELP Assessment Update June2018).</p> <p>Evidence #WA147 – StateReportCard.</p> <p>Evidence #WA087 – ORS-User-Guide, shows a sample Individual Student Report (ISR) on page 110.</p> <p>Evidence #WA148 – New Family Report mockup is a sample of the printed student score report produced by AIR            Evidence #WA121 – ELPA29 webpage contains links to the Achievement Level Descriptors (p. 2), which can be viewed at any time.</p> <p>Evidence #WA148 – New Family Report mockup is designed to provide an understandable format.            Evidence #WA150 – ScoreReportALD translated webpage contains a cover letter document (Evidence #WA151 – English-ELPA21 Score Report Overview) explaining the ELPA21 score reports.</p> <p>Evidence #WA087 – ORS-User-Guide, p. 98, explains how to print translated versions of ISRs from the system. The languages available are listed on pages 98 and 105, and an example report is on page106.</p>	<p>The State has systems for reporting assessment results (Evidence WA #087) in timely fashion (Evidence WA #146).</p> <p>The State has a website which reports assessment results to the public (Evidence WA #147).</p> <p>The State has systems for reporting assessment results (Evidence WA #087) in terms of the State’s grade-level/grade-band (Evidence WA #146, #148) though strictly speaking not in terms of the State’s ELP standards, as results are reported in terms of the four skills model rather than the functional-communicative approach of the standards, and it would be more in keeping with the letter and spirit of the standards to report scores in those terms.</p> <p>The reports are in an understandable and uniform format (Evidence WA #148), and there are accompanying documents to support understanding of them (Evidence WA #150)</p> <p>The guidance for parents are written in a number of top home languages used in the state (Evidence WA #150-#154).</p> <p>Parents with disabilities have the option of requesting score reports in an alternative format accessible to that parent (Evidence WA #156-157).</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence #WA125 – Forms and Translated Material webpage contains links to access the following webpages:</li> <li>Evidence #WA150 – ScoreReportALD translated webpage contains a cover letter document</li> <li>(Evidence #WA151 – English-ELPA21 Score Report Overview) translated into the top 9 languages in Washington’s EL population. This cover letter is sent home with the Individual Student Report</li> <li>(ISR).</li> <li>Evidence #WA150 – ScoreReportALD translated webpage also contains the Achievement Level Descriptors translated into the top 11 languages in Washington’s EL population.</li> <li>Evidence #WA152 – Parent Notification_ continue webpage contains the Evidence #WA153 – Parent Notification Letter ELPA21English and translated versions.</li> <li>Evidence #WA154 – Parent Notification_ transition webpage contains the Evidence #WA155 –Parent Transition Letter English and translated versions.</li> <li>Evidence #WA156 – Sample Score Reports webpage</li> <li>Evidence #WA157 – Principal Letter Templates webpage.</li> </ul> <p>AELPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence #WA097 – RCW 28A.655.090</li> <li>Evidence WA090 – Quick Start Guide, p. 5.</li> <li>Evidence #WA125 – Forms and Translated Material webpage contains links to access Evidence</li> </ul>	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WASHINGTON**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>#WA158 – Parent Notification Letter WIDA in English and a Spanish translated version.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #WA156 – Sample Score Reports webpage Evidence #WA157 – Principal Letter Templates webpage.</li> </ul>	
<b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan and timeline in relation to reporting scores according to the State’s ELP standards, as this should be the case and would have a positive impact on teaching and learning for ELs.</li> <li>• See WIDA notes for Alternate ACCESS Peer recommendations.</li> </ul>		

**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.