



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Tony Evers
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
125 S. Weber Street
P.O. Box 7841
Madison, WI 53707

November 9, 2018

Dear Superintendent Evers:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (the Department) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), which governed State assessments through the 2016-2017 school year. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), which governs State assessments beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, maintains the essential requirements from NCLB that each State annually administer high-quality assessments in at least reading/language arts, mathematics and science that meet nationally recognized professional and technical standards with a few additional requirements. I appreciate the efforts of the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WIDPI) to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in February and July 2018, and which was a follow-up to a review that occurred in 2016.

State assessment systems provide essential information that States, districts, principals and teachers can use to identify the academic needs of students, target resources and supports toward students who need them most, evaluate school and program effectiveness and close achievement gaps among students. A high-quality assessment system also provides useful information to parents about their children's advancement against and achievement of grade-level standards. The Department's peer review of State assessment systems is designed to provide feedback to States to support the development and administration of high-quality assessments.

In regard to the assessments that WIDPI submitted for review for February 2018, peer reviewers and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the reading/language arts and mathematics alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) in grades 3-8 and high school (Dynamic Learning Maps-Year-End Model (DLM-YE)) met all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. Congratulations on meeting these important ESEA requirements; an assessment system that produces valid and reliable results is fundamental to a State's accountability system. As noted below, however, there is one new aspect of the ESEA, as amended by ESSA, for which WIDPI will need to demonstrate that the DLM-YE meets requirements.

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

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

The Department also reviewed several other components of WIDPI's assessment system and determined that they meet many, but not all, of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and the Department's analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (Wisconsin Forward Exam (Forward) reading/language arts and mathematics 3-8). **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**
- R/LA and mathematics general assessments in high school. (ACT reading/language arts and mathematics). **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**
- Science general assessments in grades 4 and 8 (Forward 4/8 Science). **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**

The components that substantially meet requirements meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The Department expects that WIDPI should be able to provide this additional information within one year. In addition, we know that WIDPI recently adopted new academic content standards in science. While I encourage you to use the results of this peer review for your science assessments, WIDPI must submit complete information demonstrating how the science assessments based on these new academic content standards meet the requirements of the statute and regulations. I know our staff members have been in discussion regarding when WIDPI will submit this information for peer review next year.

Please note that the assessment requirements for ESEA, as amended by the NCLB, were in effect through the end of the 2016-2017 school year. The WIDPI peer review was conducted under the requirements of this statute. Beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, the assessment requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, will apply to State assessments. Department staff carefully reviewed the evidence and peer review recommendations in light of the updated requirements for State assessments under the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. As a result of this additional review, I have determined that the WIDPI administration of the DLM-YE assessments needs to meet one additional requirement related to alternate academic achievement standards. This requirement is listed under critical element 6.3. Under the orderly transition authority in section 4(b) of the ESSA, I am granting WIDPI until December 15, 2020, to submit evidence of an AA-AAAS that meets this ESSA requirement.

The specific list of items required for WIDPI to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because the State has not fully satisfied the condition placed on the State's Title I, Part A grant award related to its State assessment system, this condition will continue. To satisfy this condition, WIDPI must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. WIDPI must provide to the Department a plan and timeline by which it will submit the additional documentation within 30 days of the receipt of this letter. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action.

In addition, the full peer review notes from the review are enclosed. These recommendations to the Department formed the basis of our determination. Please note that the peers' recommendations may differ from the Department's feedback; we encourage you to read the full peer notes for additional suggestions and recommendations for improving your assessment system beyond what is noted in the Department's feedback.

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 Lisa Sadeghi of my staff at: OSS.Wisconsin@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan
Assistant Secretary for
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Viji Somasundaram, Director, Office of Student Assessment

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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
2.1 – Test Design and Development	<p>For the ACT reading/language arts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the test design addresses the full breadth and depth of the academic content standards, specifically that gaps identified in the alignment study have been addressed and implemented on the operational form of the assessment.
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	<p>For the ACT reading/language arts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of adequate validity based on test content, specifically that gaps in the test content, as identified in the alignment study, have been incorporated on operational forms of the assessment.
4.1 – Reliability	<p>For the Forward assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence the State has documented adequate reliability of its assessments, for each student group, consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Analysis and interpretation of potential reasons for lower reliability estimates of Forward test scores for English learners. <p>For the ACT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence the State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, specifically the analysis and interpretation of potential reasons for lower reliability estimates of test scores for English learners in all subjects.
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	<p>For the Dynamic Learning Maps-Year-End Model alternate assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. WIDPI should provide this evidence by December 15, 2020.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT
CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

February 2018 State Assessment Combined Peer Review Notes for the DLM Year-End Assessment Consortium RESUBMISSION



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

Note: Peer review notes provide the combined recommendations of the individual peers to the U.S. Department of Education (Department), based on the statute and regulations and the Department's peer review guidance and the peer's professional judgement of the evidence submitted by the State. These assessment peer review notes, however, do not necessarily identify the final set of 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 THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT
CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

Contents

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 3
 2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 3

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 4
 4.1 – Reliability..... 4
 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 6
 4.4 – Scoring 7

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<p><u>YE 01</u> (Technical Manual Update YE 2015-16)</p>	<p>DLM provides a brief but adequate explanation for why speaking and listening standards (part of CCSS) were not included in the DLM ELA assessment, to the effect that partner states had not assessed these standards in their general assessments. For all students, therefore, including SWSCD, speaking and listening were to be taught and assessed at the local level (YE 01, pp. 9-10).</p> <p>It might have been useful (but not essential) to include participating state’s waiver letters to support this statement.</p> <p>The supplementary submission evidence did not address part of the summary statement request for additional evidence—specifically, an explanation of why Language is not directly addressed. A brief explanation such as that offered for the question about Speaking and Listening would have been helpful—which the reviewers assume is that in their general assessments, all of the partner states assess Language in the context of Reading or Writing (e.g., as is the case with PARCC).</p>
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement (from August 2017 Peer Review)</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.1 – Reliability (from 2016 peer review)</p> <p>For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), WVDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of monitoring and refinement of the diagnostic classification models from subsequent test administrations 	<p>YE 01, pp. 43-46; 48-62.</p> <p>YE 03, pp. 102.</p>	<p>Overall, Peer Reviewers are impressed with the DLM learning and assessment models. Peers are hopeful that the psychometric model, which is less mature, will eventually be refined to a similar level, to capitalize on the advantages of the learning and assessment models.</p> <p>DLM provided detail in the Technical Manual Update YE 2016-17 (YE 01) as evidence of monitoring and refinement of the diagnostic classification models from test administrations subsequent to the initial administration. Given recommendations below, Peer Reviewers would expect that technical manuals in subsequent years continue to address and update evidence of monitoring and refinement of Diagnostic Classification Models.</p> <p>The DLM’s Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) discussed and indicated support for maintaining the current scoring model for 2017-18 while additional research is conducted on different methods for being able to support cross-linkage level inferences (YE 03).</p> <p>On p. 45, there is mention of the fact that non-masters sometimes have a greater than chance likelihood of providing correct responses to items measuring the linkage level, which may indicate that items or LLs as a whole are “easily guessable.” It would be useful to note what is being done to address that. Peer reviewers recommend checking this again with more operational data. If the issue remains, either model or items or both need to be changed.</p> <p>In reference to the issue of Model Fit, peers were</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>satisfied with the methods being followed to ensure that the model fits the data. However, the Peers suggest following the recommendations of the DLM Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to use a Bayesian estimation procedure to help address some of the methodological issues with the current approach to assessing model fit.</p> <p>Peers recommend that DLM continue to be guided by and to take into serious consideration the advice of the TAC in regards to refinement of the model and generation of data to demonstrate Model Fit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>YE 01 (Technical Manual Update YE 2015-16), pp. 10-11, 13-14</p> <p>Appendix A: ELA Text Photograph Guidelines</p>	<p>DLM provides an adequate explanation of the development and selection of reading passages, including steps taken to ensure passages are accessible to SWSCD.</p> <p>The peers found Table 5 (p. 11) very helpful in clarifying internal and external passage review criteria. While not essential to document attention to this CE factor, it would have been of interest to not only cite a source of more information on p. 10 of YE 01 (“For a complete summary of external review of ELA passages, see Results from External Review During the 2014–2015 Academic Year [Clark, Swinburne Romine, Bell, & Karvonen, 2016]”), but to have provided it among sources of evidence.</p> <p>The explanation of steps taken in the selection and/or creation of graphic components was clear and complete. The reviewers appreciated inclusion of the specific guidelines used in selecting photographs for ELA passages.</p> <p>No additional evidence was required regarding steps taken to ensure that assessments are fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement (2017 review)</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.4 – Scoring (from 2016 review)</p> <p>For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), WVDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of monitoring procedures used for scoring DLM-YE writing items, including measures of inter-rater reliability. 	<p>Technical Manual Update YE 2016-17 (YE 01), pp. 106-113; 141-142</p>	<p>The sampling for the writing products seems to be small. Peer reviewers urge that an effort be made future studies to increase the number of samples and make sure that they represent the full range of abilities reflected in the underlying population.</p> <p>DLM describes the scoring of writing products by human raters (teachers) using a partially-crossed matrix design (multiple, different raters across products). Agreement was determined to be good to excellent; but see below:</p> <p>To some extent, a conventional treatment of interrater reliability is not applicable to scoring of writing products in DLM because a “high-inference process common in large-scale assessment such as applying analytic or holistic rubrics” is not used (p. 107). Evaluation based on presence of text features requires little/no inference and thus one would expect raters to assign identical scores.</p> <p>Nevertheless, to address questions about interrater reliability, DLM conducted a study in spring 2017 using writing products from that administration. Teachers’ original ratings from the operational administration were compared to the one additional rating or one randomly selected rating from the raters who participated in the study.</p> <p>While DLM points to agreement rates for intraclass correlation (ICC) as falling in the excellent range ($\geq .75$ and Fleiss’s kappa in the good range (.60-.74), these ranges for comparable dichotomous decisions may be modest, but are certainly adequate (typically ICC should be $> .80$ to be considered “excellent”). It would be helpful to compare ranges applied to scoring of low inference items to those more typical</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>of direct assessment of writing. This might be addressed as part of the anticipated continuation of studies on writing score agreement.</p> <p>DLM indicates that they plan to conduct further study of interrater reliability of writing product scoring (p. 142), by expanding the collection and evaluation of written products.</p> <p>It might be useful for DLM to consider including as part of the study of rater agreement those scores assigned by teacher administrators for writing process items (which depend on administrator judgment). Such items were not included in the study in 2017.</p> <p>In addition, peer reviewers recommend some form of real time monitoring of teacher assigned scores by rescoring or second-scoring by a trained administrator of a small sample, rather than relying solely on post-hoc analyses.</p> <p>Raters' demographic may not be representative (YE01 Table 58, p. 110). It is hard to say, since state teacher demographics were not provided, but it seems that the raters in the study were overwhelmingly non-Hispanic white. Peer reviewers would urge that in subsequent studies, in so far as possible, a more diverse pool of raters be identified.</p>
Section 4.4 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

July 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes (Resubmission for gen. ed. 3-8, high school gen.ed. and AA-AAAS)



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 . 3

 1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students 3

 1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards 4

 1.3 – Required Assessments 5

 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments 5

 1.5 – Participation Data 5

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 6

 2.1 – Test Design and Development & 2.2 – Item Development 6

 2.3 – Test Administration 11

 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration..... 11

 2.5 – Test Security 12

 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 13

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 22

 3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 22

 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 26

 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 28

 3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables 31

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 33

 4.1 – Reliability..... 33

 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility 37

 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 39

 4.4 – Scoring 40

 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 43

 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 43

 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... 43

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 44

 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 44

 5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 46

 5.3 – Accommodations..... 47

 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations..... 49

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 51

 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students
..... 51

 6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 51

 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 53

 ESSA Equal Benefits Provision..... 55

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element	WIDPI Response, June 2018	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students (from February 2018 review notes)</p> <p>DPI should provide evidence to support the linkage of the 2005 adopted science academic content standards to the Next-Generation Science Standards for the development of the Forward Exam.</p>	<p>Wisconsin adopted new science standards in November 2017. Wisconsin will provide evidence related to the Science standards adoption, test development and other peer review requirements in a separate peer review submission in the future.</p>	<p><u>ED Follow Up</u> <u>ED will work with WIDPI to schedule a peer review for Science assessments in 2019.</u></p>
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>_X_</u> No Additional Evidence needed.</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 Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	WIDPI Response, June 2018	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards (from February 2018 review notes)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence to support the coherent and rigorous academic content standards in reading/language arts and mathematics. • Provide evidence to support that the content standards were developed and reviewed with broad stakeholder involvement. 	<p>Requirements previously met.</p> <p>Wisconsin’s ESEA Flexibility Waiver request included adoption of the standards and was approved by ED on July 6, 2012.</p> <p>The Wisconsin ESEA Flexibility Renewal Request (July 27, 2015) and the ESEA Flexibility Renewal Approval Letter (August 6, 2015) were both included as evidence in the initial peer review (December 2017) submission.</p> <p>Evidence</p> <p>Forward003: Wisconsin ESEA Flexibility Request: July 27, 2015 (previously submitted).</p> <p>Forward004: ESEA Flexibility Renewal Approval Letter 2015-08-06 (previously submitted).</p>	<p><u>Peers’ Comments and Suggestions</u></p> <p>Requirements previously met per ED peer review guidance.</p>
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence 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 Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
1.3 – Required Assessments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No additional evidence requested in February 2018 review 		
Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
X No additional evidence is required.		

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	WIDPI Response	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments From February 2018 Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide evidence that DPI clearly communicates to LEAs that students with disabilities who are privately placed by the LEA are still required to be assessed. 	LEAs are responsible for testing all students with disabilities placed in Residential Care Centers, regardless of whether the RCC is located within the district of accountability. This is publicly communicated in the Forward Exam FAQ posted on DPI webpage. Evidence Forward069: Forward Exam FAQ (previously submitted), page 6 provides this information.	WIDPI’s response verified. No additional evidence is now required
Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
X No additional evidence is required.		

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
1.5 – Participation Data No additional evidence requested in February 2018 review		-
Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
X No additional evidence is required .		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	WIDPI Response	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.1 – Test Design and Development & 2.2 – Item Development</p> <p>From February 2018 Review ACT -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Address the gaps and weaknesses in the test content, which are identified in the independent alignment study and demonstrate the strategy to improve the technical quality of the high school assessments (e.g., use supplemental items or tests). 	<p>ACT</p> <p>Gaps and weaknesses in test content addressed The document ACT High-level Plan to Address Alignment Gaps (ACTDLM071) includes a summary of the alignment study findings (pp.2-6) which addresses the gaps in test content. The complete alignment study addressing gaps and weaknesses in the test content was originally submitted to the Department of Education in December 2017.</p> <p>Evidence ACTDLM071: Plan to Address Alignment. High-level plan to address alignment gaps. ACTDLM045 WDPI ACT Alignment Final Report (previously submitted).</p> <p>Strategy to improve technical quality of the high school assessments ACT is making targeted revisions to the ACT test specification targets to demonstrate full alignment to the WI high school math and ELA content standards.</p> <p>The document ACT High-level Plan to Address Alignment Gaps (ACTDLM071) describes the specific adjustments that will be made to improve the technical quality of the Mathematics and English Language Arts tests (pp.1-2).</p> <p>Mathematics: In line with the alignment study findings and peer reviewers’ suggestions, ACT’s plan is to ensure a greater number of items measure WI high school content standards. Specifically, ACT plans include: The immediate identification of items not measuring high school standards through analysis of the test</p>	<p>Peers’ Notes for ACT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The peers recognized WI’s efforts to improve the alignment of ACT items to the state content standards in reading/language arts and mathematics and with an implementation timeline. WI submitted a plan that addresses gaps and weaknesses in content of ACT to improve its technical quality. An independent alignment study should be conducted to confirm that ‘modified’ ACT demonstrates sufficient alignment to the corresponding WI content standards by closing the gaps in test content. Because ACT and ‘modified’ ACT are derived from different test specifications, evidence should be provided to support the comparability of test scores between the two through an appropriate statistical procedure (e.g., linking).

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	WIDPI Response	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>blueprint and item metadata; Once identified, remove 10–12 of those items (the plan will be phased to accommodate development cycles); Replace omitted items with 10–12 items from ACT’s current pre-tested item pool that 1) measure high school standards (e.g., Number and Operations, Functions, Algebra) and 2) reflect necessary cognitive complexity levels to construct forthcoming forms; Analyze resulting test forms to assure targeted content, cognitive, and statistical requirements are met, as well as confirm the increase in HS standards coverage; and Conduct additional psychometric analyses to account for any impact to equating or reporting. Implementing this plan will strengthen alignment between the ACT and WI standards while maintaining testing time and a college reportable score.</p> <p>English Language Arts In line with the alignment study findings and peer reviewers’ suggestions, ACT’s plan is to ensure greater alignment between the ACT and WI ELA content standards through the following activities: Adjust the Reading test specifications targets to increase number of items measuring the “Integration of Knowledge and Ideas” (IKI) Reporting Category (this plan will be phased to accommodate development cycles). Immediate increase of 1–2 items in this content category for forms under construction today (maximum available in current pool) to reach 6–8 items total per form Planned increase of 7–9 items in this category per reading form for all future development/ forms construction cycles.</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 Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	WIDPI Response	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Immediately review item task models on reading and English tests to identify possible content changes that would impact DOK since the number of items at or above the DOK level of individual standards was judged low for “Key Ideas and Details,” “Craft and Structure,” and “Knowledge of Language” reporting categories. New item development will be guided by these task models to ensure a higher overall average DOK across these three reporting categories for all future item development cycles.</p> <p>ACT will also be reviewing the “Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity” and “Vocabulary Acquisition and Use” and work with the team who led the alignment study to discuss these categories and how the reporting of these results can better be understood to support broader ELA alignment.</p> <p>Timeline: May 2018 - Make adjustments to test specification targets and make item replacements on forms. Summer 2018 - Conduct psychometric simulations and analyses to assure forms are of high technical quality and identify any equating adjustments that would need to be instituted. Fall 2018 - Equate new forms. Spring 2019 - Administer new forms for state customers. Evidence ACTDLM071: Plan to Address Alignment. High-level plan to address alignment gaps.</p> <p>Forward</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 Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	WIDPI Response	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Forward</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide additional evidence and detailed information to support the use of DRC's nationally field-tested College -and -Career - Ready item bank. • Provide additional evidence in test design to address Content Standards at Depth of Knowledge levels for items using the two-way test specifications. 	<p>Based on initial peer review feedback, the Forward Exam test vendor (DRC) has provided additional evidence and detailed information about the development and use of DRC's nationally field-tested College-and-Career-Ready (CCR) item bank, and the steps taken to create the CCR items.</p> <p>Evidence Forward126: DRC Item Bank. Forward127: DRC CCR Item Bank Counts.</p> <p>All items used on the Forward Exam are subjected to a review process that includes assigning Content Standards by Depth of Knowledge (DOK) level. WDPI and Wisconsin educators reviewed the CCR bank items for content alignment, rigor level alignment (grade-level appropriateness, difficulty, DOK), technical design, and universal design. The Item Review Training presentation slides (Forward026) were previously submitted. The consensus results from the 2015, 2016, and 2017 item reviews are provided here as evidence, showing the number of items reviewed by grade, standard, and DOK level, supporting the two-way test specifications of Content Standard by DOK level.</p> <p>Evidence Forward026: Forward Exam Item Review Training Presentation (previously submitted). Forward128: 2015 Item Review. Forward129: 2016 Item Review. Forward130: 2017 Item Review.</p> <p>In response to the initial peer review feedback to provide additional evidence showing two-way test specifications by Content Standards and DOK levels,</p>	<p>Peers' Noted for Forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WI provided additional evidence to support the use of the DRC's item bank. • WI provided updated test specifications to address content and cognitive categories. Sufficient details and specificity would be useful for educators to understand the assessments.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	WIDPI Response	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>the 2017 Tables of Specifications have been updated with item level DOK information. WDPI also requested DRC provide updated blueprints showing two-way test specifications to provide clarity of DOK levels.</p> <p>Evidence Forward131: 2017 Updated ELA Specifications. Forward132: 2017 Updated Math Specifications. Forward133: Updated ELA Blueprint. Forward134: Updated Math Blueprint.</p>	
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement (also applies to critical element 2.2)</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provided brief rationale for ACT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WI should conduct an independent alignment study to confirm that ACT based on modified test specifications demonstrates sufficient alignment to the state corresponding content standards in closing the gaps and the weaknesses in test content. • WI should provide evidence to support the comparability of test scores between ACT and ACT based on modified test specifications. <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Forward or</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 Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.3 – Test Administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No additional evidence requested in February 2018 peer review 		
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required/		

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration No additional evidence requested in February 2018 peer review		
Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
X No additional evidence is required .		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	WIDPI Response	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.5 – Test Security from February 2018 peer review Forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide additional evidence to demonstrate the implementation of the test security procedures. • Provide additional evidence to support consistent decision-making in the implementation of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities. (e.g. within or across districts, different decisions were made for the same type of irregularity.) 	<p>The document Test Security Process Guidelines (Forward135) provides an overview of the process and procedures to follow to investigate possible test security violations. Each incident reported to the WDPI is logged and assigned to a review committee that is charged with identifying whether test items were exposed, whether the validity of test results were compromised, and whether there was any evidence of academic fraud. The evidence from each incident is reviewed to ensure that there is consistency in WDPI determinations and that the facts of each incident support the determination that was made. Instances of possible academic fraud from licensed school staff are forwarded to the legal department of the WDPI for potential license revocation actions. Wisconsin Statute §115.31(2) (Forward136) authorizes the State Superintendent to revoke the license of any department-licensed individual for any conduct or behavior that endangers the education of a student.</p> <p>Evidence Forward135: Test Security Process. Forward136: WI Stats 115. Wisconsin Stat. §115.31(2), license or permit revocation; reports; investigation.</p>	<p>Peers’ Notes for Forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WI provided additional documents collectively addressing requested evidence of test security. • WI provided detailed information of the procedures for reporting, reviewing, and documenting irregularities and incidents, as well as for the consistent decision-making (Forward 135). <p>The state policy (Forward136) clearly addresses the consequences of test security.</p>
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required for Forward</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 Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	WIDPI Response	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy From February 2018 review: Forward Provide additional evidence to support the state system of protecting data integrity and privacy at the LEA level.</p>	<p>WDPI has policies, procedures, guidance, and training in place to protect the integrity and privacy of student assessment data at the LEA level. The following evidence related to the Wisconsin Information System for Education (WISE), the Forward Exam, and specific requirements in state statute clarifies and amplifies our previous response.</p> <p>WISE WISE provides tools for district data exchange and access through tiered, role-based security. WDPI provides extensive guidelines, training, and technical assistance to districts and schools through, for example, web pages, webinars, user groups, conferences, and a dedicated help desk. These were briefly described in our peer review submission, and are expanded upon here.</p> <p>Policies and Procedures WISE is a secure set of tools that supports ID generation, data collection, and reporting to meet all state and federal district and school reporting requirements. WISEdata allows districts to securely submit data to WDPI from their student information system vendor. WISEid is a secure statewide student identification number. WISEdash provides district staff secure advanced reporting and guided data analysis tools. There is a set of public-facing reporting tools, WISEdash Public, which provides access to aggregated data that has been redacted to ensure student privacy. WISEsecure includes the Secure Home login page and an Application Security Manager (ASM) for controlling access to the secure WISE applications. Only users with a system ID and access rights can log in on Secure Home. Access rights in each district are based on a tiered, role-based model:</p>	<p>Peers’ Notes for Forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WI provided additional documents collectively addressing the requests for evidence of test security procedures and consistent decision-making (Forward135 and Forward136). • The State Statute and Forward 167 clearly address the confidentiality and disclosure of student records • WI provided the rules of minimum sample size for aggregate and disaggregate reporting of assessment results.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	WIDPI Response	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>1. District Security Administrator (DSA). One or two per district, typically the district administrator or designee. Access must be approved by the WDPI Security Administrator. Manages Application Administrators.</p> <p>2. Application Administrator. One or two per application. Assigned by the DSA. Manages Application Users.</p> <p>3. Application User. The number of application users is based on educational need. Assigned by the Application Administrator. Uses secure applications to perform job duties.</p> <p>Evidence</p> <p>Forward162: WISE overview (web page). Page 2, item 7: importance of security and privacy; pages 2-3: links to more information about system components; pages 3-4: links to training, support, and user groups.</p> <p>Forward161: WISEdata (web page). Page 1: purpose and links to more information, including secure login; page 2: upcoming events to support users; page 3: the first objective is to provide privacy protection; page 4: guiding principles and data reporting and presentation sections highlight privacy protection.</p> <p>WISEdash</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Forward159: WISEdash District Home (web page). Page 1: overview and access information; page 2: user guides. o Forward115: WISEdash User Guide (previously submitted). Page 3: WISEdash secure application user roles. o Forward163: WISEdash Public (web page). Page 1: overview and statement that data are redacted to protect student privacy; page 2: links to additional information. <p>WISEsecure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Forward165: WAMS Login Screen. Secure 	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	WIDPI Response	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Home is the login page for secure WISE applications. User ID and password are required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Forward152: Secure Home Information (web page). Page 1: overview and how to get access to Secure Home. Page 2: how to set up a District Security Administrator. Pages 2-5: more detailed information on how to get access to various security roles. Pages 5-7: security model overview and links to help documents, privacy information, and help ticket. ○ Forward151: ASM Information (web page). Application Security Manager (ASM) information about the various roles, for example, page 1: DPI Security Administrator and District Security Administrator; and page 6: WISEdash Application Administrator and WISEdash User. ○ Forward164: ASM Quick Start. Page 1: DPI ASM hierarchy, including the three district-level tiers. Pages 1-2: how to use the ASM to assign a new Application Administrator or a new application level role. ○ Forward149: Student Privacy Agreement. Users must accept the agreement in order to access the secure WISE tools the first time they log in and every 120 days thereafter. <p>Guidelines, Training, and Technical Assistance Comprehensive guidelines, training, and technical assistance are easy to find. Forward054 is just two clicks away from the main DPI webpage and offers a topic-based menu. WDPI holds an annual WISEdata conference for district staff involved in collecting, maintaining, reporting, or certifying data. In 2018 the conference included sessions on data security and privacy. WDPI also provides technical assistance through a dedicated help desk available by email, phone, or online support</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 Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	WIDPI Response	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>ticket.</p> <p>Evidence Forward156: Privacy Information Access (web page). Shows that comprehensive data privacy information (Forward054) is easy to find, only two clicks from the main DPI web page. Forward054 Student Data Privacy Main Menu (previously submitted). Links to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Overview. Includes information about FERPA, Wisconsin pupil records law, and links to additional resources. Links to Overview to Student Data Privacy in WI. ○ DPI Safeguarding. Links to Forward055. ○ Privacy for Parents. ○ Data Users. Links to District Personnel and Data Users. ○ Training. ○ Resources. Links to Student Data Privacy Training and Resources for Student Data Privacy. <p>Forward153: Privacy Overview. Slides 4-11: rights and responsibilities, including examples of confidential student data and guidelines for releasing information publicly. Pages 12-13: tips for protecting confidential data. Pages 14-18: access to public and secure data tools and data requests. Pages 19-25: laws and policies. Forward055 DPI Student Data Safeguarding (previously submitted). Provides a high-level view of three methods employed by WDPI to protect student privacy: data redaction for public reporting, a multi-tiered data request process, and a three-tiered hierarchy for managing district users of WDPI secure applications (WISE). Forward150: District User Security (web page). Provides an overview of the three district security</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 Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	WIDPI Response	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>levels and instructions for how to set up district access. There is a summary flowchart on page 2.</p> <p>Forward155: Privacy Training (web page). Includes training materials on protecting personally identifiable information, categories of student records, managing student records, sharing confidential information, and FERPA.</p> <p>Forward154: Privacy Resources (web page). Internal and external resources on topics such as data breaches, contracting, free and reduced lunch, special education, parent resources, trainings, and legislation and policy.</p> <p>Forward157: WISEdata Conference Information (web page). Information on the annual conference for district staff involved in state and federal reporting related to funding, accountability, or education program management.</p> <p>Forward158: WISEdata Conference Schedule (web page). Sessions include FERPA 101, Data Breach Response, So You Think You Know FERPA?, Support from PTAC, and Data Security Best Practices.</p> <p>Forward160: WISEsupport. Online help request form.</p> <p>Forward Exam Policies and procedures eDirect is a secure website used to manage the Forward exam and access student reports provided by the vendor, Data Recognition Corporation (DRC). Access to features in eDirect requires a valid username and password, and is based on a hierarchical, role-based security model. Each district has one district assessment coordinator (DAC), who is responsible for setting up the other users in the system. Authority for setting up school-level users can be delegated to the school 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 Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	WIDPI Response	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>coordinator (SAC) at each school. Editable role-based permission sets are provided to make it easier to set up users. For example, the District Report User and the DAC roles include permissions needed to view reports for all schools in a district, while the School Report User and the SAC roles include permissions needed to view reports for all tested grades within a school. All district and school staff involved in the Forward Exam, including district and school report users, must complete the appropriate training and annually sign a confidentiality form. WDPI collects the DAC confidentiality form and maintains a validated, up-to-date DAC list. DACs are responsible for collecting and keeping on file signed confidentiality forms from other district and school staff.</p> <p>DRC ships paper Individual Student Reports to each district. District staff are required to sign for receipt of the reports and the shipments are tracked by DRC. Each student receives two reports, one for the student's file and one to be sent to the student's parent or guardian. District and school staff are required to keep the reports secure and confidential.</p> <p>Evidence Forward058 Test Security Plan for the WI Forward Assessment-DRC (previously submitted). Page 22: Reporting Security. Paper report shipments are tracked and require district signatures upon receipt. Online reports utilize the eDirect system with role-based security. Forward023 User's Guide to Interpreting Results (previously submitted). Pages 8-12: accessing and using online reports requires role-based permissions managed within the eDirect system. Pages 15-19:</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 Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	WIDPI Response	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>accessing and using aggregate reports. Pages 20-24: accessing and using Individual Student Reports. Page 25: help desk and WDPI contact information.</p> <p>Forward166: Managing eDirect Users. Page 1: secure login. Page 2: required security agreement includes student privacy and FERPA. Page 6: Only one DAC per district. DAC may assign an assistant, but this is not encouraged. DAC may delegate school-level user management to SACs. DACs and SACs are responsible for assigning roles and permissions to other users. Page 11: DACs and SACs may assign role-based permissions sets, which are editable. Page 12: DAC and SACs are responsible for inactivating users who no longer need access to eDirect. Page 14: user roles and permissions matrix includes, for example, report delivery and user management.</p> <p>Forward049: DAC Confidentiality Form (previously submitted). Items 9 (“I will not disclose individual student test scores or test performance data to unauthorized persons.”) and 12 (“I understand the importance of student privacy and ensure that any reference to WISE IDs is kept secure.”). This form must be signed by the DAC and returned to WDPI, where it is kept on file.</p> <p>Forward050: DTC Confidentiality Form (previously submitted). Items 8 and 11.</p> <p>Forward051: SAC Confidentiality Form (previously submitted). Items 9 and 13.</p> <p>Forward052: STC Confidentiality Form (previously submitted). Items 9 and 11.</p> <p>Forward053: TA-Proctor Confidentiality Form (previously submitted). Items 8, 11.</p> <p>Forward169: Report User Confidentiality. Items 2, 4.</p> <p>Guidelines, Training, and Technical Assistance WDPI provides educators at the district and school</p>	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	WIDPI Response	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>levels with guidelines, training, and technical assistance related to the security, confidentiality, and appropriate use of student Forward Exam data. In addition to the dedicated Forward Exam webpages and manuals, WDPI provides training for new DACs and both face-to-face and online pre-test training. WDPI has dedicated program staff to answer questions - two for the Forward Exam, one for data questions, and one for test security questions. DRC also operates a help desk.</p> <p>Evidence</p> <p>Forward045: New District Assessment Coordinator (DAC) Orientation (previously submitted). Slide 44: DAC is responsible for ensuring staff are trained in student privacy. Slide 49: DAC is responsible for confidentiality forms. Slide 61: DAC is responsible for maintaining student privacy and ensuring district and school staff understand and maintain student privacy. Forward168: DAC Training Slides. Used in face-to-face pre-test training and also available online. Pages 5-7: school and district roles, such as DAC and SAC. Page 9: confidentiality agreement process. Pages 21-22: training materials. Pages 38-46: working in eDirect. Pages 54-55: reporting. Forward047: Wisconsin Test Security Manual (previously submitted). Page 7: requires school and district staff maintain confidentiality of student test scores. Forward088: Wisconsin State Testing Plan (previously submitted). Pages 4-5: districts should ensure that staff receive test security training, complete confidentiality forms, and understand the importance of student privacy and secure WISEid. Forward007: Wisconsin Forward Exam webpage (previously submitted). Page 2 provides contact</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 Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	WIDPI Response	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>information for help desk, program manager, data and privacy issues, and test security.</p> <p>State Statute Wisconsin Stat. §118.125(2) requires public schools to maintain the confidentiality of all student records, with certain exceptions provided in the statute. School boards are required to adopt policies to maintain the confidentiality of these records.</p> <p>Evidence Forward167: WI Stat 118. Wisconsin Stat. §118.125(2) on confidentiality and disclosure of pupil records.</p>	
Section 2.6 Summary Statement		
<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 Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	WIDPI Response	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content From February 2018 review</p> <p>ACT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Address gaps & weaknesses in the test content, as identified in the alignment study, and demonstrate the strategy (systematic process and timeline) to improve the technical quality of the high school assessments (e.g., use supplemental items or tests). 	<p>ACT</p> <p>Gaps and weaknesses in test content addressed The document ACT High-level Plan to Address Alignment Gaps (ACTDLM071) includes a summary of the alignment study findings (pp.2-6) which addresses the gaps in test content. The complete alignment study was originally submitted to the Department of Education in December 2017.</p> <p>Evidence ACTDLM071: Plan to Address Alignment. ACT high-level plan to address alignment gaps. ACTDLM045 WDPI ACT Alignment Final Report (previously submitted)</p> <p>Strategy to improve technical quality of the high school assessments ACT is making targeted revisions to the ACT test specification targets to demonstrate full alignment to the WI high school math and ELA content standards.</p> <p>The document ACT High-level Plan to Address Alignment Gaps (ACTDLM071) describes the systematic process of improvement to technical quality that will be made to the Mathematics and English Language Arts tests (pp.1-2) and the timeline for those improvements (p.2). Systematic process to improve technical quality of the high school assessments Mathematics: In line with the alignment study findings and peer reviewers’ suggestions, ACT’s plan is to ensure a greater number of items measure WI high school content standards. Specifically ACT plans include: The immediate identification of items not measuring</p>	<p>Peers’ Notes for ACT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The peers recognized WI’s efforts to improve the alignment of ACT items to the state content standards in reading/language arts and mathematics and with an implementation timeline. WI submitted a plan that addresses gaps and weaknesses in content of ACT to improve its technical quality. An independent alignment study should be conducted to confirm that ‘modified’ ACT demonstrates sufficient alignment to the corresponding WI content standards by closing the gaps in test content. Because ACT and ‘modified’ ACT are derived from different test specifications, evidence should be provided to support the comparability of test scores between the two through an appropriate statistical procedure (e.g., linking). <p>Peers’ Notes for Forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WI proposed a systematic process to address the gaps and weaknesses in test content for Forward ELA and mathematics assessments (Forward137). WI provided an implementation plan with a timeline to improve the alignment. WI should consider an independent updated alignment to confirm that after modification of the Forward Assessments sufficiently align to the state content standards.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	WIDPI Response	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>high school standards through analysis of the test blueprint and item metadata; Once identified, remove 10–12 of those items (the plan will be phased to accommodate development cycles); Replace omitted items with 10–12 items from ACT’s current pre-tested item pool that 1)measure high school standards (e.g., Number and Operations, Functions, Algebra) and 2) reflect necessary cognitive complexity levels to construct forthcoming forms; Analyze resulting test forms to assure targeted content, cognitive, and statistical requirements are met, as well as confirm the increase in HS standards coverage; and Conduct additional psychometric analyses to account for any impact to equating or reporting. Implementing this plan will strengthen alignment between the ACT and WI standards while maintaining testing time and a college reportable score.</p> <p>English Language Arts In line with the alignment study findings and peer reviewers’ suggestions, ACT’s plan is to ensure greater alignment between the ACT and WI ELA content standards through the following activities: Adjust the Reading test specifications targets to increase number of items measuring the “Integration of Knowledge and Ideas” (IKI) Reporting Category (this plan will be phased to accommodate development cycles). Immediate increase of 1–2 items in this content category for forms under construction today (maximum available in current pool) to reach 6–8 items total per form Planned increase of 7–9 items in this category per</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 Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	WIDPI Response	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>reading form for all future development/forms construction cycles</p> <p>Immediately review item task models on reading and English tests to identify possible content changes that would impact DOK since the number of items at or above the DOK level of individual standards was judged too low for “Key Ideas and Details,” “Craft and Structure,” and “Knowledge of Language” reporting categories. New item development will be guided by these task models to ensure a higher overall average DOK across these three reporting categories for all future item development cycles.</p> <p>ACT will also be reviewing the “Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity” and “Vocabulary Acquisition and Use” and work with the team who led the alignment study to discuss these categories and how the reporting of these results can better be understood to support broader ELA alignment.</p> <p>Timeline for improvements</p> <p>May 2018 - Make adjustments to test specification targets and make item replacements on forms.</p> <p>Summer 2018 - Conduct psychometric simulations and analyses to assure forms are of high technical quality and identify any equating adjustments that would need to be instituted.</p> <p>Fall 2018 - Equate new forms.</p> <p>Spring 2019 - Administer new forms for state customers.</p> <p>Evidence</p> <p>ACTDLM071: Plan to Address Alignment. ACT high-level plan to address alignment gaps.</p> <p>Forward</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 Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	WIDPI Response	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Forward Provide a systematic process with implementation timeline to address gaps & weaknesses identified in ELA and mathematics, as well as follow-up analyses for adequate alignment.</p>	<p>A systematic process to address gaps and an implementation timeline have been created and are provided here as evidence.</p> <p>Evidence Forward137: Alignment Recommendations Timeline. Proposed timeline for implementation of alignment study recommendations.</p>	
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provided brief rationale for ACT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •WI should conduct an independent alignment study to confirm that ACT based on modified test specifications demonstrates sufficient alignment to the state corresponding content standards in closing the gaps and the weaknesses in test content. •WI should provide evidence to support the comparability of test scores between ACT and ACT based on modified test specifications. <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Forward</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 Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	WIDPI Response	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes From February 2018 review Forward</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide adequate validity evidence based on cognitive processes, such as a think-aloud lab, distractor analysis. • Provide additional evidence to address the number of items by cognitive level and content standard combination in the test design using two-way specifications (e.g. items should address content standards at DOK levels). 	<p>Additional information about the measures of validity based on cognitive processes, and detailed information about the item review process and field test data analyses, including distractor analysis, are provided in A Summary of the Wisconsin Forward Exam Field Test Data Analysis and Item Review Process (Forward138). A qualitative review of distractors is conducted as part of the initial field test item review. After items are field tested, a quantitative review of distractor data analysis is conducted. The training presentations for both the field test item review and data review are provided as evidence. Data from the field test item analysis are provided for one grade and content area, as an example.</p> <p>Evidence Forward138: Data and Item Review Process. Forward026: Forward Exam Item Review Presentation (previously submitted). Page 36 directs Item Review participants to examine distractors for appropriateness Page 34 shows the Item Review Rating Sheet used by participants Forward139: 2017 Data Review Training. Forward140: Field Test Item Statistics. Grade 3 Math is provided as an example.</p> <p>Operational item level statistics, including distractor analysis, for every grade and content area have been added to the updated 2017 Forward Exam Technical Report (Forward141).</p> <p>Evidence Forward141: Updated 2017 Technical Report. Appendix G. Item Analysis, pages 327-362.</p> <p>To show the number of items by cognitive level</p>	<p>Peers’ Notes for Forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •WI did not provide the results from distractor analysis for cognitive processes, instead providing item statistics from the field test. The statistics on their own, without connection to theory about how often various options should have been selected, is limited evidence of validity based on cognitive processes. •Distractor analysis provides some evidence of validity based on cognitive processes. It would be good to see heuristics for flagging distractors selected by too few respondents (e.g., less than 5%), which may indicate ineffective distractors which only function to add reading load (Forward138 and Forward139). •For additional information about Distractor Analysis and concerns about distractors that are rarely selected, please refer to Rodriguez, M.C. (2005). Three options are optimal for multiple-choice items: A meta-analysis of 80 years of research. Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 24(2), 3-13 OR to Wakefield, J. A. (1958). Does the fifth choice strengthen a test item? Public Personnel Review, 19, 44-48.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	WIDPI Response	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>(DOK) and content standard, the tables of Specifications have been updated with item level DOK information. The consensus results from the 2015, 2016, and 2017 item reviews are also provided here as evidence, showing the number of items reviewed by grade, standard, and DOK level, supporting the two-way test specifications of Content Standard by DOK level.</p> <p>Evidence Forward128: 2015 Item Review. Forward129: 2016 Item Review. Forward130: 2017 Item Review. Forward131: 2017 Updated ELA Specifications. Forward132: 2017 Updated Math Specifications.</p>	
Section 3.2 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Forward		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	WIDPI Response	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure From February 2018 review: ACT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide additional evidence of DIF analyses using all relevant student groups with a reasonable sample size (specify the minimum sample size) that show the extent to which the interrelationships among sub-scores are [consistent] with the State’s academic content standards. Provide additional evidence of DIF analyses that show whether particular items (e.g., essays, performance tasks or items requiring specific knowledge or skills) function differently for all relevant student groups with a reasonable sample size (specify the minimum sample size) 	<p>The document Interrelationship, Reliability, Rater and Classification Consistency, and DIF Analyses for Wisconsin (ACTDLM072) is a report summarizing the analysis that shows the interrelationships among sub-scores (reporting categories) are consistent with the State’s academic content standards. Wisconsin state data on the ACT tests for spring 2017 were used for this study.</p> <p>Tables 4,5, and 6 report the correlation matrices among the reporting categories (subscores) for the initial, make-up, and accommodated forms, respectively.</p> <p>Reporting categories (subscores) for English include: Production of Writing (PoW), Knowledge of Language (KLA), and Conventions of Standard English (CoE). Mathematics includes the following eight reporting categories: Preparing for Higher Mathematics (PHM); Number and Quantity (NAQ); Algebra, Functions, Geometry, Statistics and Probability (SAP); Integrating Essential Skills (IES); and Modeling. Reading includes the following three reporting categories: Key Ideas and Details (KID), Craft and Structure (CAS), and Integration of Knowledge and Ideas (IOK). Science includes the following three reporting categories: Interpretation of Data (IOD); Scientific Investigation (SIN); and Evaluation of Models, Inference, and Experimental</p>	<p>Peers’ Notes for ACT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WI provided additional evidence of DIF analysis by all relevant subgroups. The correlation matrix for validity based on internal structure was provided for the overall population, not by subgroup.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	WIDPI Response	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Results (EMI). Writing includes the following four reporting categories: Ideas and Analysis (IaA), Development and Support (DaS), Organization (ORG), and Language Use and Conventions (LUC).</p> <p>Evidence: ACTDLM072: Wisconsin Analyses, pages 2-5.</p> <p>DIF analyses were conducted on the 2017 WI student samples and are included in the Interrelationship, Reliability, Rater and Classification Consistency, and DIF Analyses for Wisconsin (ACTDLM072) report. The procedures used for the analysis include the standardized difference in proportion-correct (STD) procedure and the Mantel-Haenszel common odds-ratio (MH) procedure.</p> <p>The researchers adopted a minimum sample size requirement based on an industry practice: a minimum of 300 students for focal group and 700 students for total (Zwick, 2012). As a result, DIF analyses were conducted on each multiple choice item for the initial form on nine group comparisons. The groups compared were: Male/Female, White/Asian, White/ African-American, White/ Hispanic, White/ American-Indian, White/ Two or more races, Non-Economically Disadvantaged/ Economically Disadvantaged, Non-Disability/Disability, Non-English Learner/English Learner.</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 Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	WIDPI Response	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>The analysis was not conducted for a sub-group whose sample is less than 300 (i.e., Pacific Islander group). The minimum sample size used in these comparisons was 477 for the American-Indian group.</p> <p>Using pre-established criteria, the items with STD or MH values exceeding the tolerance level are flagged. Table 10 (p. 11) shows the Criteria of DIF Categories on MH Procedure for multiple-choice items. Using the STD procedure, items were flagged when the values of STD were higher than 0.10. Table 11 (p. 12) shows the DIF analysis results based on the MH procedure and Table 12 (pp. 13-14) shows the DIF analysis results based on the STD procedure for the nine comparisons.</p> <p>DIF analyses were also conducted for the writing test for 2017 WI student samples (pp. 14-15). For DIF analysis of the writing test, the same minimum sample size requirement and nine pairs of comparison groups were used as for the multiple-choice item DIF analysis. The analysis indicated that there was no concern of the writing item functioning differently for each of the nine group comparisons (see p. 15, Table 14).</p> <p>Evidence: ACTDLM072: Wisconsin Analyses, Pages 11-15.</p>	
Section 3.3 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for ACT		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables From February 2018 review Forward Provide additional validity evidence based on relationships with other variables, such as formative or interim assessments (e.g., MAP).</p>	<p>WDPI previously submitted evidence to support the validity of the Forward Exam based on relationships to other variables in terms of correlations between Forward Exam content area scores and comparisons of the percent in each performance category on the Forward Exam and the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) administered in Wisconsin. Both of these measures indicated a high degree of correlation.</p> <p>The peers requested additional validity evidence, suggesting, for example, that WDPI examine the relationships between scores on the Forward Exam and an interim assessment such as the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP). In January 2017 the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA), publishers of MAP, released a linking study of the two assessments. The study analyzed matched Forward Exam and MAP student scores in ELA (n=26,785) and mathematics (n=27,467) from 99 Wisconsin schools in grades 3-8. The study found high classification consistency between the two tests, between 81-83% for ELA and 86-88% for mathematics. The study also found high correlation coefficients between Forward Exam and MAP ELA scores (ranging from 0.78 to 0.81) and between Forward Exam and MAP mathematics scores (ranging from 0.85 to 0.89). These results support the validity of the Forward Exam based on relationships to the MAP interim assessments.</p> <p>Evidence Forward142: Linking Forward and MAP. Page 8: classification consistency. Page 24: correlation coefficients.</p>	<p>Peers’ Notes for Forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •WI provided additional validity evidence based on the relationships of Forward test scores with other variables on the same content and across content areas. •The CE 3.4 requires evidence that demonstrates convergent validity evidence based on the relationships of test scores with similar constructs and divergent validity evidence based on the relationships of test scores with different construct. •The results of the analysis that WI submitted using the percentage of students at various performance levels between Forward and other assessments is not convergent and divergent validity evidence. According to Peers, this method/approach is inappropriate.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		
[X] No additional evidence is required for Forward.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.1 – Reliability From February 2018 Review: ACT _X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for ACT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WI DPI should provide additional evidence to support the reliability for the composite R/LA test scores using the State’s data from test administration, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reliability estimates for the State overall and all major reporting sub-groups with reasonable sample sizes. (Please specify the minimum sample size.) ○ Standard error of measurement for the State overall and major reporting sub-groups with reasonable sample sizes. (Please specify the minimum sample size.) ○ Estimates of classification accuracy and decision consistency for the State overall and all major reporting sub-groups with reasonable samples. (Please specify the minimum sample size.) <p>Forward Exam _X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WI DPI should provide explanations to address the lower reliability for ELs (e.g., all grades in English/language and grades 6-8 mathematics). • WI DPI should provide the SEM by performance level or for the cut score points. • WI DPI should provide the classification 	<p>ACT Reliability and standard error of measurement Pages 6-7 of the report Interrelationship, Reliability, Rater and Classification Consistency, and DIF Analyses for Wisconsin (ACTDLM072) present scale score reliability and standard error of measurement (SEM) of the ACT English Language Arts (ELA), English, reading, mathematics, and science scale scores using Wisconsin students data in school year of 2017 (SY17).</p> <p>The analysis was conducted on the overall state testing population, as well as by different sub-groups defined by: gender (i.e., male and female), ethnicity (i.e., Asian, African-American, American-Indian, Hispanic, white, and two or more races), economic status (economically disadvantaged students), English Learning status (English learners), and Disability status (students with a disability). The analysis mainly focused on the students who took the initial form, and the analysis was not conducted for a sub-group with less than 300 samples (i.e., Pacific Islander group). As additional information, the reliabilities and SEMs for make-up and accommodated forms are provided. Table 7 presents scale score reliabilities and SEMs for ELA, English, reading, mathematics, and science.</p> <p>Evidence: ACTDLM072 Wisconsin Analyses, Pages 6-7.</p>	<p>Peers’ Notes for ACT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WI provided additional evidence of reliability of test scores, such as reliability coefficients, standard errors of measurement, and classification consistencies, for the overall population and for all major reporting subgroups. • Observed lower reliability for some subgroups (e.g., African Americans, ELs) should be explored with interpretations since ACT scores are used for the state high-stakes accountability. • The negatively skewed item difficulty distributions may be due to a lack of items for low-achieving students leading to lower reliability for some groups of students.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>accuracy and consistency by subgroup.</p>	<p>Classification accuracy and decision consistency Pages 7-9 of the report Interrelationship, Reliability, Rater and Classification Consistency, and DIF Analyses for Wisconsin (ACTDLM072) present a summary of analyses of the classification consistency and accuracy on differentiating students into performance levels with SY17 WI students who took the initial test form.</p> <p>The analysis was conducted on the same data set and sub-groups used for reliability estimation: gender (i.e., male and female), ethnicity (i.e., Asian, African-American, American-Indian, Hispanic, white, and two or more races), economic status (economically disadvantaged students), English Learning status (English learners), and Disability status (students with a disability). As additional information, classification consistency for make-up and accommodated forms are also provided. The classification consistencies were calculated with the method developed by Livingston and Lewis (1995). This method was selected as it can be used in calculating classification consistency of composite scores, such as the ELA score.</p> <p>Table 8 (pp. 8-9) presents a summary of the agreements between the operational test classifications—that is, the percentages of students who would be consistently classified in the same achievement levels on two equivalent administrations of the test. The agreement rate (percentage consistently classified) and Kappa index were computed for each test score under two classification</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 Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>schemes. One is a two-level classification scheme which refers to proficient/non-proficient decisions (i.e., Basic and below vs. Proficient and above), and the other is a four-level classification scheme which refers to classification</p> <p>Evidence: ACTDLM072 Wisconsin Analyses, Pages 7-9.</p> <p>Forward An explanation to address the lower reliability for English learners has been added to the Wisconsin Forward Exam Technical Report 2017 (updated May 2018) (Forward141). To summarize this explanation, the reliability coefficient is affected by the variability of students' scores. Higher variability of scores is associated with higher reliability coefficients. The variance of scores for the English learner subgroup tends to be less than the variance of scores for other subgroups, leading to lower reliability.</p> <p>WDPI along with the Forward Exam test vendor will continue to monitor the performance of EL students to determine whether any substantive changes need to be made to future forms of the assessment.</p> <p>Evidence Forward141: Updated 2017 Technical Report. Section 9.1, page 221 provides explanation of lower reliability for ELs. The Forward Exam Technical Report has been updated to provide SEM by cut score points and classification accuracy and consistency by subgroup.</p> <p>Evidence Forward141: Updated 2017 Technical</p>	<p>Peers' Notes for Forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •An explanation is included indicating lower reliability for ELs is likely due to lower variability (Forward141). This is likely true, although the lower variability may indicate the test as currently constructed is not optimal for ELs. There may be a floor effect on the test for this group. The State should determine whether the distribution for ELs is more skewed, indicating a floor effect. If there is evidence of a floor effect, the State should indicate how this will be addressed. Ideally the test should be more reliable for ELs if used with this population. •Using a scatter plot between theta estimates and item difficulty parameters may also help identify potential issues in item/test development.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Report. Appendix I. CSEM, pages 371-388. Appendix J. Classification Consistency and Accuracy Analysis by Subgroup, pages 389-418.	
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
<p>[X] The following additional evidence is needed/provided brief rationale for ACT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WI should explore the potential reasons for lower reliability of ACT scores for some subgroups and provide comprehensive explanations. • WI should develop a plan for improving the reliability of ACT scores for subgroups to support its use in the state high-stakes accountability of all students. <p>At a minimum, the following groups/tests should be addressed: ELs/all test; African Americans/science tests; and Accommodated/science test.</p> <p>[X] The following additional evidence is needed/provided brief rationale for Forward</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WI should further explore the potential reasons for lower reliability of Forward test scores for ELs and provide a more comprehensive explanation. Scatter plots or histograms may provide insight into whether there is a floor effect on the Forward for this group of students. • WI should develop a plan for improving the reliability of Forward scores for ELs to support its use in the state high-stakes accountability for this student group. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility From February 2018 Review Forward Exam _X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WI DPI should provide evidence to support the appropriate process for item bias and sensibility review by WI reviewers with a diverse set of backgrounds. • WI DPI should provide evidence to report the results of DIF analysis for field testing and from the operational test. 	<p>Each year approximately 70 educators from all over Wisconsin participate in New Item Review for the Forward Exam.</p> <p>Educators review all new items for content, grade level appropriateness, link to correct standard, and bias and sensitivity issues. Educators must submit an application if they are interested in participating in New Item Review. From the pool of applicants, participants are selected by WDPI to include content experts with experience teaching the state academic content standards in tested grades, and individuals with experience and expertise teaching diverse student populations, including students with disabilities, English learners, economically disadvantaged, and minority students. In addition, the participants represent a diverse geographic range across the state, including participants from rural, suburban, and urban districts.</p> <p>Evidence Forward143: Item Review Application</p> <p>Differential item functioning (DIF) studies are conducted following each administration of the Forward Exam. A brief summary of this process and how DIF results are evaluated is provided in A Summary of WI Forward Exam Field Test Data Analysis and Item Review Process (Forward138). Detailed information on DIF procedures and criteria used to evaluate the operational test items is provided in the updated Wisconsin Forward Exam Technical Report 2017 (Forward141). The same procedures and flagging criteria are used to evaluate field test items for all grades and content areas. An example (one grade, one content area) of item DIF statistics for field test items is provided here as evidence (Forward140).</p>	<p>Peers’ Notes for Forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WI provided additional evidence for the Bias Review process. • WI provided additional information about the selection of reviewers, including the application form, and considerations in selection, but not provide a table with percentage of demographic characteristics of the panels.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Evidence Forward138: Data and Item Review Process. See page 5. Forward141: Updated 2017 Technical Report. Section 10.1, pages 248-251. Forward140: Field Test Item Statistics. Grade 3 Math is provided as example.	
Section 4.2 Summary Statement		
[X] The following additional evidence is needed/provided brief rationale for Forward: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WI should provide a table indicating the characteristics of participants in the Bias and Sensitivity 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 Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum from February 2018 review: Forward Exam _X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: WI DPI should provide additional evidence about the process for LOSS/HOSS and examine their impacts on school accountability and student academic growth measures.</p>	<p>The DRC memo on the Forward Exam Lowest and Highest Scale Scores from May 3, 2018 (Forward144) provides an overview of the procedure used to calculate the LOSS/HOSS for the Wisconsin Forward Exam, results of the review of the item response patterns of students who obtained the LOSS on the mathematics section of the exam, and presents recommendations for addressing the high number of students performing at the LOSS on the mathematics exam. The memo recommends that “Including easier non-MC items on the future operational test forms may help students score above the LOSS. If lower ability students are able to answer some non-MC items correctly, their scores will be expected to be higher than the LOSS.” The Mathematics Item Development Plan (Forward145) includes development of additional short answer and technology enhanced items that are of easy or medium difficulty. The inclusion of additional easy or medium difficulty short answer and technology enhanced items should help to address the issue of the large number of students performing at the LOSS in mathematics.</p> <p>Evidence Forward144: LOSS HOSS Forward145: Math Item Development</p>	<p>Peers’ Notes for Forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WI provided additional information on the procedure for LOSS and HOSS and their impact on student performance for high-stakes accountability. • WI provided an item development plan to improve the technical quality of Forward exams, especially in mathematics (Forward 144 and 145).
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>[X] No additional evidence is required for Forward</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 Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.4 – Scoring from February 2018 review ACT <u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for ACT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WI DPI should provide additional evidence and detailed information on hand scoring for writing, such as rater recruiting criteria, training materials, range finding/calibration, validity papers, and procedures to reconcile discrepant ratings among human scorers. The rater consistency should be provided based on empirical data in the WI test administration and by test form. <p>Forward Exam <u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WI DPI should provide additional evidence about AI scoring, such as the sampling procedure, training on the AI engine, and the monitoring process for scoring. WI DPI should provide an explanation for the differences in scoring depicted on Tables 5.3 to 5.5 (p. 59, Forward Exam 008). WI DPI should provide an explanation for the non-scorable percentages on Table 5.5 being exactly equal, to the one hundredth of a decimal point, for AI and the human scorers. <p>WI DPI should provide evidence about the transcription procedure for ELs and quality assurance.</p>	<p>ACT Additional evidence and detailed information on hand scoring File ACTDLM020: ACT Writing Scoring Process Analyses for Wisconsin was previously provided to the Department of Education in December 2017 and includes detailed information on hand scoring including rater recruiting criteria, rater training, range finding/calibration, validity papers, and procedures to reconcile discrepant ratings among human scorers.??</p> <p>The peer review notes requested that DPI provide additional information on these items and rater consistency based on empirical data in the Wisconsin test administration and by test form. ACTDLM073 provides the additional information requested about how raters are trained and how essays are scored.</p> <p>Evidence: ACTDLM073: Scoring. ACTDLM020 ACT Writing Scoring Process Analyses for Wisconsin (previously submitted).</p> <p>Rater consistency Pages 9-10 of the report Interrelationship, Reliability, Rater and Classification Consistency, and DIF Analyses for Wisconsin (ACTDLM072) presents rater agreement indices calculated based on the two rater scores for the writing prompts used in the initial, make-up, and accommodated test administrations, regardless of whether there is a third rater adjudication or not. As shown in Table 9 (p. 10), these agreement indices included the perfect agreement rate, the perfect plus adjacent agreement rate, and the quadratic weighted kappa coefficient. The perfect agreement rate, or proportion of students</p>	<p>Peers' Notes for ACT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WI provided detailed information about hand-scoring for ACT writing. WI provided additional evidence for rate consistency based on operational data.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>who received the same domain score (from 1 to 6) from both raters, ranged from approximately 0.63 to 0.74 across domains and forms. The perfect plus adjacent agreement rates, or the proportion of students who received either the same domain score or adjacent domain scores (e.g., a score of 5 and a score of 6) from both raters, was very high, about .99 across all domains and forms.</p> <p>The quadratic weighted kappa coefficient (Cohen, 1968) is a measure of agreement between raters for categorical scores (e.g., 1, 2, 3). It uses weights to reflect the relative difference between categories. The kappa coefficient is a positive number if the observed agreement is larger than the chance agreement, with larger numbers representing more agreement between two raters. The quadratic weighted kappa coefficients for the ACT writing domain scores across the domains and forms ranged from 0.71 to 0.84, indicating good rater agreement. Note that raters disagreed more than one score point on about 1% of the cases. Since these discrepancies had been resolved by a third rater before scores were reported, the actual rater consistency of the reported writing scores is expected to be even slightly higher than what is shown in Table 9.</p> <p>Evidence: ACTDLM072: Wisconsin Analyses, pages 9-10.</p> <p>Forward Additional evidence about AI scoring, including information about the training process, model building, evaluation metric, and scoring is provided.</p> <p>Evidence</p>	<p>Peers' Notes for Forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WI provided additional evidence for rater consistency in hand-scoring for Forward assessments. • WI provided the information about transcription procedures for ELs and additional evidence to support the quality assurance.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p align="center">Forward146: AI Scoring Information.</p> <p>Tables 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5 in the Wisconsin Forward Exam Technical Report 2017 (Forward141) have been updated and an explanation of the information in these tables has been added to the text. Table 5.5 has been edited to remove the AI% column, because non-scorable codes are always assigned by humans. Additional information was added to explain the process for assigning non-scorable codes.</p> <p>Evidence Forward141: Updated 2017 Technical Report. Section 5.4.1: Distribution of TDA Item Scores, page 53. Tables 5-3, 5-4, and 5-5, pages 58-59.</p> <p>Information about scribing and transcription procedures is provided in: Forward147: Scribing Guidelines. Forward035: Qualifications and Guidelines for Translators and Interpreters (previously submitted).</p>	
Section 4.4 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for ACT or Forward		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms		
Section 4.5 Summary Statement		
Forward Exam: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Forward Exam in February 2018		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment		
Section 4.6 Summary Statement		
Forward Exam: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Forward Exam in February 2018		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance		
The		
Section 4.7 Summary Statement		
ACT: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required from February 2018. Forward Exam <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required from February 2018		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities From February 2018</p> <p>ACT _X_ No additional evidence is required for ACT</p> <p>DLM _X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for DLM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WI DPI should provide additional evidence with clear explanations for parents regarding the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, as well as on accommodated testing. This additional evidence should address any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards. <p>Forward Exam _X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: WI DPI should provide clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>WDPI provides clear explanations for parents regarding differences between the alternate assessment and other assessments, including effects on a student’s education, such as high school graduation, on the assessment team website (Forward034) and in brochures for parents (Forward119 and ACTDLM029). Educators are required to provide detailed information to families during IEP development, including the effects of State and local policies (Forward104, ACTDLM030, Forward105, and ACTDLM040). This local connection is important because it engages families directly with their schools, and because some effects, such as graduation, are determined by local policies.</p> <p>In Wisconsin, only students with the most significant cognitive disabilities take the alternate assessment (DLM), and no student should take the alternate assessment unless they are also participating in the Wisconsin Essential Elements (EE) (Forward105 and ACTDLM040, p. 6). Other states too!!</p> <p>Evidence: Forward034: Information for Families About Assessment in WI (web page, previously submitted). Page 1, general assessment information; page 2, brief information about DLM; page 3, additional information about DLM. Forward119 and ACTDLM029: Parent’s Guide to Understanding the Essential Elements Brochure (previously submitted). Explains what the Essential Elements are and how they are linked to the grade-level academic standards. On the back of the brochure there is a section that addresses implications that participating in the Wisconsin Essential Elements (and therefore the DLM assessment) may have.</p>	<p>Peers’ Notes for Forward and DLM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WI should provide additional evidence with clear explanations for parents about the differences between the general and the alternate assessments, which are addressed in the state and local policies on the corresponding consequences for students who take alternate assessments. It is unclear from submitted evidence whether parents understand the connections between assessments and graduation. WI provided a great deal of factual information, such as test content, Webpage, and forms. WI should explain to parents the three paths, including the eligibility and consequences, based on general, accommodated, and alternate assessments. No sufficient details are described in the DLM documents, <u>nor in accommodated testing.</u>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Forward104 and ACTDLM030: Participation Guidelines for Alternate Assessment (Form I-7-A) (previously submitted). Guides teachers when making IEP decisions for students they deem appropriate for the EE. Participation Criterion section 3 directs the LEA to assure that parents understand the differences between the alternate achievement standards and the academic content standards, how their child's achievement will be measured, and how participating in alternate standards and assessment could affect the student's completion of requirements for a regular high school diploma.</p> <p>Forward105 and ACTDLM040: Guide to Determining Students with the Most Significant Cognitive Disabilities (previously submitted). Page 6 articulates participation requirements and also the requirement for IEP teams to inform parents of the differences between assessments and the potential effects of participating in the Essential Elements, including any impact on diploma requirements.</p>	
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<p>[X] The following additional evidence is needed/provided brief rationale for Forward and DLM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •WI should provide additional evidence with clear explanations for parents about the differences between the general and the alternate assessments, which are addressed in the state and local policies on the corresponding consequences. This information should include the format of the assessments, how they are completed, how they are scored, and how they are used, etc. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs •		
Section 5.2 Summary Statement		
ACT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for ACT from February 2018 review Forward Exam: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Forward Exams from February 2018 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 Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.3 – Accommodations ACT _X_ No additional evidence is required for ACT (but, see discussion in section on Equal Benefits) Forward Exam: _X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WI DPI should provide evidence about guidelines for IEP teams to assign appropriate accommodations to match each student’s needs. • WI DPI should provide validity and reliability evidence for the online transcriptions to ensure that the test construct is not altered. 	<p>WDPI provides guidelines for IEP teams to assign appropriate accommodations on the Forward Exam. Below is a description of how the evidence we submitted supports this claim.</p> <p>Evidence</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Forward009: District and School Assessment Coordinator (DAC) Guide (previously submitted). Pages 6-8 provides information on accommodations.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Forward010: Forward Exam Accessibility Guide (previously submitted). There are three categories of supports:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Universal tools are available to all students and use is determined by student preference. Tables 1 (pp.2-5) and 2 (p. 6) include descriptions of each tool.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Designated supports are available to a student for whom the need has been indicated by an educator or team of educators (with parent/guardian and student input as appropriate) and are part of a student’s regular classroom instruction. Tables 3 (pp. 7-9) and 4 (pp. 10-15) include descriptions of each designated support and guidelines for use. For example, on page 7 the guidance for use of “color choices,” which alters the background color, indicates that “students with attention difficulties, visual impairment, or other print disabilities may benefit from this support. Color supports should be informed by evidence that color selections meet the student’s needs.”</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Accommodations are features available to a student for whom there is a documented need in an Individualized Education Program (IEP) or 504 plan, and for whom similar accommodations are used as part of regular classroom instruction. Tables 5 (pp. 17-18) and 6 (pp. 19-23) include descriptions of each example, on page 19 the guidance for “alternate response options,” such as adapted keyboards,</p>	<p>Peers’ Notes for Forward: •WI provided additional evidence about accommodations.</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 Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>indicates that “some students with physical disabilities may need to use the alternate response options accommodation. Some alternate response options are external devices that must be plugged in and be compatible with the assessment delivery system. It is important to test compatibility ahead of time with the Online Training Tools.”</p> <p align="center">Forward012: Accessibility Training Presentation (previously submitted). Provides additional information and examples of the supports and accommodations.</p> <p align="center">Forward014: Forward Exam Accommodations web page (previously submitted). Provides a high-level overview and links to resources that help educators understand and select appropriate supports and accommodations.</p> <p>Information about scribing and transcription procedures is provided in: Forward147: Scribing Guidelines. Forward035: Qualifications and Guidelines for Translators and Interpreters (previously submitted for critical elements 1.4 and 5.2).</p>	
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Forward		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations from February 2018 Review ACT</p> <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for ACT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •WI DPI should provide evidence, in addition to documents, to support its comprehensive process for monitoring test administration for special populations. •WI DPI should provide evidence to support the accommodations used on assessments are consistent with those used during classroom instruction for students with disabilities and English Learners. <p>Forward Exams</p> <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •WI DPI should provide additional evidence to support its comprehensive process, in addition to documentation, for monitoring test administration for special populations (e.g., flowchart, follow-up data collection and analyses). •WI DPI should provide evidence about the consistency between accommodations used in assessments and those used in classroom instruction. 	<p>ACT and Forward</p> <p>ACTDLM080 and Forward148 are flowcharts that show the comprehensive process for monitoring test administration for special populations.</p> <p>Forward170 describes the annual WDPI validation of selected LEAs’ Special Education Procedural Compliance Self-Assessments, which includes a check of whether appropriate assessment accommodations are provided to students. Part of the validation procedure involves comparing individual students’ statewide assessment accommodations (available in the test results file) with those individual students’ I7 forms. This procedure verifies that accommodations offered on statewide assessments are consistent with the aids and supports offered during classroom instruction (ACTDLM042 and Forward121). If the accommodations offered are not consistent with the I7, LEAs are required to correct them. Corrections are required as soon as possible for identified student-level errors, and compliance must be demonstrated based upon a reasonable sample of randomly selected student records created after the LEA has completed their actions to ensure compliance. WDPI will use enforcement mechanisms, as necessary, including withholding of funds, consistent with 34 CFR §300.600 and 34 CFR §300.604.</p> <p>Evidence: ACTDLM080 and Forward148: Monitoring Flowchart. Forward170: Compliance Assessment Information. ACTDLM042 and Forward121 (both</p>	<p>Peers’ Notes for ACT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •WI provided additional evidence to support the comprehensive process for monitoring test administration for special populations. <p>Peers’ Notes for Forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •WI provided additional evidence to support the comprehensive process and the consistency between accommodations used in assessments and instruction.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>previously submitted): Directions and Standards for Assessing Compliance</p> <p>IEP 16 (pp.29-31) requires districts to verify that students' IEPs document that the IEP team considered and determined whether accommodations were needed for each applicable assessment. The standards for IEP 16 (p. 31) include guidance that IEP teams "should consider what accommodations the student is familiar with in daily instruction..." and "when possible, the accommodation should be used consistently for both instruction and when participating in assessments."</p> <p>IMP 5 (pp. 36-38) requires districts to determine whether the accommodations specified on students' IEPs were actually provided on the applicable assessments. The standards for IMP 5 include guidance that "when possible, the accommodation should be used consistently for both instruction and when participating in assessments."</p>	
Section 5.4 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required for ACT or Forward		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students		
Section 6.1 Summary Statement		
Forward Exam: <u>X</u> No additional evidence is required for Forward Exam in February 2018		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting from February 2018 review: ACT X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for ACT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WI DPI should provide the rationale of using the Modified Briefing Book to support the process for standard setting. Since the Performance Level Descriptors (PLDs) were developed 2 years after the 2015 standard setting, WI DPI should provide validity evidence to support the alignment of the ACT academic achievement standards with the expectations addressed in the PLDs for high school students. <p>Forward Exam: <u>X</u> No additional evidence is required for Forward Exam</p>	<p>The document Justification for using a Briefing Book Method for Setting Cut Scores on ACT (ACTDLM075) provides a detailed rationale for the use of the Modified Briefing Book method to support the standard setting process for the ACT in Wisconsin.</p> <p>The 2017 PLD development utilized the 2015 standard setting as a guiding resource. ACTDLM074 goes into detail about how:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the 2015 cut scores were used to guide the PLD writing activities exactly as they would have been had the cut score development occurred simultaneously; the 2015 cut scores were used to select test items representing each performance level for ACT?, in a manner commonly used for PLD workshops across the country; If the WI ACT forms are altered from the regular ACT test, alignment is needed between forms to use test results for CCR the current forms, including the multiple forms used to support the development of the PLDs in 2017, were developed using the same test specifications as the forms used to support the 2015 standard setting; Panelists endorsed the validity of the 	<p>Peers' Notes for ACT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to the changes in test content from modified test specifications, the 'old' Achievement Level Descriptors for ACT should be reviewed to address high school content standards and reflect cognitive complexity. For the same reason above, WI should have a plan for a confirmation standard setting to review previously determined achievement standards. The standard setting should address any necessary adjustment of achievement standards (or cut scores) on the basis of the 'new' Achievement Level Descriptors and student performance on ACT with changes in test content. Recommendations from Peers on CE2.1 Test Design and Development and CE3.1 Validity based on Content can be referenced for CE6.2.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	resulting PLDs based on the 2015 cut scores. Evaluation results indicated that 100% of the PLD panelists were “confident that the revised performance level descriptors are valid.” Evidence: ACTDLM075: Briefing Book Justification. ACTDLM074: Standards Setting.	
Section 6.2 Summary Statement		
<p>[X] The following additional evidence is needed/provided brief rationale for ACT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •According to the ACT High-Level plan, WI should revisit the Achievement Level Descriptors to address the State’s high school content standards and reflect cognitive complexity. •WI should plan a confirmation standard setting with appropriate approach/method to verify previously determined achievement standards based on updated Achievement Level Descriptors and student performance on ACT forms from modified test specifications. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards from February 2018 review</p> <p>ACT</p> <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for ACT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since the Performance Level Descriptors (PLDs) were developed 2 years after the 2015 standard setting, WI DPI should provide validity evidence to support the alignment of the ACT academic achievement standards to the expectations addressed in the PLDs for high school students. • WI DPI should provide validity evidence to support the methodology and the process used for standard setting. Doing so will ensure the challenging and aligned academic achievement standards address the rigorous and challenging academic content standards. <p>Forward Exam</p> <p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required for Forward Exam</p>	<p>The 2017 PLD development utilized the 2015 standard setting as a guiding resource. ACTDLM074 goes into detail about how:</p> <p>the 2015 cut scores were used to guide the PLD writing activities exactly as they would have been had the cut score development occurred simultaneously;</p> <p>the 2015 cut scores were used to select test items representing each performance level, in a manner commonly used for PLD workshops across the country;</p> <p>the current forms, including the multiple forms used to support the development of the PLDs in 2017, were developed using the same test specifications as the forms used to support the 2015 standard setting;</p> <p>Panelists endorsed the validity of the resulting PLDs based on the 2015 cut scores. Evaluation results indicated that 100% of the PLD panelists were “confident that the revised performance level descriptors are valid.”</p> <p>Evidence:</p> <p>ACTDLM074: Standards Setting. ACTDLM069 (previously submitted): ACT PLD Technical Report</p> <p>WDPI utilized ACT’s college and career readiness benchmarks as a guiding resource when establishing the cut scores in Wisconsin. These benchmarks are directly linked with student performance in first year credit bearing college courses. When WDPI enlisted educators to establish performance level descriptors, these educators reviewed the Wisconsin academic content standards, ACT test items for ELA and mathematics, and the cut scores developed by WDPI for ELA and mathematics. The educators were fully</p>	<p>•Please see peers’ comment on CE2.1 Test Design and Development and CE3.1 Validity based on Content, as well as CE6.2 Achievement Standard Setting.</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 Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>supportive of the current cut scores and did not evidence any concerns with their appropriateness in determining proficiency for Wisconsin students.</p> <p>Evidence: ACTDLM014 (previously submitted): ACT Standard Setting Report ACTDLM064 (previously submitted): ACT Benchmarks ACTDLM069 (previously submitted): ACT PLD Technical Report</p>	
Section 6.3 Summary Statement		
<p>[X] The following additional evidence is needed/provided brief rationale for ACT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •WI should provide additional evidence to support the Challenges and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards. Requested evidence below is from CEs 2.1, 3.1, and 6.2. •After the proposed alignment changes to ACT, WI should conduct an independent alignment study to confirm that ACT based on modified test specifications demonstrates sufficient alignment to the State’s corresponding content standards in closing the gaps and weaknesses in test content. •According to the ACT High-Level plan, WI should revisit the Achievement Level Descriptors to address the State’s high school content standards and reflect cognitive complexity. •WI should plan a confirmation standard setting with appropriate approach/method to verify previously determined achievement standards based on updated Achievement Level Descriptors and student performance on ACT forms from modified test specifications. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)
<p>ESSA Equal Benefits Provision ACT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> During the April 20th, 2018 phone call with USED, USED requested that WDPI provide evidence to support the equal benefits provision in ESSA. 	<p>Background and overview</p> <p>The Every Student Succeeds Act Title I Part A final regulations, under the section titled “Inclusion of all students,” §200.6 (3)(ii) reads “A State must ensure that the use of appropriate accommodations under this paragraph (b) of this section does not deny a student with a disability...Any of the benefits from participation in the assessment that are afforded to students without disabilities.” Section §200.6(f)(2)(i)(B) describes the same regulation for English learners, that the State must “ensure that the use of the appropriate accommodations ...does not deny an English learner...any of the benefits from participation in the assessment that are afforded to students who are not English learners.”</p> <p>Prior to the Spring 2018 administration of the ACT in Wisconsin, if a student was denied an accommodations request from ACT, the student had the option to take the test without accommodations, or use the necessary accommodations for a non-college reportable score. At the time, for English learners, ACT allowed linguistic and other supports, but only for non-college reportable scores. The non-college reportable score report was in a different format than a college-reportable score report. The non-college reportable score report provided different information than the college reportable score report and it was not accepted by colleges for admissions application purposes.</p> <p>With the reauthorization of ESEA including the equal benefits provision for assessments, Wisconsin DPI began exploring options for meeting the provision of the law and ensuring all students’ needs are met in terms of accommodations and receiving the benefit of a college reportable score.</p> <p>Data analysis</p> <p>At the time WDPI began to examine options, data review revealed that in the prior year (2015-16) 158 Wisconsin students received a non-college reportable score for state testing of the ACT. The breakdown included 49 students with disabilities, 47 English learners, and 62 students for other reasons (504 plans for example).</p> <p>Evidence:</p> <p>ACTDLM076 Equal Benefits Infographic.</p> <p>Improvements to ACT accommodations and accessibility supports offerings</p> <p>Starting in fall 2017, ACT updated policies with respect to students with disabilities (for example, to ensure that they are consistent with the principles of universal design). An updated list of allowable accessibility supports, guide for requesting accommodations, and related materials was posted to the WDPI ACT Accommodations and Supports webpage. These supports were available to Wisconsin students for the 2018 state testing administration.</p> <p>Evidence:</p> <p>ACTDLM003: The ACT 2017-18 Allowable Accessibility Supports: State and District (SD) Testing (previously submitted). A chart that shows which presentation, interaction & navigation, response, and general test condition supports are embedded/universally available and those that are available as accommodations requiring ACT approval. 003 is an old document, which cannot be used to support the current response to the US DOE request.</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 Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)
	<p>Starting in fall 2017, ACT instituted a new set of approved supports for English learners taking the ACT including: written test directions translated in 12 languages, extended test time, use of approved word-to-word bilingual dictionary, and testing in a small group environment. These supports result in a college reportable score and would be available to Wisconsin students for the spring 2018 test administration.</p> <p>Evidence:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">ACTDLM004: ACT Policy for Supporting English Learners (previously submitted). Describes the policy for use of EL supports on the ACT.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">ACTDLM005: What You Need to Know About English Learner (EL) Supports for the ACT Test (previously submitted). Provides a quick overview of the four types of support, who is eligible, how to make a request, and so on.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">ACTDLM006: English Learner Supports Guide (previously submitted). Describes the supports available to ELs and how to request them.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">ACTDLM012: ACT-Approved Bilingual Word-to-Word Dictionaries (previously submitted). A list of bilingual dictionaries approved for use on the ACT. School staff can request permission to use dictionaries not included on this list.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">ACTDLM019: English Learner Supports for the ACT High School Assessments (previously submitted). Webpage that provides an overview of available supports and links to resources.</p> <p>Decision-making process</p> <p>Taking into consideration data on non-college reportable scores in previous years, and the information above regarding changes to ACT accommodations offerings for college reportable scores listed above, the WDPI Office of Student Assessment collaborated with WDPI legal, federal policy, and special education teams, WDPI cabinet, the Technical Advisory Committee, and ACT and made the collective decision to discontinue the use of non-college reportable scores on the ACT in Wisconsin.</p> <p>In addition, a plan was developed to ensure the accommodations needs of all students would be met while ensuring no student is denied a benefit of the test. More information can be found in the “Monitoring to ensure all students’ needs are met” section below.</p> <p>Evidence:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">ACTDLM046 WDPI TAC Minutes (previously submitted), page 4.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">ACTDLM077: NCR Accommodations Infographic.</p> <p>Notifying schools and districts</p> <p>Schools and districts were notified in July, 2017 that as a result of the new ESSA regulations and discussions with ACT and internally at WDPI, the decision was made to discontinue the use of non-college reportable accommodations on the ACT. The notification explained that starting with the spring 2018 statewide administration, non-college reportable ACT scores would not be given. Going forward, all students would test with standard conditions or ACT-approved accommodations.</p> <p>Ensuring all students could access state assessments using accommodations that are appropriate and result in a valid score remains a priority. Throughout the accommodations request process, WDPI works closely with schools and districts to offer training and technical</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 Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)
	<p>support. Mention of non-college reportable has been removed from all test administration portals and materials.</p> <p>The evidence provided is the weekly DAC Digest that announced this change for the first time to all school districts starting in July, 2017. This information was repeated in seven additional communications to District Assessment Coordinators, Special Education Directors, and school test coordinators throughout the summer and fall and again several times during the lead-up to testing in January and February 2018.</p> <p>Evidence: ACTDLM070: DAC Digest Equal Benefits. DAC Digest 7-26-17, pages 2-3.</p> <p>Monitoring to ensure all students' needs are met In order to ensure students are not being unfairly denied accommodations on the ACT, WDPI asks schools and districts to notify the Office of Student Assessment if accommodations requests for ELs or students with disabilities are denied through the ACT accommodations request process. Schools can view the decisions on accommodations requests by logging into ACT's Test Accessibility and Accommodations (TAA) System. ACT sends an email communication to the requestor when there is an accommodations decision to view in TAA.</p> <p>Evidence: ACTDLM078: DAC Digest 1-10-18, page 5. ACTDLM079: Email Update.</p> <p>WDPI regularly receives data extracts from the Test Accessibility and Accommodations (TAA) System. Data includes accommodations request information and decisions and these data are received throughout the test accommodations request window, which allows WDPI to review all accommodations requests before the deadline to submit requests. Receiving accommodations request data during this time allows WDPI to intervene while there is still time to approve accommodations requests.</p> <p>Evidence: ACTDLM018: ACT Accommodations Data File Layout (previously submitted). Data file layout for TAA extract.</p> <p>Follow up and intervention From the accommodations data extracted from ACT's Test Accessibility and Accommodations System (TAA) and notifications from schools and districts, in 2018 WDPI intervened in cases where students with disabilities or EL students were denied accommodations requests.</p> <p>One example is when a school district notified WDPI that EL accommodations requests were being denied because the ELL test wasn't given within the current school year. WDPI immediately contacted the accommodations department at ACT and had a phone call with the team to explain that in Wisconsin, the window for ACCESS for ELLs testing is December 4 – February 2 and schools do not receive student scores until April. Hence, all ACCESS test scores submitted to ACT for accommodations requests are from a previous academic year. Also, due to the transitory nature</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 Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)
	<p>of the EL population, the district submitting the request may not have the newest score.</p> <p>ACT responded quickly to this information, performed a query search of all accommodations requests denied for this reason in Wisconsin, and changed the accommodations denied for this reason to approved. Approvals were visible to the schools in the TAA portal and WDPI communicated to the schools and districts involved via email about the reversal in decisions.</p> <p>Evidence: ACTDLM082: Accommodations Intervention to ACT. ACTDLM083: Accommodations Intervention to LEA.</p> <p>Supports to districts Throughout the accommodations request process, WDPI monitors the data in the TAA accommodations requests data extracts to intervene if necessary in the case of denied accommodations requests for students with disabilities or English Learners.</p> <p>Schools and districts are instructed to contact WDPI about accommodations denials so that WDPI can intervene with ACT on behalf of the school and student. An example of an intervention that resulted in additional guidance for schools and districts is when WDPI and ACT worked together to write “Tips for editing ACT English learner supports requests for reconsideration in TAA” to provide guidance to schools and districts on submitting successful requests for ACT’s new EL supports.</p> <p>Evidence: ACTDLM078: DAC Digest 1-10-18, page 5. An example of one of several announcements to district assessment coordinators asking them to notify the Office of Student Assessment if an EL student or student with disabilities has an accommodation denied by ACT. ACTDLM081: Biweekly Email. January 18 email includes tips for editing English learner supports requests for reconsideration in TAA ACTDLM084: DAC Digest 1-17-18, page 6. Includes tips for editing English learner supports requests for reconsideration in TAA.</p>
ESSA Equal Benefits Provision Recommendation	
<p>Peers’ Notes for ACT on the ESSA Equal Benefits Provision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The information provided by WI indicated that the IEP team and/or WI DPI could not make accommodation decisions for students with special needs (e.g., students with disabilities, ELs, and ELs with disabilities); ACT would make the accommodations decisions. • The peers strongly suggested that ACT is not supposed to have the power to make accommodation decisions for students with special needs. • For accommodation decisions, IEP teams should address the special needs from the student characteristics perspective; while ACT should address the issue from the test construct perspective. In general, accommodations should be accepted if (a) the IEP team determines student needs for the accommodation; AND (b) ACT indicates that the accommodation would not undermine the construct targeted by the test. • A crosswalk should be developed to compare previous allowable accommodations with the current allowable accommodations on ACT. • Commonly used accommodations in the classroom may not all be feasible to be used under testing conditions. • The use of valid vs. invalid test scores in state assessment reporting based on types of accommodations could be an issue with the equal benefits provision from ESSA. Thus, WI and ACT’s movement away from flagging scores is positive. • Procedures should be developed to monitor the requests for accommodations and decision-making. 	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Wisconsin Resubmission July 2018

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