



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Jillian Balow
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Wyoming Department of Education
2300 Capitol Avenue
Hathaway Building, 2nd Floor
Cheyenne, WY 82002

December 2, 2016

Dear Superintendent Balow:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) 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. Therefore, as you know, the Department reinstated peer review of state assessment systems so that each State receives feedback from external experts on the assessments it is currently administering. We appreciate the efforts required to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in May 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 child'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.

On October 6, 2016, the Department sent a letter to chief State school officers outlining the outcomes for States related to the assessment peer review. I am writing to provide you feedback on your State's recent submission of evidence. External peer reviewers and Department staff evaluated Wyoming's submission and found, based on the evidence received, that the components of your assessment system meet some, but not all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (PAWS R/LA and Math 3-8): **Partially meets requirements.**
- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in high school (ACT R/LA and Math HS): **Partially 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.

- Reading/language arts and mathematics alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in grades 3-8 and high school (WyAlt R/ELA and Math): **Partially meets requirements.**
- Science general assessments in high school (ACT HS): **Partially meets requirements.**
- Science AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (WyAlt Science): **Partially meets requirements.**

The **partially meets requirements** designation for a component means that it does not meet a number of the requirements of the statute and regulations and Wyoming will need to provide substantial additional information to demonstrate it meets the requirements. The Department expects that Wyoming may not be able to submit all of the required information within one year.

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

The Department notes that Wyoming submitted a waiver request for assessing speaking and listening that was approved on August 5, 2016, for the 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 school years.

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

Thank you for your ongoing commitment to improving educational outcomes for all students. I look forward to our continued partnership as we move ahead with this critical work. I appreciate the work you are doing to improve your schools and provide a high-quality education for your students. If you have any questions, please contact Monika Kincheloe and David Lewis at: OSS.Wyoming@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Ary Amerikaner
Deputy Assistant Secretary
Delegated the Duties of Assistant Secretary
for Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Jessica Steinbrenner

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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
2.1 – Test Design and Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of item specification documents that specifically notes depth of knowledge (DOK levels) for PAWS. • Evidence that the PAWS mathematics assessment measures reasoning and problem solving skills across the subscale categories to support the claims made. • For all assessments in reading/language arts, evidence regarding how the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) plans to assess the full breadth of its reading/language arts standards, including writing, speaking and listening. [NOTE: Wyoming has received a speaking and listening waiver; therefore, the Department does not expect Wyoming to submit additional evidence regarding speaking and listening during the period of the waiver.] • Documentation of independent alignment studies between the State’s academic content standards and the State’s high school assessment, the ACT.
2.2 – Item Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of item-person distribution data for PAWS. • Evidence of item specifications for PAWS (same as in 2.1 above). • Evidence of specific item-writer training materials used for item development in PAWS and WyAlt.
2.3 – Test Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that PAWS test administration training is required for local educational agency (LEA) staff, as well as evidence documenting completion of such training (for PAWS and WyAlt) by LEA staff. • Evidence of State policies for test administration to address unexpected or irregular testing situations that may arise during course of test administration.
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation that clearly identifies or clarifies WDE’s role in the monitoring of the ACT test administration.
2.5 – Test Security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation outlining what remediation WDE requires following test security violations (for all assessments). • Documentation of security procedures for WyAlt. • Documentation of a test security agreement with ACT, including procedures ACT follows to report incidents to WDE. • Documentation of PAWS and WyAlt test security training, if it differs from the 2016 training evidence that was submitted.
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a specific data security agreement between WDE and ACT.
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of an independent alignment studies evaluating the test items to the State content standards for all assessments (PAWS, WyAlt, and ACT). • Documentation of PAWS calibration and scaling reports.
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation that all of the State’s assessments (PAWS, WyAlt, and ACT) measure the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
Processes	
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the reporting structures of the PAWS, WyAlt, and ACT are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards. Evidence for this critical element is typically confirmatory, but what is provided is procedural.
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyses that associate PAWS scores with other nationally recognized tests scores. Provide correlations among WyAlt content area scores.
4.1 – Reliability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that students from WDE were used in the WyAlt second-rater analysis. Evidence of WyAlt inter-rater reliability for reading/language arts and science.
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation on the accommodations that can be used for each assessment, grade, and subject areas (i.e., PAWS and ACT). A plan and timeline to include WDE teachers in WyAlt content and fairness review panels. Training materials given to ACT fairness review committees and item writers, including demographic information on these reviewers.
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of score interpretation comparability before and after the addition of “integration of knowledge and ideas” in the PAWS reading/language arts test in 2015.
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of training provided to teachers on accommodations for the PAWS and ACT. Documentation of parental notification of any possible consequences of taking the WyAlt. Documentation to clarify the relationship between WDE’s inclusion/accommodation policies and ACT’s.
5.2 – Procedures for including English Learners (ELs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of training for teachers on English learner accommodations for PAWS and ACT. Evidence that English learners receive appropriate accommodations related to their English proficiency based on their individual needs. Documentation of the process, including who is on the decision-making team, for determining accommodations for English learners. Evidence of a decision-making framework that schools use to make accommodations decisions.
5.3 – Accommodations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of the process for reviewing an exceptional accommodation request (PAWS, WyAlt, ACT).
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that WDE monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>each assessment administered;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; ○ Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s individualized educational program team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures (PAWS, WyAlt, ACT).
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of formal adoption of alternate academic achievement standards for all grades (for the WyAlt) and the academic achievement standards for high school (for the ACT).
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify how the WDE performance level descriptors (PLDs) for the ACT are connected to WDE’s content standards and to the interpretations of academic knowledge and skills.
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of alignment between the PLDs and academic content standards (for PAWS). • Documentation of the process by which PLDs were developed (for PAWS). • For the WyAlt, a plan and timeline to validate the AA-AAAS for use with WDE’s academic content standards. • For the WyAlt R/LA and mathematics in grades 3-8, evidence that State’s alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade level academic content standards, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A description of the process used to develop the alternate academic achievement standards that shows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The State’s grade-level academic content standards or grade-level extended academic content standards were used as a main reference in writing performance level descriptors for the alternate academic achievement standards OR; ▪ The process of setting cut scores used, as a main reference, performance level descriptors linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards OR; ▪ The AA-AAAS cut scores were set and performance level descriptors written to link to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards OR; ▪ A description of steps taken to vertically articulate the alternate academic achievement standards (including cut scores and performance level descriptors) across each grade.
6.4 – Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of the availability of PAWS, WyAlt, and ACT score reports in alternate formats (e.g., Braille, translations, etc.). • Documentation of the process and timeline for delivering individual score reports for PAWS, WyAlt, and ACT.

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

May 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

Note: Peer review notes provide the combined recommendations of the individual peers to the U.S. Department of Education (Department), based on the statute and regulations 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 WYOMING

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 (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 5
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 6
1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 7

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 8
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 8
2.2 – Item Development..... 11
2.3 – Test Administration 13
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)16
2.5 – Test Security 17
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 19

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 20
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 20
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 22
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 24
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables 25

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 26
4.1 – Reliability..... 26
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 28
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 30
4.4 – Scoring 31
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 32
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 33
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... 34

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 35
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 35
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 38
5.3 – Accommodations..... 40
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 42

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 43
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 43
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 45
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 47
6.4 – Reporting..... 49

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all subjects</p>	<p>Evidence is provided to show that academic content standards have been adopted (evidence #5 for ELA and math). Standards for science were previously approved.</p> <p>State submitted evidence of Board adoption of standards extensions during the on-site peer review by email.</p>
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all three subjects</p>	<p>State has provided evidence (#22-29 McRel studies) documenting gaps between previous WyCPS standards and CCSS, as well as crosswalks. A broad group of stakeholders was included in both the general standards (evidence #1) and the extensions (evidence #11-16 and #43-44).</p>
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.3 – Required Assessments</p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). 	<p>Evaluate for grade/subject combinations listed in left column</p>	<p>PAWS General assessment for ELA reading only, not writing, listening or speaking ACT Reading and writing, language, not listening or speaking WyAlt Uses grade band assessments to assess each grade level in ELA and Math</p>
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Grade band aa-aaas is appropriate for grade level AA-AAAS assessment in ELA and Mathematics 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment; ○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column-SWD and EL</p>	<p>Students who have been expelled by the public school system are not included in the state assessment program in addition to students who are in school out-of-state.</p> <p>The state offers exemptions (for the language arts assessment only) for ELLs who have been in US schools for less than 12 months or who take an alternative English language assessment (ACCESS for ELL).</p>
<p>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.5 – Participation Data</p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>	<p>Prompts for Reviewers: --data disaggregated by student group: ELA/Math/Science --Shows students tested and students enrolled for each breakout --for end-of-course HS, procedures to ensure each student is tested and counted in participation rate along with data --includes grade level tests and AA-AAAS</p>	<p>Tables shown (document #61) have the number of students tested and the percent participation. Thus the number of students enrolled is not explicitly stated but can be derived.</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> x </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>PAWS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of purposes and intended interpretations is sufficient (evidence #62, p. 10-11 and 18). • Test blueprints (#63-65) are sufficient, as are test construction documents (evidence #66). • Although the item specifications are described as containing DOK levels (evidence #62, p.40), the item specification documents were not provided. <p>Peers recognize that it is difficult to test higher-order skills and higher DOK levels in a MC format (required by the legislature). Please provide evidence that the PAWS math assessment measures reasoning and problem solving skills across the subscale categories. (This is stated but not substantiated, on p. 28 of evidence #62).</p> <p>Similarly, evidence #62 states, “the Wyoming language arts and performance standards include an expectation that all students will become effective readers, writers, listeners, and speakers” but only reading is assessed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State does not have any computer-adaptive assessments; all are paper and pencil. <p>ACT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although the technical documentation of the ACT is substantial, there is insufficient documentation of the alignment between the State’s academic content standards and the ACT. Also, the alignment studies were not independent (rather, they were done by

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>ACT) and no Wyoming teachers were involved.</p> <p>Specifically, evidence #76, p. 6: states: “this document will demonstrate strong overlap between the two entities, but they are inherently different.” ACT can help to determine college and career-readiness but there is nothing stated to help schools and districts address instructional or curricular deficiencies in order to help students <i>become</i> college and career-ready. Documentation provided also states, “states may use this as <u>part</u> of their statewide assessment.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACT test design and development is clearly discussed in evidence #77. • ACT is not computer-adaptive. <p>WyAlt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #59 addresses the purposes and intended uses. WyAlt has 5 performance levels whereas the PAWS has 4. Please clarify how the WyAlt performance levels are used compared to the PAWS performance levels. • Blueprint evidence in #68-70 is sufficient for grade bands but not for grade levels. • Evidence indicates that WyAlt is given in grade <u>bands</u> whereas the most recent guidance refers to grade <u>levels</u>. WDE should work with USED to address this issue. Is this something WDE is planning to address in the future? <p>WyAlt is the same alternate assessment used in Ohio. At the high school level, WyAlt is administered in Wyoming in grades 9-11 and in Ohio in grades 10-12. In science at the elementary level, there is also a</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		mismatch (Ohio assesses as grade 5 whereas Wyoming assesses at grade 4.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment is not computer-adaptive.
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u>x</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Rationale provided in comments above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please address why WDE has included a vertical scale (PAWS) and what it intends to accomplish by using such a scale/how it connects to the test’s stated purposes. • Provide item specification documents (with DOK levels) for PAWS. • Please provide evidence that the PAWS math assessment measures reasoning and problem solving skills across the subscale categories. (This is stated but not substantiated, on p. 28 of evidence #62). • Please provide evidence regarding how Wyoming plans to assess ELA standards in writing, speaking, and listening. • Please provide documentation of independent alignment studies between the State’s academic content standards and the ACT. • Please clarify how the WyAlt performance levels are used compared to the PAWS performance levels (e.g., since there are 5 levels in one and 4 in the other). • WDE should consult with USED regarding the viability of a grade-banded alternate assessment. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.2 – Item Development</p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>Although the criteria for item development are alluded to (evidence #62), specific item writer/reviewer training materials from the vendor were not provided (although they are summarized on p. 90-91).</p> <p>PAWS Item-person distribution data is not provided.</p> <p>Webb’s DOK is mentioned, but it is difficult to assess its application without item specifications.</p> <p>Item writer criteria listed on p. 41-42 (evidence #62) are very limited and basic. Furthermore, criteria for panel selection do not mention variables such as race, gender, culture, or language background. Evidence #158 also shows that bias reviewers are not representative of the state’s demographics in terms of race/ethnicity and do not represent the full range of grade levels (they had predominantly elementary level experience).</p> <p>ACT The item development process is clearly described in evidence #77 and 89-97.</p> <p>WyAlt It is advisable for states to share resources, as Wyoming and Ohio have done, but it is concerning that Wyoming teachers were not involved in any bias review of items for this assessment, nor were they involved in standard-setting.</p>
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>Rationale is provided in the above notes. <u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Item-person distribution data for PAWS. • Item specifications for PAWS (same as in 2.1 above). • Specific training materials used for item development in PAWS and WyAlt. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>PAWS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #98 specifies that test administration training is required for the WyAlt but it does not specifically indicate that it is required for PAWS. Please provide evidence that PAWS training is required. <p>Accommodations are listed in evidence #104, which is from 2006. To what extent does WDE believe that this list of accommodations reflects the breadth of current assistive technology accommodations?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Q&A portion in the video in evidence #100 gave peers pause about consistency issues between written policies (e.g, evidence #48, p. 23 “allowable resource guidelines” indicates that word walls are allowable if they are a part of routine instruction but the ETS representative in the video indicated that no word walls were allowable.) Also, the training videos could benefit from a heavier focus on the content of the Directions for Test Administration (evidence #49) and state policy and procedures. • There are no technology-based assessments. <p>ACT</p> <p>The ACT test administration manual is referenced as evidence #106 but evidence #106 is actually a TOMS video and peers could not locate the ACT test administration manual among the documentation submitted. However, we were able to download a copy from WDE’s website.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thorough and consistent test administration information is provided in the Test Administration Manual. More information could be provided about the process by which test accommodations are requested and the documentation needed for accommodations to be granted. • WDE does not appear to have its own procedures for the administration of ACT. Peers recommend that WDE develop such procedures of its own for this assessment. • There are no technology-based assessments. <p>WyAlt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training materials for administrators are extremely thorough and detailed and provide both models and opportunities for attendees to practice scoring tasks (evidence #104). The level of detail is something that WDE might want to consider for its PAWS test administration training. <p>Allowable accommodations for the WyAlt are clear and well-documented (evidence #58).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #98 specifies that test administration training is required for the WyAlt. • There is no technology-based assessment in WyAlt.
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
<p>Rationale provided in comments above.</p> <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence that PAWS test administration training is required, as well as evidence documenting completion of such training (for PAWS and WyAlt). • Include state policies on test administration and FAQs addressing “what-if” scenarios in training, which seem to be under-emphasized in the training materials provided as documentation. State may want to consider revising PAWS training materials to focus more on policy and less on materials handling considerations. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p>_____ policies and procedures apply to all grade-level and AA-AAAS in all subjects</p>	<p>Note that the training presentation has quite a few gaps for individual administration procedures of the assessments for grades 3-8.</p> <p>There is evidence provided for a monitoring plan of test administration in schools by WDE (evidence #107 and 108). A suggestion is that perhaps this plan be modified to include ‘unannounced visits’ of schools during test administration window. Also, suggestions were made by peers in other sections (5.4) that might be used to enhance the monitoring of test administration in Wyoming by WDE.</p> <p>The <i>ACT Test Administration Manual: State and District Testing (2015)</i> –was found online and used to inform evidence for this section, as well as the previous section—the index identified it as evidence #106, but this was actually a TOMS training video for the PAWS program.</p> <p>For the ACT, there did not seem to be any WDE sourced evidence for test administration training or test monitoring (beyond the observation plan for all schools). The ACT Test Admin Manual lays out clear test administration procedures, but there is no clear linkage or alignment to WDE “ownership” of the test administration in terms of separate training requirements (based on evidence submitted). This would seem to have a direct impact on WDE’s ability to use monitoring to ensure an appropriate standardized test administration.</p>
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please provide documentation that clearly identifies or clarifies WDE’s role in the monitoring of the ACT test administration. If the test monitoring outlined in evidence is generic to all tests, please specify this. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p>	<p>Overall, it appears that the first responders to test security issues are outside vendors (ETS, ACT) rather than WDE. Peers believe that this approach might represent a conflict of interest that could leave the state vulnerable regarding test security.</p> <p>PAWS It is unclear what remediation is required following test security incidents. Documentation should be provided to this effect. Also, in evidence #112, it is clear that WDE does not require districts to take any specific action once irregularities are detected.</p> <p>WyAlt It is unclear what remediation is required following test security incidents. Documentation should be provided to this effect.</p> <p>Evidence #109 shows a test security flowchart that lists ETS as the first point of contact for security irregularities. Is there a similar flow chart for the WyAlt?</p> <p>Evidence #110 provides a detailed webinar training for the PAWS and WyAlt, but this is dated 2016. Was a similar training done in 2015?</p> <p>ACT There is ample detailed information in the ACT Test Administration Manual about test security procedures.</p> <p>In evidence #113 (p. 2) ACT indicates that it does not conduct any random reviews of test scores. This seems inconsistent with the security policies for the other assessments, which do analyze WtR erasures</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>and similar unusual gains.</p> <p>It is also unclear whether and how ACT informs WDE of any test irregularities it finds, given that evidence #113 indicates that ACT does not release such information to third parties.</p> <p>Evidence #114 (ACT terms and conditions) lists an exception for South Carolina but not for Wyoming. Is there a specific agreement between WDE and ACT that addresses test security?</p>
Section 2.5 Summary Statement		
<p>See rationale in the notes above.</p> <p><u>x</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation should be provided outlining what remediation WDE requires following test security violations (for all assessments). • A flow chart of security procedures for WyAlt should be provided. • Provide documentation of test security agreement with ACT, including procedures ACT follows to report incidents to WDE. • Provide 2015 PAWS and WyAlt test security training, if it differs from the 2016 training evidence that was submitted. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #115 documents data security in Wyoming statutes. Peers noted that WDE also has contracts with ETS (PAWS) and AIR (WyAlt) specifically mentioning data security, including FERPA. Is there an addendum to the WDE contract with ACT that reflects a similar data security agreement? <p>The data verification form (evidence #121-122) is a strong method of ensuring data integrity and quality.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peers found the definition of the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting in the header in evidence #221: “To protect individual student confidentiality, results are not reported for 5 or fewer students and performance percentages are capped at 5% and 95%.” Peers are concerned that having such a small <i>n</i> size could allow the data to be identifiable. One possibility that WDE could consider would be increasing the range of the smallest bin (e.g., making 6-9 become 6-20). Most states use a higher minimum cell size.
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See rationale provided in notes above.</p> <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence of a specific data security agreement between WDE and ACT, as you have provided with AIR and ETS. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>Independent studies (not conducted by the vendor) aligning test <u>items</u> to state standards are needed for all assessments (PAWS, WyAlt, and ACT).</p> <p>PAWS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have any studies of the vertical scale been conducted (i.e., what does a score of 550 mean at grade 3 vs. grade 8?). Evidence #62 references PAWS Calibration and Scaling Reports but peers could not find those in the documents. Please provide. <p>WyAlt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As indicated above, alignment studies are needed between WyAlt items and WDE extensions. The graphs on p. 17 and 18 (evidence #59) indicate that in future iterations the test needs to be able to discriminate among examinees at a wider range of abilities. This is problematic across the board but more so in ELA. This could be the result of the student population who participated in the WyAlt that year or the difficulty of the instrument itself. <p>ACT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation provided in evidence #75 and 76 shows that alignment between CCSS and ACT <u>assessment frameworks</u> has been evaluated (albeit by ACT itself). This method identified partial alignment with notable gaps. However, no Wyoming stakeholders were involved in the alignment study.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>ACT has provided a great deal of relevant documentation supporting the validity of the test for its intended use, to predict college readiness. This addresses part, but not all, of WDE's use of the assessment. (It is a norm-referenced, rather than a criterion-referenced assessment, and it appears that WDE is using a norm-referenced test to do the job of a criterion-referenced test.)</p> <p>It appears as though evidence #130 is incomplete. Is there a later version with state evidence that could be submitted?</p>
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See rationale provided in notes above.</p> <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide results of independent studies (not conducted by the vendor) aligning test <u>items</u> to state standards for all assessments (PAWS, WyAlt, and ACT). Wyoming teachers should be included in all such alignment studies. • Provide PAWS Calibration and Scaling Reports. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>PAWS</p> <p>Peers need test item specifications and alignment information in order to be able to determine the adequacy of processes used.</p> <p>Evidence #62, p. 40 states, “All items were written to measure specific content standards at a variety of specified levels of cognitive complexity as developed from Webb’s Depth of Knowledge levels.” Further documentation of this is needed.</p> <p>Cognitive labs (evidence #133 and 134) did not provide sufficient evidence of the items’ cognitive demands. Although cog labs can be small and valid, they need to include a representative sample of students (in terms of gender, race, location in the state, etc.) and this did not appear to be the case. Furthermore, the method used to conduct the cog labs was not sensitive enough to gather appropriate information about how students arrived at their answers (i.e., there were no think-alouds but rather limited follow-up questions after students had answered test items.)</p> <p>WyAlt</p> <p>Given that no alignment/linkage documentation is provided, it is difficult to determine whether the intended cognitive processes are represented. The cited evidence (evidence #59, p. 21-26) speaks only to the process used to assess item characteristics in terms of difficulty. This does not address specific cognitive processes, nor does it address the “as represented in the State’s academic content standards” requirement.</p> <p>ACT</p> <p>The cited evidence (evidence #77) provides support</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		for the difficulty of the test but not for the cognitive complexity or processes students need to rely on to answer test items.
Section 3.2 Summary Statement		
<p>See rationale provided in notes above.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Once WDE provides test item specifications and alignment evidence for all assessments, it should pursue documentation of evidence for this critical element. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>Please provide evidence that the reporting structures of the PAWS, WyAlt, and ACT are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards. Evidence for this critical element is typically confirmatory, but what is provided is in fact procedural. Confirmatory evidence needs to be gathered/reported.</p> <p>PAWS The evidence cited (evidence #62, p. 13-16, 79-85, 90-94) does not respond to the critical element. Peers recommend that WDE provide documentation of the relationship among the domains (e.g., through a crosswalk and/or CFA).</p> <p>WyAlt The evidence cited (evidence #59, p. 28-44) does not respond to the critical element. Looking at the sample interpretive guide (evidence #165) it appears that subscores are not reported. Is this the case? If so, no additional evidence is needed. If not, validity evidence of the subdomains would be required.</p> <p>ACT The cited evidence is not responsive to this critical element. What is provided is merely content specifications.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See rationale provided in notes above.</p> <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide evidence that the reporting structures of the PAWS, WyAlt, and ACT are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards. Evidence for this critical element is typically confirmatory, but what is provided is procedural. Confirmatory evidence needs to be gathered/reported. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>PAWS Evidence #62 cites subscore correlations and evidences #138, 141, and 142 show results of linking PAWS scores to MAP scores from the districts where MAP was given. Peers could not find an <i>n</i> size listed in the MAP linking documentation. Please provide demographic data about the sample that participated in MAP. This would give us a sense of the distribution/representativeness of the sample.</p> <p>WDE has the lexile and quantile scores, which are reported on the standard PAWS score report (evidence #163). The State also has NAEP data, and peers ask that WDE pursue analyses that associate PAWS scores with NAEP scores and we recommend that they associate PAWS scores with lexile and quantile scores.</p> <p>WyAlt Peers did not find the cited evidence (#59, p. 28-34) to contain documentation of relationships between scores on the alternate assessment and other variables. At a minimum, please provide correlations among WyAlt content area scores. WDE may also consider a study to connect attainment of IEP goals and objectives to proficiency.</p> <p>ACT There is substantive documentation of the relationship between ACT scores, high school GPA, first year college GPA, high school coursework patterns, and school characteristics.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See rationale provided in notes above. <u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide demographic data about the sample that participated in the MAP-PAWS equipercentile linking study referenced in evidences #141-142. • Pursue analyses that associate PAWS scores with NAEP scores. • Provide correlations among WyAlt content area scores. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>PAWS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability for PAWS is documented in evidence #62. • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement are reported in evidence #62. • The technical manual (evidence #62) reports consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels for PAWS. • Tests are not computer-adaptive. <p>WyAlt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #59 (p.42-43) cites an <i>n</i> size of over 3,000. Please clarify who these students were (since <i>n</i> sizes suggest the data is either Ohio data or combined Ohio and Wyoming data). <p>Please provide interrater reliability evidence for ELA and science. (What is provided in the second-rater analysis is just for math.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall and CSEM are provided in evidence #59. • Evidence #59 provides documentation of consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions. • Tests are not computer-adaptive. <p>ACT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability evidence for ACT is provided over six administrations (evidence #77). • Overall and CSEM are provided in evidence #77. • Evidence #154 provides documentation of consistency and accuracy of estimates in

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		categorical classification decisions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACT used in Wyoming is paper and pencil, rather than computer-adaptive.
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
See rationale provided in notes above. <u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please clarify who the students in the WyAlt second-rater analysis cited on p. 42-43 (evidence #59) were (since <i>n</i> sizes suggest the data is either Ohio data or combined Ohio and Wyoming data). If none of the students were from Wyoming, WDE needs to provide a comparable analysis including Wyoming students and raters. • Please provide WyAlt interrater reliability evidence for ELA and science. (What is provided in the second-rater analysis is just for math.) 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>PAWS</p> <p>Technical report does not include a plan to include SPED or ESL/Title I teachers in item, data, or bias reviews. Provide a plan that would include these groups.</p> <p>Evidence #158 demonstrates that there is an underrepresentation of certain content area experts on the panels (i.e., no high school teachers, only 1 ESL/title I teacher and 1 SPED teacher).</p> <p>Evidence #104 (accommodations manual) does not list accommodations by test or by subject area; all accommodations guidance is combined, which may lead to misinterpretation. Provide a chart showing which accommodations can be used on which tests/subject areas.</p> <p>WyAlt</p> <p>The technical manual for the PAWS (evidence #62) lists contradictory information about who can participate in the WyAlt. Page 5, section 1.5.1, in the second paragraph states that section 504 students take the PAWS. Later, the third paragraph states, “However, students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are assessed using the Wy-ALT under the provisions of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act or Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act.” This last sentence should be removed.</p> <p>Content and fairness review information (evidences #160-161) comes from committees in Ohio. No information is provided about the demographics of the participants but Wyoming teachers were not involved in any phase of test or item development. Provide a plan to include Wyoming teachers in these panels in the future.</p> <p>WDE does not have sufficient <i>n</i> sizes on the alternate</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>assessment to generate reliable DIF analyses using the MH approach. Similar, more reliable, information might be obtained through descriptive statistics.</p> <p>ACT As noted in the WDE submission, ACT does not identify students as IEP or EL and therefore cannot provide DIF analyses based on these categories.</p> <p>DIF analyses that are provided in evidence #137 are from South Carolina data, so it is unclear to what extent this applies to Wyoming.</p> <p>Please provide the training materials given to fairness review committees and item writers and provide demographic information for participants. What is provided in evidence #89, for instance, is too general: “Create items that are accessible to all students, including those needing special accommodations.” There is no detail about how this is done or how the success of the process is judged. Furthermore, the criteria indicated are for item development and it is unclear whether these are the same used for item review.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See rationale provided in notes above.</p> <p><u>x</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a plan to include a greater percentage of SPED, EL, and high school teachers in PAWS item, data, and bias reviews. • Provide a chart showing which accommodations can be used on which tests/subject areas. • Provide a plan to include Wyoming teachers in WyAlt content and fairness review panels. • Please provide the training materials given to ACT fairness review committees and item writers and provide demographic information on those people as well. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>PAWS Evidence #62 reports SEMs that demonstrate that students scored across the continuum.</p> <p>WyAlt Evidence #59 presents CSEMs in graphical form to visually capture the range of performances.</p> <p>ACT Evidence #77 provides difficulty distribution and mean discrimination indices.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>PAWS All items are machine-scored, dichotomous MC items.</p> <p>Evidence #163 (PAWS interpretation guide for teachers) reports subscores, many of which are based on very few items and could lead to misinterpretation. Peers concur with WDE TAC advice (evidence #171) to discontinue reporting scaled subscores.</p> <p>WyAlt WyAlt is hand-scored in a double rater model and training materials provided are detailed and clear. Interrater reliability rates for second raters (for math) are high (evidence #59). Similar evidence should be provided for ELA and science (as requested in the summary statement for section 4.1).</p> <p>ACT Sufficient evidence was provided to document reliable, valid scoring (evidence #77). Score interpretations for WDE’s uses are not sufficiently supported by ACT’s evidence. See notes in section 3.1 above.</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>PAWS Only one operational form is used each year. A score category (“integration of knowledge and ideas”) was added in 2015 to the ELA test, causing a rearrangement of items in other categories. How did WDE ensure that the score interpretations stayed the same after this change? Was there a standards validation study? There was a decrease from 2014 to 2015 in percent of students categorized as proficient by the assessment. Was this change to the test considered as a possible explanation for this finding?</p> <p>WyAlt Test results from year to year are linked to a common scale. Evidence provided is responsive to this critical element (evidence #59).</p> <p>ACT Evidence provided about test construction (evidence #135) and about equating procedures (evidence #77, 169) demonstrates comparability of forms across years.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide evidence of score interpretation comparability before and after the addition of “integration of knowledge and ideas” in the PAWS ELA test in 2015. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>PAWS N/A</p> <p>WyAlt N/A</p> <p>ACT Evidence cited by WDE to address this critical element (evidence #170) is not relevant because all ACT administration in Wyoming is paper-and-pencil. However, peers found evidence elsewhere (in the technical manual (evidence #77) to support the comparability of multiple forms within and across years.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>WDE has a TAC that meets regularly to review and analyze assessment data for the PAWS and WyAlt (as documented in evidences #171-179).</p> <p>PAWS Ongoing research on the vertical scale is recommended if the state is committed to using one going forward (e.g., unidimensionality, articulation across grade levels). Peers wondered what the purpose of the vertical scale is, given that growth is not a stated purpose of the assessment system.</p> <p>WyAlt Peers noted that the design of the WyAlt always puts the field-test task last. WDE might want to consider this decision and the impact it might have on the test.</p> <p>ACT ACT has a TAC (documented in evidence #180) that meets regularly.</p>
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>x No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS</p>	<p>Peers could not locate evidence of training for teachers on accommodations for PAWS and ACT. Please provide relevant documentation.</p> <p>PAWS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A • Evidences #50 and 104 document the decision-making procedure regarding assessment for students with IEPs. • Evidences #50 and 104 document the decision-making procedure regarding which assessment students with IEPs take, whether they receive accommodations, and which accommodations they should receive. • Evidence #49 and 104 provide documentation of accessibility tools and accommodations available. • A main purpose of #104 is to guide the selection of appropriate accommodations. • N/A • N/A • N/A <p>WyAlt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidences #60 and 181-183 explain differences between PAWS and WyAlt. • Evidence #60 (participation criteria) addresses this issue. • Evidences #50 and 104 document the decision-making procedure regarding which assessment students with IEPs take, whether they receive accommodations, and which accommodations they should receive.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA; • Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments); • The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #58 and 104 provide documentation of accessibility tools and accommodations available. • Evidence #104 provides documentation of appropriate accommodations. • Evidence #60 lists participation criteria. • Parents are informed that their children’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards (evidences #181 and #183). However, peers could not locate documentation of parental notification of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments. Please provide or add an FAQ to this effect to evidence #183. • Peers could not locate evidence documenting procedures to ensure that students using alternate achievement standards promote access to the general curriculum. As mentioned above, peers require alignment evidence and item specs in order to assess the extent to which the AAAAS promote access to the general education curriculum. <p>The State could also undertake a consequential validity study to address this requirement.</p> <p>ACT Although evidence #184 provides a list of accommodations available, clear information about how those are requested or selected and what WDE’s role is in the process are not provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A • The State statutes (evidence #181) provide some documentation to this effect but it is unclear to what extent ACT’s policies are

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>aligned to WDE's policies and statutes. Please provide relevant documentation to clarify.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accommodations are addressed in evidence #184 and 185. • Accommodations are addressed in evidence #184 and 185. • No evidence is provided to substantiate that WDE plays a role in the selection of accommodations for students taking the ACT. • N/A • N/A • N/A
<p>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See rationale provided in notes above.</p> <p><u>x</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide documentation of training provided to teachers on accommodations for the PAWS and ACT. • Provide documentation of parental notification of any possible consequences of taking the WyAlt. • Provide documentation to clarify the relationship between WDE's inclusion/accommodation policies and ACT's. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS</p>	<p>Peers could not locate evidence of training for teachers on EL accommodations for PAWS and ACT. Please provide relevant documentation.</p> <p>PAWS/WyAlt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WDE administers the W-APT screener (evidence #189) and students scoring 5.0 or less are labeled EL; students scoring above that are not labeled EL. <p>Evidence #56 (p. 4) provides a group of accommodations that ELs are eligible to receive. It is also not clear whether all ELs receive accommodations. Please clarify.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information on assessment accommodations available for ELs is provided in the evidence cited. • It is not clear, however, what individual characteristics guide the selection of particular accommodations in the list. Guidance on p. 1 of evidence #56 indicates that schools determine and document the accommodations but it is not clear what the process is and who is on the decision-making team. Provide a decision-making framework that schools use. <p>ACT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACT policy (evidence #186, p. 15) states, “ Any ESL or ELL examinees that have an accommodation plan based solely on language proficiency are not eligible for ACT-approved accommodations. Therefore, these examinees should test with non-college reportable accommodations.” This is inconsistent with WDE’s policy for ELs on

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>PAWS and WyAlt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information is provided in evidence #186. • Guidance is provided in evidence #186, but if ELs receive accommodations based solely on language proficiency, their scores are not college-reportable. This seems problematic.

Section 5.2 Summary Statement
<p>See rationale provided in notes above.</p> <p><u>x</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence of training for teachers on EL accommodations for PAWS and ACT. • Clarify whether ELs receive all available accommodations related to their English proficiency as a bundle or in an individualized manner. • Guidance on p. 1 of evidence #56 indicates that schools determine and document the accommodations but it is not clear what the process is and who is on the decision-making team. Provide a decision-making framework that schools use to make these decisions.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p>	<p>WDE provides all statewide assessment accommodations in one list (evidence #104), which could bring about implementation confusion. See note in section 4.2.</p> <p>PAWS/WyAlt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidences #56 and 104 document appropriate accommodations for SWD and students covered by Section 504. • Documentation indicates a suite of appropriate accommodations that may be used for ELs (evidence #56 and 104). • WDE provided information about the scores of accommodated vs. unaccommodated students on each test (Appendix K, evidence #62). We recommend that WDE go one step further and report mean scores and SDs for students by the specific accommodation received. • Although no procedure is outlined to explain how exceptional requests for accommodations beyond those routinely allowed are handled, peers located a sentence in evidence #48 (p. 5) that speaks to this: “For questions regarding appeals, accommodations, and special forms, please contact the Wyoming Department of Education at xxx.” Please provide information about what happens once contact is made with WDE and how those accommodations decisions are made. <p>ACT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidences #190 and 191 document the availability of accommodations for SWD and section 504 students. • See comments in section 5.2

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peers could not locate evidence addressing this critical element. Since ACT does not report accommodations categories, it is unlikely for ACT to be able to address this element, unless WDE connects and links the data. ACT’s procedure for providing accommodations to students typically appears to result in a non-college reportable score. This provides access but not meaningful interpretation of results or comparison of scores and is problematic. Peers also noted that the process for requesting ACT accommodations appears so resource-intensive (evidence #190), it could represent a barrier to access. Peers recommend that WDE research the impact on schools and students.
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<p>See rationale provided in notes above.</p> <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please provide information about what happens once an exceptional accommodation request is made to WDE and how such accommodations decisions are made. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p>	<p>Peers could not find documentation of <u>monitoring</u> of accommodation provision. This could be embedded into WDE’s existing site visit monitoring structure. Please provide evidence that addresses the five points of this critical element for all elements in the testing program. (Peers noted that in some states this service is provided by Offices of Special Education and might be available from that office.)</p>
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See rationale provided in notes above. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide evidence that addresses the five bullet points of this critical element for all elements of the testing program. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>PAWS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wyoming has adopted academic achievement standards in the required grades and content areas (evidence #17). • Test results for PAWS (evidence #196) demonstrate high participation rates in the general assessment, which is based on grade-level academic achievement standards. • Evidence is provided for (a), (b), and (c). <p>WyAlt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence provided in the technical manual (evidence #59, p. 15) states that ODE recommended performance standards for the alternate. We could not locate evidence that Wyoming’s SBE adopted them. • Test results for WyAlt (reported in evidence #59) demonstrates participation rates in the alternate assessment, which is based on alternate academic achievement standards. These rates are consistent with only students with the most significant cognitive disabilities taking this test. • Evidence is provided for (a), (b), and (c) [evidence #202 and #59]. <p>ACT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peers could not locate evidence of formal adoption by WDE of ACT achievement levels. Please provide. • WDE reports ACT performance by level; however, the performance is connected not to grade-level academic achievement standards but to ACT benchmarks. • Evidence is provided for (a), (b), and (c) [evidence #205-207].

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 6.1 Summary Statement		
<p>See rationale provided in notes above.</p> <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide documentation of formal adoption of AAAAS (for the WyAlt) and AAS (for the ACT). 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>PAWS had four levels (advanced, proficient, basic, below basic) whereas the WyAlt has five levels. This indicates a lack of system cohesion.</p> <p>PAWS The Bookmark method of standard setting employed is generally defensible except that there is no vertical articulation of cut scores. Please elaborate on why WDE has included a vertical scale and what it intends to accomplish. If WDE intends to model growth, this is essential (and is unclear from the evidence provided.) The stated purpose of the PAWS does not include growth and some inconsistencies were found in the documentation provided. Evidence #229 discusses growth in terms of student growth percentiles, yet the test design is described as being on a vertical scale. This, too, indicates a lack of system cohesion.</p> <p>Demographic data on the standard-setting panelists (evidence #194, Appendix C) indicates that it was not broadly representative either in terms of EL or special education expertise.</p> <p>WyAlt The alternate assessment is grade-<u>banded</u> whereas the requirements and other assessments in the system refer to grade <u>levels</u>.</p> <p>The ID matching method employed was defensible with the exception of how PLDs were handled (panelists were presented with final, rather than draft, PLDs and could not make changes). Panelists for standard setting had a broader range of backgrounds and expertise than in the PAWS standard setting and there was good representation of teachers who had experience working with the target student population (evidence #200).</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>However, evidence #200 also indicates that the standard setting was conducted in Ohio with Ohio panelists. Wyoming educators were not involved in the process.</p> <p>ACT Although standard setting followed an appropriate method given that the ACT is a norm-referenced test that is predictive of college and career readiness, it is not a content-based assessment of student achievement.</p> <p>Panelists had a range of backgrounds and expertise, as demonstrated on p. 7 of evidence #210.</p> <p>Peers wondered how the PLDs listed in evidences #204-207 are connected to grade-level Wyoming content standards and to the interpretations of academic knowledge and skills. Please clarify.</p>
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See rationale provided in notes above.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify how the ACT PLDs listed in evidences #204-207 are connected to grade-level Wyoming content standards and to the interpretations of academic knowledge and skills. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>PAWS There is no evidence of alignment between the PLDs and academic standards.</p> <p>Peers located the target student definitions in Appendix D (evidence #194) and we understand that they were developed from the PLDs. We found the PLDs on the WDE website during the review. Although the webpage indicates that “Committees comprised of Wyoming teachers developed the PLDs for PAWS during the standard-setting processes” we could not locate more specific documentation. Please provide documentation of the process by which PLDs were developed.</p> <p>Peers noticed that the PAWS scale cut scores (evidence #194, p. 17) do not advance incrementally. This makes interpretation of test scores difficult and confusing for both teachers and parents, particularly since it appears that WDE intended to build a vertical scale.</p> <p>WyAlt PLDs provided in evidence #200 (Appendix A) reflect the range of performance on Wyoming’s academic content standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities.</p> <p>PLDs reflect different content across grades but there is no documentation of linkage to different content across grades.</p> <p>According to evidence #200, it appears that panelists in standard-setting (who were Ohio teachers, not Wyoming educators) were not asked to judge to what extent the PLDs reflect the highest achievement standards possible for this population of students. It is therefore difficult to determine to what extent this aspect of the critical element is met. Peers</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>recommend that WDE convene a similar panel of Wyoming educators to validate their cut scores and PLDs. Please provide a validation plan for WDE's AAAS.</p> <p>Some evidence was provided (evidence #71 and 72) of the alignment between items and achievement level descriptors (which are grade-leveled). Given that the test is scored in grade bands, it is unclear how this was done and it is a system cohesion issue. Please clarify which PLDs (those in Appendix A, evidence #200 or those in evidence #71-72) WDE plans to use in the validation plan requested above.</p> <p>ACT While the cut scores are likely to be predictive of college readiness, insufficient alignment evidence was submitted. Refer to notes in section 6.2.</p>

Section 6.3 Summary Statement
<p>See rationale provided in notes above.</p> <p><u>x</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence of alignment between the PLDs and academic standards (for PAWS). • Provide documentation of the process by which PLDs were developed (for PAWS). • Please provide a validation plan for WDE's AAAS.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>PAWS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #221-228 demonstrates that the state reports to the public the percentage of students tested and not tested as well as the percentages of student subgroups in each performance level. • Evidence #229 (from WDE’s website) references SGPs even though the ISR does not report them. It adds to the confusion created around how WDE is addressing student growth, which is not mentioned in the interpretive guide for teachers (evidence #230). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Score report in evidence #230 demonstrates that valid, reliable information regarding student achievement at the subject level is reported. However, peers have concerns about the reliability and potential for misinterpretation of the scaled scores for the domains in each subject area. ○ Score report in evidence #230 reports student achievement in terms of State grade-level academic achievement standards including PLDs. ○ Score reports provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students. ○ Peers could not locate evidence of the availability of PAWS score reports in alternate formats. Please provide such documentation. • Apart from WDE’s narrative on p. 54-55 of the index, peers could not locate

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 		<p>documentation of the process and timeline for delivering individual student reports. Please provide such documentation.</p> <p>WyAlt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence #221-228 demonstrates that the state reports to the public the percentage of students tested and not tested as well as the percentages of student subgroups in each performance level. Evidence #165 (Wyoming alternate assessment family reports interpretive guide) not only meets the reporting requirements but is also comprehensive, clear, and compelling for parents. Again, however, growth is not mentioned in the report, inconsistent with the information listed on WDE’s website in evidence #229. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Score report in evidence #165 demonstrates that valid, reliable information regarding student achievement is reported. Score report in evidence #165 reports student achievement in terms of State grade-level academic achievement standards including PLDs. Peers note that the PLDs used are very limited and it would be more useful for interpretation if they substituted the more complete PLDs from evidence #200 (Appendix A) in place of these. Score reports provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students. Peers could not locate evidence of

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p style="text-align: right;">the availability of WyAlt score reports in alternate formats. Please provide such documentation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from WDE’s narrative on p. 54-55 of the index, peers could not locate documentation of the process and timeline for delivering individual student reports. Please provide such documentation. <p>ACT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #221-228 demonstrates that the state reports to the public the percentage of students tested and not tested as well as the percentages of student subgroups in each performance level. • ACT score reports in evidence #231 and 232 do not address the specific academic needs of students. Evidence #78 is an interpretive guide and although it supports some appropriate score uses, it does not represent knowledge of WDE’s standards. It furthermore provides no information about the extent to which students have mastered WDE’s content standards which could be used to support instruction. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Score reports in evidence #231 and 232 demonstrate that valid, reliable information regarding student achievement is reported. ○ ACT score reports in evidence #231 and 232 do <u>not</u> report student achievement in terms of grade-level academic achievement standards and do <u>not</u> include PLDs. ○ Score reports provide information to help parents, teachers, and

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR WYOMING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>principals interpret the test results but do <u>not</u> address the specific academic needs of students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Peers could not locate evidence of the availability of ACT score reports in alternate formats or process by which they would be requested. Please provide such documentation. • Apart from WDE’s narrative on p. 54-55 of the index, peers could not locate documentation of the process and timeline for delivering individual student reports. Please provide such documentation.
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<p>See rationale provided in notes above.</p> <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide documentation of the availability of PAWS, WyAlt, and ACT score reports in alternate formats (e.g., Braille, translations, etc.) • Provide documentation of the process and timeline for delivering individual score reports for PAWS, WyAlt, and ACT. 		