

Standards and Assessments Peer Review Guidance: Information and Examples for Meeting Requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

(Revised December 21, 2007 to include modified academic achievement standards)

Critical Element	Examples of Acceptable Evidence	Examples of Incomplete Evidence
<p>4.3 Has the State ensured that its assessment system is fair and accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and students with limited English proficiency, with respect to each of the following issues:</p> <p>(a) Has the State ensured that the assessments provide an appropriate variety of accommodations for students with disabilities? <i>and</i></p> <p>(b) Has the State ensured that the assessments provide an appropriate variety of linguistic accommodations for students with limited English proficiency? <i>and</i></p> <p>(c) Has the State taken steps to ensure fairness in the development of the assessments? <i>and</i></p> <p>(d) Does the use of accommodations and/or alternate assessments yield meaningful scores?</p>	<p>The State has taken appropriate judgmental (e.g., committee review) and data-based (e.g., bias studies) steps to ensure that its assessment system is fair and accessible to all students. Review committees have included representation of identified subgroups.</p> <p>The State assessment system has been must be designed to be valid and accessible for use by the widest possible range of students.</p> <p>The State is conducting studies to determine the appropriateness of accommodations and the impact on test scores.</p> <p>Possible Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing written documents describe how the principles of universal design and/or appropriate language simplification were incorporated into each of the State’s assessments. • Evidence that students with disabilities were included in the test development process. • Existing written documentation of the State’s policies and procedures for the selection and use of accommodations and alternate assessments, including evidence of training for educators who administer these assessments. 	<p>The State has conducted data-based bias studies but has not convened committees of stakeholders to review its assessment items.</p> <p>The State has convened committees of stakeholders to review its assessment items but these committees have not included representation of identified subgroups.</p> <p>The State assessment system is not designed to be valid and accessible for use by the widest possible range of students.</p> <p>The State does not have a policy on the appropriate selection and use of accommodations and alternate assessments.</p> <p>The State does not train or monitor personnel at the school, LEA, and State levels with regard to the appropriate selection and use of accommodations and alternate assessments.</p> <p>There are no appropriate accommodations for students with particular disabilities (e.g., no allowable accommodations on the general assessment or alternate assessments for students who are visually impaired and need large print or Braille or for students who are significantly physically impaired and need assistive technology)</p>
<p>4.6 Has the State evaluated its use of accommodations?</p> <p>(a) How has the State ensured that appropriate accommodations are available to students with disabilities and students covered by Section 504, and that these accommodations are used in a manner that is consistent with instructional approaches for each student, as determined by a student’s IEP or 504 plan?</p>	<p>The State provides for the use of appropriate accommodations and has conducted studies to ensure that scores based on accommodated administrations can be meaningfully combined with scores based on non-accommodated administrations.</p> <p>Possible Evidence</p>	<p>No analyses have been carried out to determine whether specific accommodations produce the effect intended.</p> <p>The State does not require that decisions about how students with disabilities will participate in the assessment system be made on an individual basis or specify that these decisions must be consistent with the routine instructional approaches as identified by each</p>

Standards and Assessments Peer Review Guidance: Information and Examples for Meeting Requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

(Revised December 21, 2007 to include modified academic achievement standards)

Critical Element	Examples of Acceptable Evidence	Examples of Incomplete Evidence
<p>(b) How has the State determined that scores for students with disabilities that are based on accommodated administration conditions will allow for valid inferences about these students' knowledge and skills and can be combined meaningfully with scores from non-accommodated administration conditions?</p> <p>(c) How has the State ensured that appropriate accommodations are available to limited English proficient students and that these accommodations are used as necessary to yield accurate and reliable information about what limited English proficient students know and can do?</p> <p>(d) How has the State determined that scores for limited English proficiency students that are based on accommodated administration circumstances will allow for valid inferences about these students' knowledge and skills and can be combined meaningfully with scores from non-accommodated administration circumstances?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State has analyzed the use of specific accommodations for different groups of students with disabilities and has provided training to support sound decisions by IEP Teams. • The State routinely monitors the extent to which test accommodations are consistent with those provided during instruction. • The State has analyzed the effect of specific accommodations for students with limited English proficiency and has shared results with LEAs and schools. • Documentation of the quality and consistency of the accommodations it offers for limited English proficient students (e.g., training of translators, simplified English, standardized translation of instructions for test administration that are comparable to the general assessment). 	<p>student's IEP or 504 plan.</p> <p>The State uses the same accommodations for limited English proficient students as it uses for students with disabilities.</p>
<p>6.2</p> <p>1. What guidelines does the State have in place for including all students with disabilities in the assessment system?</p> <p>(a) Has the State developed, disseminated information on, and promoted use of appropriate accommodations to increase the number of students with disabilities who are tested against academic achievement standards for the grade in which they are enrolled?</p> <p>(b) Has the State ensured that general and special education teachers and other appropriate staff know how to administer assessments, including making use of accommodations, for students with disabilities and students covered under Section 504?</p>	<p>The State provides clear, written guidelines to all LEAs concerning how to appropriately include <u>all</u> students with disabilities in the assessment system. This statement specifies that decisions about how to include students with disabilities (i.e., whether a student takes the general assessment without accommodations, the general assessment with accommodations, an alternate assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, an alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards, or an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards) must be made on an individual basis. Further, decisions about how a student will participate must be consistent with the routine instructional approaches as identified by each student's IEP or 504 plan.</p>	<p>The State does not provide clear, written guidelines to all LEAs on how to maximize inclusion of students with disabilities in its assessment system.</p> <p>The State allows some students with disabilities to be exempted from participating in the assessment system.</p>

Standards and Assessments Peer Review Guidance: Information and Examples for Meeting Requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

(Revised December 21, 2007 to include modified academic achievement standards)

Critical Element	Examples of Acceptable Evidence	Examples of Incomplete Evidence
<p>2. If the State has approved/adopted modified or alternate academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities, what guidelines does the State have in place for placing those students in the appropriate assessment?</p> <p>(a) Has the State developed clear guidelines for IEP Teams to apply in determining which students with disabilities are eligible to be assessed based on modified or alternate academic achievement standards?</p> <p>(b) Has the State informed IEP Teams that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate or modified academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA?</p> <p>(c) Has the State provided IEP Teams with a clear explanation of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and those based on modified or alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on the student's education resulting from taking an alternate based on alternate or modified standards?</p> <p>(d) Has the State ensured that parents are informed that their child's achievement will be based on modified or alternate academic achievement standards?</p> <p>3. If the State has adopted modified academic achievement standards, do the guidelines include all required components?</p> <p>(a) Criteria for IEP Teams to use to determine which students with disabilities are eligible to be assessed based on modified academic achievement standards that include, at a minimum, each of the following?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student's disability has precluded the student from achieving grade-level proficiency 	<p>Possible Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State's guidelines, as communicated to LEAs, provide for the inclusion of all students with disabilities in the assessment system, consistent with the requirements listed in this element. • State guidelines that include all required components for implementation of modified or alternate achievement standards have been disseminated to LEAs 	

Standards and Assessments Peer Review Guidance: Information and Examples for Meeting Requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

(Revised December 21, 2007 to include modified academic achievement standards)

Critical Element	Examples of Acceptable Evidence	Examples of Incomplete Evidence
<p>as demonstrated by objective evidence of the student's academic performance; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student's progress to date in response to appropriate instruction, including special education and related services designed to address the student's individual needs, is such that, even if significant growth occurs, the IEP Team is reasonably certain that the student will not achieve grade-level proficiency within the year covered by the student's IEP; and • The student's IEP goals for subjects assessed by the statewide system are based on the academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled. <p>(b) Has the State informed IEP Teams that a student may be assessed based on modified academic achievement standards in one or more subjects?</p> <p>(c) Has the State established and monitored implementation of clear and appropriate guidelines for developing IEPs that include goals based on content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled?</p> <p>(d) Has the State ensured that students who are assessed based on modified academic achievement standards have access to the curriculum, including instruction, for the grade in which the students are enrolled?</p> <p>(e) Has the State ensured that students who take an alternate assessment based on modified academic achievement standards are not precluded from attempting State diploma requirements?</p> <p>(f) Has the State ensured annual IEP Team review of assessment decisions?</p> <p>4. Has the State documented that students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are, to the extent possible, included in the general curriculum ?</p>		