

# STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW SEMINAR



U.S. Department of Education  
Office of State Support  
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

August 1-2, 2018 | Washington, DC

## **B-1 Monitoring Test Administration (including special populations)**

## CRITICAL ELEMENT 2.4

The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments, the general ELP assessments, the AA-AAAS and the AELPA.

# Critical Element 2.4 EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE

Evidence to support this critical element for all of the State's assessments includes:

- Brief description of the State's approach to monitoring test administration (e.g., monitoring conducted by State staff, through regional centers, by districts with support from the State, or another approach);
- Existing written documentation of the State's procedures for monitoring test administration across the State, including, for example, strategies for selection of districts and schools for monitoring, cycle for reaching schools and districts across the State, training on monitoring, observation forms, schedule for monitoring, monitors' roles, and the responsibilities of key personnel;
- Documentation that the administration of all State assessments (e.g., the general academic assessments, the general ELP assessments, the AA-AAAS, and the AELPA) are monitored to some degree.
- Summary of the results, and follow-up of the results, of the State's monitoring in recent years of test administration in the State.
- Procedures for collecting data from technology-based assessments to monitor fidelity of test administration.

# CRITICAL ELEMENT 5.4

The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:

- Consistent with the State's policies for accommodations;
- Appropriate for addressing a student's disability or language needs for each assessment administered;
- Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;
- Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student's IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL;
- Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures;
- Monitored for administrations of all required academic content assessments, AA-AAAS, ELP assessments, and AELPA.

# Critical Element 5.4 EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE

Evidence to support this critical element for the State's assessment system includes documents such as:

- Description of procedures the State uses to monitor that accommodations selected for students with disabilities and ELs are appropriate;
- Description of procedures the State uses to monitor that students with disabilities are placed by IEP Teams, placement teams, or individuals or teams designated by a district to make assessment decisions about students with disabilities or ELs in the appropriate assessment;
- The State's written procedures for monitoring the use of accommodations during test administration, such as information provided to districts; instructions and protocols for State, district and school staff; and schedules for monitoring;
- Summary of results of monitoring for the most recent year of test administration in the State.

# QUESTIONS

1. What evidence have states submitted for 2.4 and 5.4 that peers recommend meet these critical elements?
  - a) How might the evidence of monitoring differ for different types of assessments (i.e., general academic assessment, general ELP assessment, AA-AAAS, AELPA)?
  - b) What evidence has been submitted/could be submitted specifically pertinent to monitoring the administration of accommodations for student populations with fidelity?
  - c) What evidence could States submit to document that AA-AAAS and AELPA were administered with fidelity?
2. What is the single biggest challenge for States to submit evidence on in this topic area?
  - a) What have peers noted is often missing evidence—*i.e.*, states have not provided evidence—for these critical elements?
  - b) What do you think States need to provide to address these critical elements? What's been missing?
3. How might evidence for these critical elements differ for computer-based assessments vs. paper-based assessments?
  - a) What opportunities exist to enhance collection of monitoring data from technology-based assessments?