# Indiana Formative (Interim) Assessment Grant
# Assessment Program Evaluation Protocol

This rubric is used to evaluate programs submitted for approval under Indiana's Formative Assessment Grant beginning School Year 2021-2022. The Requestor must meet six criteria:

1. **Interim/Benchmark Assessment Program**: Assesses English/Language Arts and/or Mathematics.
2. **Construct Coherence**: Aligns to the breadth and depth of Indiana Academic Standards and employs strong test development processes.
3. **Comparability and Reliability**: Provides a reliable measure across forms and administrations.
4. **Fairness and Accessibility**: Provides a fair and accessible measure for all students.
5. **Consequences and Uses**: Provides data to differentiate instruction for students and to inform educational decision-making.
6. **Predictive Measures**: Provides data to predict student performance on Indiana's statewide accountability assessment.

The Requestor must follow the process outlined in the *Indiana Formative Assessment Grant Process* to submit evidence for consideration. To receive approval, the Requestor must pass all criteria labeled in the rubric below as Pass/Fail. Strong responses receive "Adequate" determinations for all other criteria within the below rubric. Programs may receive approval with one or two "Incomplete" or "Lacking" criteria based on the determination of the review committee.

The rubric is adapted from Strengthening Claims-based Interpretations and Uses of Local and Large-scale Science Assessment Scores Project (SCILLSS). (2017). Ensuring Rigor in Local Assessment Systems: A Self-Evaluation Protocol. Lincoln, NE: Nebraska Department of Education.

**Assessment Program Name**: Click here to enter text.
**Assessment Program Vendor**: Click here to enter text.
**Assessment Program Content Areas:** Click here to enter text.
**Assessment Program Grade Levels Serviced**: Click here to enter text.
**Contact Name**: Click here to enter text.   **Email**: Click here to enter text.  **Phone**: Click here to enter text.
**Contact Name**: Click here to enter text.   **Email**: Click here to enter text.  **Phone**: Click here to enter text.

**IDOE Contact**: Click here to enter text.  **Email**: Click here to enter text. **Phone**: Click here to enter text.
**Reviewer Group:** [A, B, or C]
**Review Begin Date**: Click here to enter text. **Review Completion Date**: Click here to enter text.

**Final Status:** ☐ **Approved**          ☐ **Not Approved**
**Approval Notes**: Click here to enter text.

# Indiana Formative (Interim) Assessment Grant Evaluation Protocol

| Questions Considered | Evidence Requested | Comments from Committee Review | Adequacy of Evidence |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Criterion 1: Interim/Benchmark Assessment Program**<br>**Assesses English/Language Arts and/or Mathematics.** | | | |
| Does the program assess English/Language Arts and/or Mathematics? | The program must provide interim/benchmark assessments (Grades K-10 accepted) that measure student achievement and/or growth regarding performance on Indiana Academic Standards over the course of the school year.<br>*Note: Assessment programs, not curricula (or "lesson-based" programs), are the target of this grant.* | | ☐ Pass<br><br>☐ Fail |
| **Criterion 2: Construct Coherence**<br>**Aligns to the breadth and depth of Indiana Academic Standards and employs strong test development processes.** | | | |
| Alignment<br><br>Does the assessment measure the breadth and depth of Indiana Academic Standards?<br><br>Are there standards that the assessment does not measure (e.g., writing, process, etc.)?<br><br>What evidence shows that the assessment is sufficiently rigorous?<br><br>What set of standards or learning outcomes does the assessment align to? | The Requestor must provide a formal alignment study verifying the alignment of the measurement to Indiana Academic Standards. The alignment study must:<br>• Use a research-based process (a narrative describing the process is required),<br>• Be completed or verified by a third party, and<br>• Provide evidence that the breadth and depth of Indiana Academic Standards are sufficiently measured.<br>*Note: A correlation guide or crosswalk does not provide the same level of information that an alignment study provides and therefore will not be accepted.*<br><br>A minimum of 85% of Indiana Academic Standards for each grade/content area must be assessed. A minimum of 90% of the assessment should align to one (or more) Indiana Academic Standard(s) (100% is desired).<br><br>Varying levels of rigor should be measured across each test form, including Depth of Knowledge (DOK) Levels 1 - 3 (or similar measurements on a different scale). DOK 1 should be emphasized less than DOKs 2 and 3. | | ☐ Pass<br><br>☐ Fail |

| Questions Considered | Evidence Requested | Comments from Committee Review | Adequacy of Evidence |
|---|---|---|---|
| Test Development<br><br>What is the overall process used for test development?<br><br>Who was involved in the test development process (e.g., roles, expertise, geographic location)?<br><br>What criteria are typically used to create/accept items for use on the assessment?<br><br>What quality controls are in place to ensure high-quality items and administration? | The Requestor must provide a technical report verifying the fidelity of the test development process. This report should include evidence of the following:<br>• A valid process was used to develop the assessment. The assessment should be constructed using a research-based method that focuses on the measurement of the intended construct.<br>• Stakeholders were appropriately involved in the test development process. Preference is given to assessments with a multi-step review process (which may include educators).<br>• Criteria are in place to ensure only high-quality items are utilized on the assessment. This criteria may include content and fairness considerations as well as item parameters (statistical data/field test data). | | ☐ Adequate<br><br>☐ Incomplete<br><br>☐ Lacking |
| Scoring<br><br>How were item rubrics created? What differences in student responses do the rubrics account for?<br><br>What quality controls are in place to verify that scoring rubrics are correctly applied to items (both machine-scored and hand-scored as applicable)?<br><br>How are scores for individual test items combined for a total test score? | The Requestor must provide evidence that scoring is completed with fidelity.<br>• The Requestor utilizes a system to ensure scoring rubrics are correctly applied to items during online scoring.<br>• If there are open-ended items, the Requestor uses scoring rubrics to ensure objectivity when reviewing student responses. If no open-ended items occur, the Requestor should state this in the application.<br>• A research-based scoring method should be applied to the assessment to return a valid "total score." This total score should be given meaning by resources that connect the score to knowledge and skills directly related to academic standards. | | ☐ Adequate<br><br>☐ Incomplete<br><br>☐ Lacking |

| Questions Considered | Evidence Requested | Comments from Committee Review | Adequacy of Evidence |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Criterion 3: Comparability and Reliability** <br> **Provides a reliable measure across forms and administrations.** | | | |
| Does the assessment support reliable scores over time? <br><br> If the assessment has several forms, how are those forms designed to ensure comparability of scores across all forms? <br><br> Is the assessment administered in a standardized format to ensure comparability across different testing sites? <br><br> Does the assessment administration protect against various types of cheating to ensure scores accurately reflect student knowledge and skills? | The Requestor must provide evidence that scoring is comparable and reliable across various forms and administrations as applicable. <br> • The assessment Requestor must have processes in place to ensure the consistency of score results across different forms and over time, if applicable. If not applicable, the Requestor should state this in the documentation. <br> • The assessment Requestor must provide evidence of protocols and processes defined for test administration. This may include defined test windows, test administration manuals/instructions for teachers, and/or test security information. <br> The Requestor should describe any security features provided that protect against cheating. | | ☐ Adequate <br><br> ☐ Incomplete <br><br> ☐ Lacking |

| Questions Considered | Evidence Requested | Comments from Committee Review | Adequacy of Evidence |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Criterion 4: Fairness and Accessibility**<br>**Provides a fair and accessible measure for all students.** | | | |
| What procedures were used in test development to ensure items were created without bias and are fair for all students?<br><br>How were the needs of students with disabilities and English learners addressed during the test development process? What evidence supports that these populations are able to show what they know on this assessment?<br><br>What accommodations and/or supports are offered during testing?<br><br>How are students' responses scored in ways that focus on the construct-relevant portion of the task and minimize construct-irrelevant influences on student responses? | The Requestor must provide evidence that all students can access the test content.<br>• Evidence that items were developed with processes to ensure fairness and accessibility. Strong processes include stakeholder review, use of Universal Design (especially in graphics), review of linguistic complexity, and avoidance of multi-meaning words in item stems.<br>• Evidence that scoring focuses on construct-relevant portions of item tasks and minimize construct-irrelevant influences.<br>• Evidence of supports for students or student groups during test administration.<br>• Evidence of available accommodations. Student accommodations must be provided during testing either by the assessment program or by the local school. Strong responses explain how necessary accommodations are provided during test administration.<br>Note: Providers should address access for specific subpopulations.<br>• Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities.<br>• Students involved in Spanish emersion programs.<br>• Students who are blind or visually impaired. | | ☐ Adequate<br><br>☐ Incomplete<br><br>☐ Lacking |

| Questions Considered | Evidence Requested | Comments from Committee Review | Adequacy of Evidence |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Criterion 5: Consequences and Uses**<br>**Provides data to differentiate instruction for students and to inform educational decision-making.** | | | |
| How are the scores from the assessment intended to be used? | The Requestor should articulate the appropriate purpose(s) and limitation(s) of the assessment for interpretation. The Requestor should provide interpretive guides to educators at a minimum, along with resources for parent interpretation. | | ☐ Adequate<br><br>☐ Incomplete<br><br>☐ Lacking |
| Are scores/reports useful for educators and parents?<br><br>Are scores/reports provided in a timely manner for action?<br><br>Are assessment scores associated with recommendations for action…<br>• at the student level?<br>• at a group level?<br>• at a whole-class level?<br><br>Are there resources to give meaning to the "total score" provided by connecting them to knowledge/skills?<br><br>How are instructional tools and resources aligned to the scores and to the constructs being measured? | The Requestor must provide evidence of reports generated through the delivery of the assessment. Reports must:<br>• Provide data regarding student achievement and/or growth following each administration.<br>• Provide timely analysis of student performance multiple times throughout the school year.<br>• Provide a platform for teacher access to student- and class-level data.<br><br>The Requestor should provide examples of training/resources that support educators in connecting provided data with educational action.<br><br>The Requestor may provide examples of instructional resources or other tools that support differentiated instruction, if available. | | ☐ Pass<br><br>☐ Fail |
| How are scores shared with students and parents?<br><br>What resources help students and parents interpret scores and identify associated recommendations for action? | The Requestor should provide evidence that resources are available to support students and parents in interpreting assessment results and using results to make informed educational decisions. | | ☐ Adequate<br><br>☐ Incomplete<br><br>☐ Lacking |

| Questions Considered | Evidence Requested | Comments from Committee Review | Adequacy of Evidence |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Criterion 6: Predictive Measures** | | | |
| **Provides data to predict student performance on Indiana's statewide accountability assessment.** | | | |
| Can test scores/results provide predictive measures for student performance on Indiana's ILEARN assessment for students in grades 3-8? | The Requestor must provide a formal predictive study showing how the assessment predicts student performance on ILEARN, Indiana's statewide summative assessment for grades 3-8. The predictive study results will be provided to Indiana school leaders. <br> • The predictive study may be completed internally but must be confirmed by a third party. <br> • The study must clearly describe the intervals considered. The predictive study may indicate predictive measures for assessments taken at different times (example: 1st quarter versus 3rd quarter). <br> • Sample size (n) must be greater than or equal to 1500 and should closely represent student characteristics and distribution of characteristics across Indiana. <br> • **Preferred**: The predictive study may indicate the probability of students achieving different proficiency levels on ILEARN based on their interim assessment score. For example, students scoring 250-275 are 80% likely to achieve At Proficiency and 20% likely to achieve Approaching Proficiency on ILEARN. <br> • Other research-based predictive models may be used. Assessment products without data from Indiana may use models that link available data but may NOT simply provide a linking study. <br><br> Predictive study results should be available to Indiana schools upon request. <br><br> *Note for vendors: Grades K-2 and grades 9-10 are not required to predict performance. Requestors of* | | ☐ Pass <br><br> ☐ Fail |

| Questions Considered | Evidence Requested | Comments from Committee Review | Adequacy of Evidence |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *programs addressing only these grade levels should indicate this within their documentation.*<br><br>*Note for schools: If interim assessment data is used by educators to inform instruction and remediation, interim assessments as a predictive measure should more consistently under-predict student performance. Predictive measures are highly impacted by the way that data is used in a school or corporation. Interim/formative assessment information should decrease the relationship between formative performance and summative performance because this information should be used to remediate.* | | |