**Detailed Scope of Services: Grades 3 – 8 and High School Summative Assessments**

**and IREAD-3**

In this section, information on the Indiana summative assessment program and requirements of the scope of work for the RFP are provided. The following parts are addressed in this section: Background Information, Elements of Test Design, and Technical Requirements.

1. **Background Information**

The State will administer mandatory computer adaptive testing (CAT) for summative assessments in English/ Language Arts and Mathematics and computer adaptive or fixed form Science and Social Studies assessments delivered online to students in grades 3-8 and high school end of course assessments (ECA) beginning in 2018-19. Indiana currently administers summative assessments to students in grades 3-8 and high school that are fixed form assessments. Annual grade level enrollment is approximated at 85,000 students per grade.

The new summative assessments outlined below comprise assessments in grades 3-8 and high school as part of *Indiana’s Learning Evaluation Assessment Readiness Network (ILEARN)* program and support College and Career Readiness aligned to the Indiana Academic Standards across grades 3-8 and high school. HEA 1003 defined ILEARN during the 2017 legislative session. The legislation is accessible at the following location: <https://iga.in.gov/legislative/2017/bills/house/1003#document-ab2e7615>

Currently, Indiana administers the Indiana Statewide Test of Educational Progress Plus (ISTEP+) in two parts each spring. A retest window is available in Winter and Summer for students not meeting the graduation requirement. IREAD-3 occurs during the spring, immediately following ISTEP+ Part 1. A summer retest window occurs for students not achieving pass during the spring window. The current vendor for ISTEP+ and IREAD-3 is Pearson. Information for the current ISTEP+ program is available at this link: <http://www.doe.in.gov/assessment/istep-grades-3-8>. Information for the current IREAD-3 program is available at this link: <http://www.doe.in.gov/assessment/iread-3>. Current test windows and durations are available at this link: <http://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/assessment/2017-18-test-windowsv2-04-06-17.pdf>.

The technical proposal submitted by the bidder must address ILEARN and the deployment and reporting of the Grade 3, IREAD-3 assessment. IREAD-3 test administrations include four previously developed, unique forms, deployed as one per administration window of IREAD-3. IREAD-3 is the annual assessment offered near the end of grade three providing proficiency data on students’ mastery of foundational reading skills. These forms are developed and requestor is required to deploy, score and report on the same platforms and structure as ILEARN.

Proposal must also include the opportunity for retests in Winter and Summer for the end of course assessments beginning in 2020 as a likely pathway for graduation to be defined by the State Board of Education in Summer, 2017 for ELA and Mathematics. Science and Social Studies content is not offered as a retest.

**(2) Elements**

Overview:

The end-of-year summative assessments aligned to the Indiana Academic Standards will measure proficiency for English/Language Arts and Mathematics and proficiency for Social Studies and Science across years in the following content areas and grade levels:

* Computer adaptive English/language arts and mathematics – Grades 3-8;
* Computer adaptive or fixed form science – Grades 4 and 6 and Biology end of course assessment;
* Computer adaptive assessments for English 10 and Algebra I end of course assessments offered as a Spring administration and Winter retest beginning in 2019-20. Fixed form ECAs may be proposed given a vendor's bank to support CAT;
* Fixed form social studies – Grade 5 and optional United States Government end of course assessment to be used as a final exam

Computer adaptive is defined as an assessment that adapts by independent item or sets of items (i.e., those items aligned to a stimulus) as a student interacts with the assessment. The test must adapt through the engagement with the student to best assess a student’s mastery of the defined content. A proposal must include the licensure or lease of items developed by the respondent and used by the state for the duration of the contract. The proposal must also include the license of items one year following the contract end to ensure sustainability of the program during any transition. The computer adaptive portion may be supplemented by a small number of items required by Indiana to ensure alignment to the Indiana Academic Standards (i.e., writing prompt) and written by the vendor as an addition to the licensed bank. These supplemental items may be given within the same test session, but owned by Indiana. The Indiana Academic Standards are accessible at this location: <http://www.doe.in.gov/standards>.

Test Window and Test Timing:

The summative assessments will occur in a single test window in late Spring which allows delivery of proficiency and aggregated reports to corporations and schools no later than July 1 beginning in 2019-20. Reports for administration in 2018-19 are required by August 15, 2019 to account for standard setting and development of systems for reporting state-specific results including equating items based on Indiana’s representative population. The English/Language Arts, Mathematics, Science or Social Studies assessments may be provided in multiple sessions, but cannot exceed an anticipated total time of eight hours for average (50th percentile) students participating in English/Language Arts, Mathematics, Science or Social Studies at a given grade level. It is anticipated that the sessions will be untimed for students within the platform and test oversight. The administration of ILEARN assessments for each subject area must be concise in duration, but will be untimed for students, in the context of adequate technical rigor and quality necessary to meet federal or other applicable standards.

The end of course assessments must be offered two times during the school year, in addition to a summer window. The school-year test windows include: 1) Late Spring for the primary window aligned with the completion of instruction; and 2) Winter, allowing for semester or trimester calendars, to offer a retest window beginning in 2019-20 as an additional opportunity for any students who have not passed the assessment and need to retake the ECA (Algebra I and/or English 10) in order to meet graduation requirements as determined by the State Board of Education. Because state law limits students who have not passed a portion of the ECAs to a maximum of one retest each semester, the two test windows must be in different semesters. Student-level proficiency for retest data must be available no later than one month in advance of the Spring and Winter windows. Spring reporting must allow for scores in advance of graduation.

IREAD-3 is offered twice annually; once during the early spring as a primary administration, and during the summer as a retest opportunity. Results are reported within four weeks for the Spring administration and on a rolling basis during the summer retest.

**(3) Technical Requirements**

Respondents must acknowledge their understanding and acceptance of the listed technical requirements. Respondents must also provide a narrative for each requirement in the below section that demonstrates their ability to meet the stated requirement.

The state assessments, as well as the administration, scoring, analysis, and reporting procedures, must be technically sound as defined by the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing [American Educational Research Association (AERA), American Psychological Association (APA), and the National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME), 2014]. Likewise, development and implementation of the assessments must adhere to the established guidelines and requirements for the U.S. Department of Education’s (USED) Peer Review of states’ systems of standards and assessments (USED, 2015).

IMPORTANT Note: Respondents are advised that the *Criteria for Procuring and Evaluating High-Quality Assessments* produced by the Council of Chief State School Officers will guide the review of proposals submitted as a result of this RFP. As such, Respondents are invited to include the five assessment criteria and provide statements of evidence related to the Respondents’ proposal.

**(3a) Background**

A number of state laws and rules govern the content, construction and delivery of ILEARN. Please fully review the Indiana Assessment Program Manual (<http://www.doe.in.gov/assessment>) and all of IC 20-32, IC 20-32-5.1 (2018), HEA 1003 and 511 IAC 6.2 before responding to this section of the RFP as every proposal must meet these legal requirements. Failure to meet all current laws and rules may disqualify the Respondent’s proposal from consideration for this Component of the system. Respondents should be prepared to address the potentiality of changes in statutes or rules and verify that a modification of the contract is possible and identify key personnel responsible for contract modifications, if necessary.

ILEARN is the primary student achievement measure for accountability. Indiana’s system of Standards and Assessments has been given a rating of "substantially meets" by USED through the Peer Review process required by ESSA in its Non-Regulatory Guidance for States (USED, 2015). It is critical that all Respondents understand that any proposal made for this Component of the assessment system is required to, upon federal review, receive the same or higher status. Respondents shall develop a plan and timeline and must provide the requirements of USED Peer Review.

The IDOE seeks proposals for an assessment that compares achievement of Indiana students to achievement of students on a national basis, and if feasible, international basis.  As Indiana law requires the state assessment program “to compare achievement of Indiana students to achievement of students on a national basis,” Respondents must address the way in which this will be accomplished, as well as any international comparisons that are possible. This comparison should report performance data that supports diagnostic evaluation of student readiness for post-secondary education and careers and that enable students, parents and schools to inform the student’s individual planning and preparation for graduation and post-graduation pursuits. A defined college and career readiness indicator must be provided as part of the student report beginning at Grade 3.

**(3b) Test Administration**

The format of the ILEARN assessments must enable electronic administration and scoring and provide a comparable form for a paper-and-pencil administration for a small population of students that cannot be assessed online such as when needed for students with disabilities or local online capacity and connectivity prevent successful online testing. Paper-and-pencil administrations may also use existing or established forms that can also be used in breach situations if an online alternative is not available.

The respondent must provide training, support and tools for the installation and testing of their online technology platform and they must provide a comprehensive plan for the timely support of schools and districts who encounter issues with the testing solution. Test delivery platforms must allow for content to be delivered in secure (test administration) and non-secure (practice test) sessions. Test delivery must allow for seamless test sessions for students during periods of interruptions. Respondent must describe the process for capturing and saving student responses during successful test sessions and during sessions where students have experienced a delay or an outage. Documentation must be provided by the respondent about system capacity, number of outages, duration and students impacted that were experienced by clients in the previous ten school year test administration cycles. A complete list of all problems that have occurred, along with any Liquidated Damages (LDs), or services in lieu of payments, that were assessed against the respondent, must be included in the response. The respondent must demonstrate prior experience in online, large-scale summative assessment with a large state (approximately one million students) within the last five (5) years. In the response, the respondent shall briefly describe online, large-scale summative assessments that the respondent has developed and delivered in other large states.

**(3c) Program Manager and Project Management Team**

The Respondent shall assign a Program Manager (PM), with PMP certification and no fewer than five years managing high stakes assessment programs, dedicated full-time to this project, and assemble a project management team to oversee and coordinate the efforts of the respondent and all related subcontractors including an assigned project manager for each aspect of the program management for ILEARN 3-8, end of course assessments, and IREAD-3, content development, scoring and reporting, data and research. A single Program Manager shall serve as the primary liaison with the IDOE for all components of the project. The Program Manager must have demonstrated previous experience with managing a large, customized high-stakes assessment project similar in scope and nature to the summative assessments.

A cohesive, dedicated, skilled core team is critical to the summative assessment project. At a minimum, this core team of key personnel shall be listed in the Respondent’s proposal. Identifying core team key personnel (i.e., more than 20% FTE) as specific individuals is a mandatory requirement for the work to be performed under this contract and subject to approval by the IDOE Office of Student Assessment. The Respondent shall provide an organizational chart showing all key staff and offices assigned to work on the various aspects of the summative assessments along with each member’s defined FTE for the duration of the contract specified by contract year. Roles and responsibilities for all key staff shall be identified. Resumes of key staff must be included in the respondent proposal. It is expected that content development staff have a minimum of a Master's Degree in the associated content areas. Examples of key staff include, but are not limited to:

* Content Specialists for English language arts/literacy and mathematics – Duties shall include, but not be limited to, consultation for scoring, oversight of any necessary test selection, blueprint development, item development training and oversight, rubric development and review, facilitation of rubric validation activities, and facilitation of achievement level descriptor writing and standard setting activities.
* Psychometrician – Duties shall include, but not be limited to, assisting with technical aspects of standard setting, compiling item statistics, IRT calibration, scaling and equating, test form selection, conducting validity studies, performing QC, provision of data for alignment studies and other research efforts, and developing technical reports.
* Research Supervisor(s) – Duties shall include, but not be limited to, designing and implementing cognitive laboratory protocols, recommending sampling procedures, designing and implementing comprehensive research plan.
* Hand Scoring Supervisor – Duties shall include, but not be limited to, selection and training of scoring staff (including both scoring leaders and scorers), training material development, score reconciliation, and quality control of performance scoring.
* Standard Setting Specialist – Duties shall include development and implementation of achievement level descriptor writing and standard setting plans, development and delivery of training to standard setting panelists.
* Accommodations/Accessibility Specialist - Duties shall include, but not be limited to, collaborating with appropriate state personnel to ensure availability and appropriate implementation of universal design features, designated features, ELL issues and accommodations.
* Information Technology Specialist – Duties shall include, but not be limited to, oversight of the Respondent’s test delivery platform, set-up and delivery of the general research file, set-up and delivery of the enrollment and test management system, troubleshooting system “bugs” and providing necessary solutions to districts requiring Tier 2 and 3 customer support.
* Customer Service Supervisor – Duties shall include, but not be limited to, oversight of the Respondent’s customer support network relative to the IDOE; providing timely responses to state staff and local personnel regarding all processes and procedures related to IDOE; ensuring necessary resource allocation to customer support for IDOE; providing and documenting accurate responses to questions from program staff, state personnel, and local districts.
* Management Support Staff – Duties shall include, but not be limited to, meeting and travel arrangements and set-up, communication with state in absence of Program Manager, direct correspondence with local districts as necessary (and approved by the state), set-up of conference calls and webinars as required, and preparation and distribution of training materials as required.

Except in the case of illness, death, or leave of absence and so long as the personnel remain partners, principals, or employees of Respondent, no re-deployment of any member of the core team as required by the work plan may be made without prior written consent of the IDOE Office of Student Assessment, which shall not be withheld without good cause. Replacement of such personnel, if approved, shall be with personnel of equal or greater ability and qualifications.

Subcontractors

The Respondent may complete a portion of the required services and deliverables using subcontractors. If the Respondent elects to use a subcontractor for any part of the required scope of work, the Respondent shall provide an effective supervisory structure for overseeing the quality of the subcontractor’s work and shall ensure that all deliverables are completed in accordance with the requirements of the contract. All subcontractors must be approved by the state. The Respondent will serve as the sole point of contact for all Contractual matters, including those that may impact or involve a subcontractor.

The respondent must identify all subcontractors proposed to be involved in the contract, and the specific deliverables and/or services they will provide. Additionally, if a subcontractor will provide services related to key elements of test development, administration, scoring, reporting, or standard setting, the respondent must clearly identify those services, and must provide one page resumes indicating relevant educational background and professional experience for subcontractor staff in primary roles. The respondent must also provide an organizational chart illustrating the supervisory relationships between the Respondent’s key project staff and subcontractor staff.

**(3d) Project Plans and Schedules**

The Respondent shall continuously monitor the ongoing operations of the summative assessments using a detailed project plan and schedule. The Respondent shall provide an annual updated project plan and schedule for joint use by the IDOE and the Respondent in monitoring all program activities by May 1 of each year beginning in 2018-19. The IDOE desires appropriate direct real time access to the project schedule. In addition, weekly updates showing all deliverables for a current week and the subsequent six weeks must be provided to the IDOE on Monday of each week. All schedule adjustments made to the overall schedule must be noted both in the master project plan schedule and in the weekly updates. In addition, a master project schedule detailing all milestones of the project and their due dates must be provided and updated monthly. The master schedule must be delivered to the Department by the first of each month in an agreed upon format electronically for import. This schedule must delineate agreed upon durations, associated tasks and responsible party for completing the process step. Changes to key milestones in the master schedule will require a contract amendment. The respondent must provide a master schedule highlighting the key milestones on the critical path for 2017-18 and 2018-19 within the proposal.

The Respondent must provide documentation regarding any missed deadlines, litigation or breaches of contract due to missed deadlines resulting in compromises of an assessment program.

**(3e) Status and Planning Meetings**

The Respondent shall participate in weekly status meetings with the IDOE to address all aspects of the program. These meetings will be conducted by web conferencing or other communication technology as proposed by the Respondent. The Respondent shall be responsible for providing written notes and other applicable documentation from the weekly status meetings within 24 hours of each meeting. An agenda of proposed topics must be delivered to the Department 24 hours in advance of the scheduled call for review. The Respondent shall also provide weekly written status reports that shall include, but not be limited to, reports on the status of ongoing activities, decisions made, decisions pending, activities completed, activities that are behind schedule, and timelines for scheduled activities. Weekly status reports shall be in a format that is approved by the IDOE Office of Student Assessment. The respondent will also maintain a decision and action log to track any outcomes from meetings held with the Department. The decision log must note any decisions that require a contract amendment.

The Respondent shall participate in and support all associated respondent costs for a minimum of six planning meetings of the IDOE and Respondent project management teams during year one in 2017-18. The first planning meeting must be scheduled within one month of contract execution. Respondent is responsible for costs associated with four meetings during subsequent years including other respondent management staff responsible for services provided to the IDOE, and representatives of the Respondent’s senior management team, as necessary. All meetings except the program kickoff will be held in the State of Indiana at a site convenient to the IDOE staff (a total of 10 meeting days for the first two years) unless the cost is determined to be less expensive at a location defined by the respondent (as long as the location is agreeable to the Department). The Respondent shall be responsible for all costs associated with these meetings. During the initial start-up phase of this project there may be a need for additional meetings; these will be at the Respondent’s expense with dates, times and locations to be mutually agreed upon by the Project Manager and the IDOE. The Respondent shall submit the meeting notes to the IDOE within five (5) working days of each meeting for final review and approval.

**(3f) Educator Involvement**

The development of the ILEARN assessments will involve several Indiana Assessment Educator Committees (“Committees”), the IDOE, and the successful Respondent. Each of these Committees requires that the Indiana Academic Standards be used as the foundation of their work. Committees are required to align their work on the summative assessments with the Indiana Academic Standards and to ensure the summative assessments measure performance against the Indiana Academic Standards for grade level and content area.

The Respondent shall propose a process whereby the Department conducts an audit of licensed items with Indiana educators for potential use on the summative assessments. Through the audit process, the items are reviewed and approved by the IDOE. The audit must include criteria for selecting high-quality items. The details of this process shall be finalized in collaboration between the successful Respondent and the IDOE. All items developed for Indiana’s independent use must be approved by IDOE and through educator meetings held and facilitated by the respondent. A proposal will include details for all meetings anticipated for 2017-18 preparation including but not limited to blueprint and item reviews and implementation in 2018-19 including but not limited to item review and standard setting. The anticipated meetings are noted in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2017-18 | Blueprint and specifications meeting |
|  | Audit of licensed bank |
|  | Passage and/or Item review for field test items needed in Spring 2019 |
|  | Alignment study conducted by third party organization |
| 2018-19 | Passage and/or Item review for field test items needed in Spring 2020 |
|  | Standard setting |

All item specifications and a sample of items must represent both coverage of Indiana Standards (in depth and breadth) and be representative of item types to be used on the summative assessments must be reviewed for alignment to Indiana Academic Standards. Additionally, all items must be reviewed for adequate depth of knowledge (DOK) and coverage of the full range of DOK. The items must also be reviewed for bias and accessibility to ensure that the summative assessments provide equitable measures for students with alternative cultural and ethnic backgrounds and diverse learning styles. Items must meet the principles of Universal Design. A review of the item specifications and audit of items must be conducted with Indiana educators in advance of the operational use in 2018-19. The proposal must define a plan for this process to occur no later than September 2018 to ensure that the items are representative of the depth and breadth of Indiana Standards, and be approved by IDOE.

Educator Committees are critical to Indiana’s assessment development work, and their membership will be maintained or modified only under the direction of the IDOE. Committees are defined by cell representation according to student population in the state, race and ethnicity, and subpopulations of students including students with disabilities and English language learners. Committees consist of 8-10 educators per grade or grade span. Committees review for content, bias and sensitivity and accessibility perspectives utilizing a quality development checklist.

The Respondent shall be responsible for the management and costs associated with all committee meetings, as applicable, including but not limited to invitations, registration, participant and data tracking, communications, confidentiality, recordkeeping, results reporting, hotel accommodations, travel and substitute teacher reimbursements, provision of meals and snacks, and honorariums to be paid to participants. Reimbursements for educators should include $100 honoraria for half-day and $150 for full day participation.

Educators must also be involved in any changes made to IREAD-3 test forms or content. This work is not anticipated under the current contract unless concerns arise from the respondent, educators or Department.

**(3g) Test Content and Item Format**

Test content must align to the Indiana Academic Standards, and the test may consist of a distribution of multiple choice, multiple select, open ended, technology enhanced, and extended response items. An essential feature of all items included on the summative assessments is the measurement of performance relative to the Indiana Academic Standards.

The ILEARN assessment must be aligned to applicable Indiana Academic Standards and should assess the student’s progress in effective written expression, higher-order thinking, and applied skills in English/language arts, mathematics, science and social studies in the grade levels or courses outlined at the beginning of this section. Laws are subject to change by the legislature and rules are subject to change by the Indiana State Board of Education.

For a bank of items licensed from previous development undertaken by the respondent, the respondent must contract with an independent organization approved by the Department to complete an alignment study with the Indiana Academic Standards within three months of the contract execution.

Only those items and items specifications that are confirmed to align to Indiana Academic Standards may be used for the operational assessment.

Development of Blueprint and Specifications:

The respondent must submit a plan for development of test blueprints during on-site meetings. These meetings must build on evidence-centered design methodology during the 2017-18 school year incorporating educator committees by grade with 8-10 participants per committee. The Department will be responsible for the nomination and recruitment to the point of invitation dissemination. The respondent will manage the invitation process through the meeting facilitation and documentation. Blueprints will be based on a small number of reporting categories (e.g., 4-5) per content area and approximately 35-40 items to ensure a shorter assessment. Final item and points allocations will be defined through the work with educators and approved by the Department. Blueprint meetings shall occur by December 31, 2017.

The respondent must submit test and item specifications delineating the priority and limits for items utilized by Indiana within the licensed bank and those developed by Indiana. Specifications should highlight sample stems and be written in educator-facing language to be posted publicly for educators. The respondent and the Department may determine that a public and nonpublic version should be developed. The respondent should account for both versions in their proposal.

All of the summative assessments in grades 3-8 shall be “domain” assessments, based on what students should know and be able to do in each content area as an aggregated reporting category. The test and item specifications should be designed to reflect a total test time of under 8 hours across content areas defined below:

* Grade 3: ELA and Mathematics
* Grade 4: ELA, Mathematics and Science
* Grade 5: ELA, Mathematics and Social Studies
* Grade 6: ELA, Mathematics and Science
* Grade 7: ELA and Mathematics
* Grade 8: ELA and Mathematics
* ECAs: ELA, Mathematics and Science

Respondent must demonstrate experience with computer adaptive form creation including algorithms and simulations. Respondent should articulate the steps taken to ensure comparability across test forms.

Preference will be given to proposals which demonstrate the ability to measure efficiently the Indiana Academic Standards to the fullest extent (length of test, cost of test, scoring time). The Respondent will recommend an approach that balances IDOE’s competing needs for a full measurement of students’ understanding of the Indiana Academic Standards and the need for a shorter assessment in terms of cost, administration time, and availability of results.

Beyond the contract period, the IDOE must be able to ensure the continuity of the summative assessment items previously developed and efficiently import electronic copies of the item banks from previous vendor to Respondent and at contract end to another. The Respondent shall propose how this need may be met, including supporting rationale and costs.

Development of test forms is complete for IREAD-3. Any changes to these forms must be approved by the Department.

**(3h) Item Ownership**

The IDOE will license items that are delivered beginning with the spring 2019 administration of the summative assessments in grades 3-8. Items developed as a supplement to the licensed items to ensure alignment to Indiana’s standards will be owned by the Department. IDOE requests a one-year license of items following the contract term to ensure successful delivery of annual assessment long-term.

Indiana requires the release of a representative sample of 10 items each year per grade and content area. These items should be deployed in a system to allow interaction mimicking the live test environment. During the 2017-18 school year, a demo environment must be available by May 15, 2018, prior to the release of items to allow engagement with items representing the new assessment in content, interaction and scoring and reporting. The expectation for 2018-19 and beyond is that the sample of released items would supplement these items. The environment must be refreshed annually no later than August 15 beginning in 2019. A subcomponent of this environment must also contain sample items for IREAD-3. The current items used for IREAD-3 may be used in part to fulfill this requirement.

Item Bank

The Respondent will secure or provide a bank of items to fulfill the final approved test blueprints for all applicable grade levels in both content areas. The Respondent shall ensure that sufficient items are available to support administration for all applicable grades and content areas of the IDOE. The state shall be responsible for any fees associated with leasing and/or licensing items from a source other than the Respondent’s item bank; however, the Respondent shall be responsible for negotiating lease or licensure terms with the applicable entity and communicating such terms to the state. The Respondent shall include any applicable lease/licensure fees in the state’s invoice as specified herein. The Respondent shall obtain and manage permissions for any and all copyrighted materials in the Respondent’s item bank, or in leased or licensed content, for distribution and use of content in print or electronic format for the duration of the contract and all subsequent renewal periods. Additionally, the Respondent shall obtain and manage permissions for any copyrighted materials included in new content development as described herein.

Because the state assessment is highly visible and must be treated as a secure testing program, the Respondent must provide items that are NOT available for purchase by Indiana public or private school districts. The Respondent may utilize items produced by or for another state IF the state has not released its previously used items to the public.

The proposal must clearly describe all anticipated sources of content for the IDOE. For all item sources, the proposal must address the following questions:

* What are the characteristics of the item bank? (How many, and what types of items are available for each grade level and content area as described herein? What is the range of cognitive complexity reflected in the item bank?)
* How, when, and by whom were the items developed? (Who were the item writers? How were they identified? What were their qualifications? How were they trained?)
* What item metadata is maintained within the item bank?
* To what standards are the items within the item bank aligned?
* How, where, and when were items field tested?
* For what specific purposes are the items being used by customers?
* What are the item reuse policies?
* To what specific customers have the items in the proposed item bank been sold?

The Respondent must describe how the proposed item bank is kept secure and under what conditions items are sold to customers. The Respondent must also provide a copy of the most recent technical report for all potential sources of item content in the form of a web link. If the Respondent is proposing use of licensed or leased items, the Respondent’s response must include all applicable terms of the lease or license.

**(3i) Item Development and Content Review**

Annually, the existing item pool counts and distributions will be reviewed and the Respondent and the IDOE will agree to the proposed item development and piloting plan for the next testing year. The IDOE expects to receive high-quality items with little need for revision, and the IDOE reserves the right to reject at no cost any and all items that it deems as poor quality or not aligned to the Indiana Academic Standards. Respondent must develop an overage to account for this risk. Furthermore, scoring rubrics that are of poor quality will also be rejected. The Respondent is responsible for ensuring that all items are carefully written, edited, and proofed before being submitted to the IDOE for review. The project schedule must allow for three IDOE review rounds, with significant edits occurring during round one, and diminishing with further review rounds.

A quality checklist will be developed by the respondent for use internally and during educator review committees. The checklist must include aspects for review related to bias and accessibility features.

The Respondent shall submit with a response to this RFP a chart indicating the number of items currently developed by Standard for each subject (English/language arts, mathematics, science and social studies) based on the current standard alignment and applicable grade level for ILEARN administrations that are part of the contract resulting from this RFP. Flexibility with use of an expanded pool across difficulty levels and grade levels should be addressed by Respondent as part of the proposal. Proposed development will be confirmed once the external alignment study is conducted. This chart will be subject to approval by the IDOE.

The IDOE requires the Respondent to propose a detailed plan for item development. Details about the development of the licensed bank of items must also be included. The item development plan shall also include:

Current item pool:

* Source of items;Alignment to the Indiana Academic Standards or current standard alignment;
* Source of items;
* Associated item metadata;
* Scoring criteria;
* Alignment to the Indiana Academic Standards or current standard alignment;
* Number and percentage of each type of item (e.g., multiple choice, multiple select, open ended, technology enhanced, and extended response) included in the item pools;
* Number and percentage of items at each level of Webb’s Depth of Knowledge or cognitive difficulty measure. Also include how classification determinations were made;
* Number and percentage of fully accessible items with all tools, supports and accommodations needed to assess subpopulations;
* Number and percentage of items that can be machine scored (e.g., dichotomous, artificial intelligence);
* Evidence of items that represent all points across the achievement spectrum and how these determinations were made;
* Samples of each item type across grade and content areas;
* Item exposure metrics (e.g., usage history), if applicable
* Number and percentage of items aligned to speaking and listening standards, if available. Timeline for future development must be indicated if not currently addressed within the item pool.

Item Quality:

* Criteria used to judge content validity and the technical quality of the items;
* Criteria used to develop test items across a wide range of depth of knowledge levels or cognitive difficulty measure;
* Criteria used to judge the item quality;
* Criteria used to judge the extent to which the items measure college- and career-readiness; and
* Procedures for ensuring that the above criteria will be used consistently throughout future item development processes.

Development, edits and revisions:

* Graphics production;
* Item development plans including a detailed schedule accounting for audit and review and final approval of Indiana-aligned items independent from the licensed pool;
* Permissions and ownership for stimuli;
* IDOE’s role in development and review of newly developed items;
* Evidence that the assessment items will meet the technical requirements of federal peer review;
* Provide translations or student supports in Spanish, Arabic, Burmese, Mandarin Chinese and may provide translations or student supports in up to one additional IDOE-defined language: Punjabi, Vietnamese, German, Hakha or Falam. If not currently available, timeline for integration must be noted in proposal.
* o Provide translations in Spanish and may provide translations in up to four additional IDOE-defined lang

It is expected that some of the items will be rejected in the process of the item reviews. Therefore, the number of items needed for the assessment refers to the number of items remaining after all item reviews have occurred. Overage must be assumed by the respondent to ensure the minimum number of passages or test items required for administrations.

The Respondent will be responsible for conducting passage reviews, content reviews and bias/sensitivity reviews, including setting up meetings and facilitating the reviews for the ILEARN assessments. The IDOE content personnel, along with the item review committees, will provide the Respondent with feedback regarding the match between test items that are developed and the Indiana Academic Standards.

English/Language Arts Requirements:

* English/language arts and literacy tests are based on an aligned balance of high-quality literature and nonfiction texts. Texts and other stimuli should be previously published or of publishable quality. Vendor is responsible for maintaining all permissions.
* English/language arts and literacy tests require appropriate levels of text complexity; the demands for text complexity increase each year so students are ready for demands of college-and career-level reading no later than the end of high school. Multiple forms of authentic previously published and publishable quality texts are assessed including written, audio, visual, and graphic, as technology and assessment constraints permit.
  + Reading assessments consist of test questions or tasks, as appropriate, that demand that students read carefully and deeply and use specific evidence from increasingly complex texts to obtain and defend correct responses. Rationale and evidence for how text complexity is quantitatively and qualitatively measured to place each text at the appropriate grade level should be included.
  + The assessments require all students to demonstrate a range of higher-order, analytical thinking skills in reading and writing based on the depth and complexity of college- and career- ready standards, allowing robust information to be gathered for students with varied levels of achievement. Specifications demonstrating the distribution of cognitive demand for each grade level and content area should be provided.
  + The assessments emphasize writing tasks reflective of State standards that require students to engage in close reading and analysis of texts so that students can demonstrate college- and career-ready abilities. Writing tasks should balance expository, persuasive/argument, and narrative writing in response to text, as State standards require. At higher grade levels, the balance shifts toward more exposition and argument.
  + The assessments require students to demonstrate proficiency in the use of language, including vocabulary and conventions. Vocabulary should focus on general academic words, using context to determine meaning, and Conventions items should mirror real world activities.
  + The assessments require students to demonstrate research and inquiry skills, demonstrated by the ability to find, process, synthesize, organize, and use information from sources. Items should mirror real world activities.
  + The assessments should measure the speaking and listening communication skills students need for college and career readiness. A timeline for integrating speaking and listening is required. Provide a description of how these skills will initially be assessed and how, over time, and as the assessment advances allow, that may be further developed.
  + High-quality items and a variety of types are strategically used to appropriately assess the State standards. Provide exemplar items for each item type used in each grade band. For constructed response and performance tasks, a scoring plan (e.g., machine-scored, hand-scored, by whom, how trained), scoring rubrics and sample student work to confirm validity of the scoring process should be provided.
  + The assessments should measure the Media Literacy standards included in the State standards. These standards require students to analyze information found in electronic, print, and mass media.

Mathematics Requirements:

* Mathematics tests require appropriate levels of item complexity in keeping with Indiana's college-and-career readiness expectations.
* The assessments require all students to demonstrate a range of higher-order, analytical thinking skills in mathematics based on the depth and complexity of college- and career-ready standards, allowing data and information to be gathered for students at different achievement levels. Specifications demonstrating the distribution of cognitive demand for each grade level and content area should be provided.
* The assessment requires students to demonstrate fluency in computations, use of mathematics vocabulary, proficiency in reasoning, thinking skills, and real-world applications.
* High-quality items and a variety of item types (including technology enhanced items that target specific math skills such as graphing) are strategically used to appropriately assess the State standards. Provide exemplar items for each item type used in each grade band. For constructed response and extended response items, a scoring plan (e.g., machine-scored, hand-scored, by whom, how scorers are trained), scoring rubrics and sample student work to confirm validity of the scoring process should be provided.
* Necessary tools including online calculators, rulers, protractors, and reference sheets must be made available to students during assessments. Calculators must be able to be turned on or off based on test section, grade level, and user (preferably by item).
* Equation editor tools must be available to students for open-ended items. The equation editor must allow students to enter math equations and symbols as well as explanation of thought process (i.e., text).

The Respondent will be responsible for ensuring interoperability of computer-administered items, including multiple-choice and technology-enhanced items. The Respondent shall thoroughly discuss a plan for ensuring such interoperability. Any assumptions about transfer of responses from online to paper or vice versa due to system limitations must be explicitly noted in the proposal.

**(3j) Accessibility**

With the exception of students who are eligible to participate in the Alternate Assessment based on Alternate Achievement Standards (AA-AAS), all students in grades 3-8 are required to take the ILEARN assessments. Students with disabilities and English learners will take the assessments with appropriate accommodations. Respondents must provide a full list of all accessibility features, tools, supports and accommodations currently provided within the test delivery platform and those anticipated with a defined timeline for availability.

A description of calculators used as a tool or accommodation must be provided and indicated whether this can be provided based on item, user and/or test session. A graphic or demo of the calculator must be provided as a part of the proposal (e.g., scientific and graphing). Accessibility for some students includes calculators for use with math and science items. Calculators provided should be appropriate for the content and grade level of the student using them.

A description of text-to-speech used as a tool or accommodation must be provided and indicate whether this can be provided based on item, user, and/or test session. A description of the voice pack is required within the proposal. A graphic or demo of the text-to-speech must be provided as a part of the proposal.

Accommodated versions of the assessments (large print and Braille and paper-pencil) must be provided to support full access for eligible students with disabilities as an exception to participating in the adaptive assessment. Any transcription of student responses must occur by the respondent. A detailed description of this process is required as part of the proposal. A description of quality assurance steps for Braille production is required in the proposal.

Respondents must describe the process for collaborating with the Department on which tools, supports and accommodations will be utilized in the online platform. A brief description of respondent’s experience related to ensuring alignment to other client’s IEP systems is also requested. Any dependencies between the proposed assessment platform and the Department's IEP system (Indiana IEP Resource Center/IIEP System <https://www.indianaieprc.org/index.php/iiep-system>) must be delineated in the proposal.

Respondents must describe development of item specifications and items that align to best practices for accessibility including linguistic complexity. Examples of item specifications and items must be provided with the proposal with annotations that delineate the extent to which components of the items are made accessible to diverse student populations based on subpopulations defined by USED.

Respondents must provide a description of how non-embedded assistive technology devices that students utilize on a regular basis can be used during secure testing. Respondent must provide the functionality to track and capture a student's use of tool and accessibility features by item.

The respondent's system must allow for meaningful participation of English language learners (ELLs) in mathematics and science assessments. ELLs, as well as other students with a demonstrated need, must be provided with translation supports as stacked translations or alternate forms in Spanish, Arabic, Burmese, and Mandarin Chinese and may be requested in up to 1 additional IDOE approved language. The potential additional IDOE approved language may be Punjabi, Vietnamese, German, Hakha or Falam depending on the availability of resources and/or need for the language. It is a requirement that items will be developed, edited and revised in these languages. Languages offered must be defined in the respondent’s proposal. When available, the respondent's system will also provide translation supports, as relevant and appropriate to the constructs being measured in the assessment. In addition, the respondent's system should provide customer facing communication such as access to parent letters, and score reports in Spanish, English and the other IDOE requested languages. Respondents should describe their plan on to accomplish this requirement, if deficient.

Assessment items must be associated with metadata that describe any changes that will be made to the content, display, or input method necessary to provide appropriate accommodations to the student. Metadata must also include alignment, associated parameters, and accessibility information for each item. In addition, the overall approach must leverage the use of computer-based accessibility tools, supported by an item-tagging system that will control and ensure appropriate application of the tools.

IDOE is interested in acquiring a CAT system that is accessible to all students. Preference will be given to bids which demonstrate an innovative approach to accessibility which maximize the use of new technology in a cost efficient manner. Respondents should explain how their systems are or will be compliant with, have applied, or will apply as many of the following principles as possible:

* APIP standards compliance. See http://www.imsglobal.org/apip/index.html.
* PNP standards compliance. See http://www.imsglobal.org/accessibility/accpnpv2p0/spec/ISO\_ACCPNPinfoModelv2p0.html.
* US Rehabilitation Action Section 508, which requires that all website content be equally accessible to people with disabilities.
* Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.0, which will make content accessible to a wider range of people with disabilities, including blindness and low vision, deafness and hearing loss, learning disabilities, cognitive limitations, limited movement, speech disabilities, photosensitivity, and combinations of these.

Respondents must provide a full list of all accessibility features, tools, supports and accommodations currently provided within the test delivery platform and those anticipated with a defined timeline for availability.

**(3k) Development of Rubrics for Constructed-Response and Extended-Response Items**

Respondent is responsible for the development of rubrics for hand scored or automated scored items for newly developed items aligning to the Indiana Academic Standards. Rubrics must be reviewed and confirmed by IDOE if part of the current item bank. Rubrics used for Indiana-specific use require Department and educator approval.

The Respondent shall propose a strategy for incorporating educator expertise into the rubric development process for new items and shall propose a professional development strategy for using the rubrics in scoring of constructed-response and extended-response items to inform the emphasis for Indiana educators to be engaged in the scoring process.

**(3l) Operational Administration of ILEARN and IREAD-3**

General

The ILEARN assessments may be comprised of multiple-choice, multiple-select, and technology-enhanced items and constructed or extended response. The respondent may define other item types in their pool for consideration by the Department. The assessment will be administered in one test window at the end of the school year in late spring (e.g., April/May). ILEARN is administered during a testing window established by the IDOE Office of Student Assessment and ultimately approved by the Indiana State Board of Education.

The Respondent must assume and plan for exposure controls and testing in each successive year’s administration of ILEARN. The Respondent must provide a separate report to the IDOE on new items introduced in each test administration; this report must include item data analysis and recommendations, if any, for improvement of the items.

The ILEARN and IREAD-3 assessments administered by the Respondent must be available to all students, and the format of the assessments must enable both an online and paper-and-pencil mode. Large print and Braille versions of the assessments must also be made available. Specific accommodations and accessibility features that are part of the online administration must be delineated and discussed in the Respondent’s proposal including refreshable Braille functionality.

Schools will be required to assess online for ILEARN and IREAD-3. Paper and pencil exceptions will be managed by the Department. The Department will provide the list of exceptions to the respondent on an agreed date that follows an online computer capacity readiness assessment of the schools. Respondent must provide technical details to support the development of a comparable paper form.

The Respondent must deliver to the IDOE aggregate score reports and incorporate the cut scores into student, classroom, school, corporation and state-level reports of operational test results. The Respondent must deliver a system in which all score reports, both online and paper-and-pencil, are delivered in common formats to schools, such that scores are compiled and shared with schools in the same manner, regardless of the testing format selected. The IDOE requires an online system that generates printer-friendly reports (i.e., section or page breaks) at the student, classroom, school, corporation and state levels.

Test Security

The IDOE places great importance on test confidentiality, integrity and security. The

Respondent must propose specific security measures considered appropriate for operational administration of ILEARN. The Respondent should include a description of the following related to test security:

* The Respondent's procedures for reducing security threats and risks and protecting test materials and related data during item development, test construction, materials production, distribution, test administration and scoring;
* The Respondent's security features for storage of test materials and related data (i.e., items, tests, student responses, and results);
* The Respondent's rules and procedures for secure transfer of student-level assessment data in and out of the State's data management and reporting systems between authorized users (e.g. State, schools, and respondent);
* The Respondent's plan to conduct and provide reports and summaries of test security analysis to the State (including erasure analysis or changes from wrong to right).
* The Respondent's plan to adapt to individual districts' technology environment while maintaining testing security and integrity.

Test security violations and other breaches of test security can impact the fairness of testing. To ensure fairness of the administration of statewide assessments, the Respondent must describe in detail and demonstrate the process to secure items during test development, and assist the state and its test security staff in responding to and conducting investigations of material breaches of test security.

The Respondent shall describe in detail the steps that it would take to monitor the fidelity with which the test administration and security procedures are being applied. This shall include a plan for on-site monitoring of computer-based administrations if available, as well as the use of forms certifying that applicable test administration and security procedures were followed to be signed by all local school personnel who were involved with administering the exams. Additional electronic monitoring of security procedures may be included.

A material test security breach is anything that may compromise the integrity or validity of the test and/or its results. Security Breaches have external implications for the state and may result in a decision by the state to remove the affected test item(s) from the available secure item bank and/or to invalidate test scores materially impacted by the breach. Although a Security Breach can be caused by a violation of state test security and/or test administration rules, it may also result from a breach that occurred in another state’s assessment program, whereby a secure test item used in Indiana assessments was compromised as a result of a Security Breach in another state that used the same secure test item. The Successful Respondent must agree to report all Security Breaches to the state within 24 hours of receiving information about them.

The Respondent must design and implement a Scoring Reliability (auditing) system for the handscoring of items and budget for a reliability system that includes a representative sample of student responses.

Data Forensics Statistics:

The Selected Respondent’s test delivery, scoring, and other systems will capture and store appropriate test response data elements to ensure that many, if not all, of the detection statistics, detailed below in Table 1, may be run after each test administration:

**Table 1: Detection Statistics**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Possible test security breach | Detection statistics |
| Examinees who share answers, teachers or proctors who disclose the actual test questions, or proxy-test taking | Pairs or groups of tests that are extremely similar (i.e., large numbers of identical answers). |
| Illicit use of stolen test questions also known as “braindump” materials | Clusters of similar test instances and association counts for detecting membership in “gangs of cheaters.” |
| Test content that may have been exposed prior to giving the test | Counts of identical tests or perfect tests. Also, unusual score differences between previously published items and new “field test” items that have not been published before. |
| Examinees who may have been coached or received unauthorized assistance | Inconsistent response patterns as measured by response aberrance (e.g., answering difficult questions correctly and missing easy questions). Analysis of gain scores may also identify examinees who received unauthorized assistance. |
| Examinees who may have worked together and/or communicated with each other during the exam | Analysis of response time stamps when the tests are given by computer can determine whether a pair of examinees has worked in a synchronous manner. |
| Coaching of actual test content | Examinees with unusual gain scores (for detecting possible gains that are artificial). Requires prior year test scores or scores from other tests that correlate highly with the test results being analyzed. |
| Disclosure of actual test content by a teacher, instructor, or on the Internet | Inconsistent use of time in responding to items or answering questions in unusually short time intervals. The analysis is only available if the response times are collected (usually through computer-based testing [CBT]). |
| Inappropriate tampering of test materials, or inappropriate direction during testing. | High numbers of wrong-to-right erasures on paper and pencil tests. The analog for CBT is an analysis of answer changes from wrong to right. |

The Respondent will send results from each DF analysis to IDOE and TAC for review, recommendations, and approval to proceed. A tight turn-around is necessary to meet scoring and reporting deadlines following each administration of the tests. The Respondent will work with the IDOE to establish procedures for flagging identified scores with an invalidation status based on the analyses done following each administration.

After the last test administration each year, Respondent shall provide a detailed interpretative report that details the findings of school year’s data forensic analyses. This report will highlight and detail statistical irregularities in a manner that supports improvements for IDOE’s ongoing test security processes.

Web Monitoring:

The Selected Respondent will provide web monitoring services to help ensure that sensitive test information is not disclosed or at risk of disclosure through websites, peer-to-peer servers, social media, and other Online channels. Respondent will monitor English language websites and searchable discussion forums for the disclosure of IDOE’s protected test content and proxy testing solicitations, and will deliver weekly updates that detail the threats that have been identified and/or monitored. Each update will:

* Identify and classify each reported Internet risk as CLEARED, ELEVATED, OR SEVERE.
* Track changes in risk status;
* Report web traffic statistics for high-level risks (SEVERE)
* Create a cloud-based archive of verified SEVERE risks, with URLs and other mutually-agreed upon details of infringing content.

Web monitoring services will be provided for a six week period around each test administration window. It is anticipated that the monitoring will last one week prior to each administration, four weeks during the administration, and one week after each administration during every contract year.

Test Administration Platform

The administration platform is intuitive and easy for non-technical users to manage for ILEARN and IREAD-3. Full audit trace capacity is required. State users, corporation test coordinators, school test coordinators, proctors and student roles must be defined. The loading and maintenance of student data should be automated and "real time" connection to the state's STN system via API is preferred. Grouping and regrouping students for test administration sessions as well as the process of managing and monitoring the assessments should be flexible and easy to carry out.

Test Delivery Platform

The test delivery platform must provide a low-bandwidth solution for ILEARN and IREAD-3 and must have capacity to handle limited or intermittent internet connections during testing. Recovery from any interruption to student testing must occur without loss of any student responses and provide quick, simple and secure reentry to the test at the last point of interaction. Errors must be reported in plain English with clear directions for next steps to both students and test administrators. In the respondent’s response, the respondent must demonstrate, in writing, and through specific evidence, the capacity to support at least 150% of the maximum number (all students) of concurrent Indiana students testing.

A parallel testing site which provides the capacity to provide full end to end testing of school and district devices, configurations, access and network functionality will be available continuously, beginning no later than six months prior to the opening of the test window through the end of the testing window.

Online Administration

The Respondent must be responsible for all operational and support tasks associated with administering the online ILEARN and IREAD-3 test, including:

* 1. Design and development of the annual test administration cycle and schedule;
  2. Development and publication of web and print instructions, manuals, and other communications to schools, including web trainings and online tutorials;
  3. Publication of tests and scoring guides;
  4. Development of readiness test for completion by schools and corporations no less than three months prior to the administration window;
  5. Development of an online scheduling system for schools to select delivery formats that will include both testing formats accessible by state-, corp-, and school-level administration.
  6. Development of practice tests (an online set of items that allow students to become familiar with online testing and any tools needed by students) and general test preparation materials (including an item sampler that provides examples of all item types with content that students will see on the test);
  7. Development of public-facing interactive website with released or sample items beginning in May, 2018;
  8. Scoring of completed online tests, including handscoring of open-ended items and essays;
  9. Maintenance of or development of anchor sets and training materials for handscoring of the open-ended items and essays from the online and paper-and-pencil administrations;
  10. Development of plans for providing accommodations;
  11. Provide appropriate security arrangements for test content and test administration;
  12. Preparation and distribution of online reports for both testing formats to teachers, schools, corporations, other administrative reports as identified by IDOE, and the IDOE, with appropriate security arrangements to safeguard access to reports; the Respondent will need to incorporate the cut scores into these reports;
  13. Distribution of electronic communication necessary for registration, testing, reporting, and general dissemination of ILEARN and IREAD-3 information;
  14. Development of a plan for rescoring by parent or school administrator of hand scored items in cases where parents have made a request under IC 20-32-5.1-13(d) (2018);
  15. Provision of a technical report that includes information regarding administration, psychometrics, and summary data for ILEARN and IREAD-3.

The Respondent must provide a detailed description of the anticipated time requirements and steps that must be implemented at the local level for successful set-up and preparation for online testing (including but not limited to time requirements and steps in the months and weeks leading up to test administration as well as time and steps necessary at the local level on each testing day). The description should also include any steps the Respondent will implement to reduce administrative burden on schools. A sample school or corporation implementation checklist for implementation may be provided in the proposal to delineate these process steps.

All functions of the online system must be platform, operating system, and browser independent (device agnostic) for the administration of ILEARN and IREAD-3.The online system should be written in HTML 5, must be capable of running completely within the browser or application window, not requiring third-party add-ons such as Flash, etc., and must correctly render and function on any 8.9" display or larger.

Any proposed solution must address the currently supported technology platforms and operating systems as a starting point, and describe how the bandwidth, adopted devices and operating systems in schools and districts will be used to inform decisions around continued and expanded support for technology. Respondent must define maximum simultaneous load capacity during successfully delivered operational test administrations and anticipated load capacity that may be untested. Support for virtual machines must also be addressed.

Specific hardware requirements are noted in Table 1.

## Table 1: Current Hardware Requirements

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Specifications | Windows | OS X, macOS | Linux | iOS | Android | Chrome OS |
| Supported devices | Desktops Laptops Tablets | Desktops Laptops | Desktops Laptops | iPads | Tablets | Chromebooks Chromeboxes |
| Processor | x86/x32 and x64 | Intel-based™ | x86/x32 and x64 | any | any | any |
| Memory | Recommend 1 GB RAM  Minimum  512 MB RAM | Recommend 2 GB RAM Minimum 1 GB RAM | Recommend 2 GB RAM Minimum 1 GB RAM | Recommend 1 GB RAM  (iPad 3rd gen +) Minimum 512 MB RAM | Recommend 2 GB RAM Minimum 1 GB RAM | Recommend 4 GB RAM Minimum 2 GB RAM |
| Minimum screen size | 9.5-in | 9.5-in | 9.5-in | 9.5-in | 9.5-in | 9.5-in |
| Minimum screen resolution | 1024 x 768 | 1024 x 768 | 1024 x 768 | 1024 x 768 | 1024 x 768 | 1024 x 768 |
|  | |
| Current Supported OS | |
| Android 5.0 - 7.0 | |
| Chrome OS 50 - 57 | |
| iOS 9.3.2 - 9.3.5, 10.2, 10.2.1 | |
| Linux Fedora 24 (64-bit); Ubuntu 16.04 (64-bit) | |
| OS X: 10.9, 10.10, 10.11 | |
| Windows: 7, 8.1, 10 | |

Paper-and-Pencil Administration

The Respondent shall propose a plan for producing paper-based test forms as an exception to online forms for ILEARN and IREAD-3. Respondent should anticipate no more than 10% of students assessed on paper. The Indiana State Board of Education must delineate final policy for online assessment expectations across grade levels.

The Respondent will be responsible for all costs and management of operational and support tasks associated with administering the paper-and-pencil ILEARN and IREAD-3 test, including:

* 1. Design and development of the annual test administration cycle and schedule which may include a set of forms with a defined reuse policy;
  2. Development and publication of web and print instructions, manuals, and other communications to schools, including web trainings and online tutorials;
  3. Publication of tests and scoring guides;
  4. Development of an online scheduling system for schools to select delivery formats;
  5. Development and execution of a plan for the ordering, delivery, and pick-up of paper-and-pencil tests and materials at corporation or school;
  6. Development and publication of practice tests and general test preparation tools (including an item sampler that provides examples of the item types with content that students will see on the test);
  7. Maintenance of or development of anchor sets and training materials for hand scoring open-ended items and essays from the online and paper-and-pencil administrations;
  8. Development of plans for providing accommodations;
  9. Provide appropriate security arrangements for test content and test administration;
  10. Preparation and distribution of online reports to teachers, schools, corporations, other administrative reports as identified by IDOE, and the IDOE, with appropriate security arrangements to safeguard access to reports; the Respondent will need to incorporate the cut scores into these reports;
  11. Distribution of electronic communication necessary for registration, testing, reporting, and general dissemination of ILEARN information;
  12. Development of a plan for rescoring handscored items in cases where school administrators and/or parents and the Respondent disagree;
  13. Provision of a technical report that includes information regarding administration, psychometrics, and summary data for ILEARN. The technical report should address both paper and online administrations.

Operational Performance Standards for Acceptable Administration

All Testing

* Aggregate state-level reporting to the IDOE must be reported by June 15 for each academic year for ILEARN Spring administrations beginning in 2019-20.
* The Respondent must meet all stress and readiness system requirements no less than three months prior to delivering the online assessment with schools and corporations.
* Schools, corporations and the state must receive aggregated student test results by June 30 for ILEARN Spring administrations beginning in 2019-20.

Online Testing

* Students participating in the online assessment must achieve response times meeting current industry standards.

**(3m) Respondent Online System for Scheduling and Registration, Communication, and Reporting System**

The Respondent must provide an online system for ILEARN and IREAD-3 that:

1. allows corporations and schools to complete an online registration for all assessments;
2. allows the IDOE to deliver necessary electronic and paper communications to corporations and schools and school officials for purposes of online and paper-and-pencil tests, separately and combined;
3. provides an online reporting system for student, classroom, school, corporation, other administrative reports as identified by IDOE, and state-level data, as described previously in this RFP. This system must be available to schools, corporations and the State; and,
4. includes a consolidated help desk to assist corporations and schools with all facets of technology issues related to online testing, registration, and reporting. The help desk must also be prepared to assist with paper-and-pencil logistical issues. The help desk must also assist state users throughout the life of the contract that results from this RFP, LEA users Monday-Friday between the hours of 0800 and 1700 EST/EDT when summative testing is not being administered; and between the hours of 0600 and 2100 EST/EDT during the summative test administration windows, the IDOE by communicating on at least a weekly basis the issues fielded by the help desk, the IDOE by defining, with IDOE approval, the details of help desk support requirements, including acceptable hold times, response times, conflict resolution, etc. Specific training procedures and protocols utilized by the help desk will be communicated to the IDOE.
5. Allows filtering of student accommodations within a designed report to ensure fidelity of the test administration to subpopulations of students.

**(3n) Scoring and Reporting**

Reporting fully, accurately, and in a timely manner is critical for any assessment program. The Respondent shall produce a full range of traditional electronic reports at the student, classroom, school, and corporation levels as well as other administrative reports as identified by IDOE, available by pdf and/or bulk pdf export, and vendor delivery of printed student reports and labels. The Respondent shall supply each corporation (and each charter and nonpublic school) with an electronic copy of their data.

The ILEARN assessment should be administered annually as late as possible in the second half of each school year, yet at a time such that the reporting of its results is synchronized with the reporting of the ILEARN by July 1 following the 2020 administration. IREAD-3 results must be available within 4 weeks of the last test date for Spring window and on a rolling basis during the summer retest beginning within 2 weeks of the window start date.

Reports must also include a predictor on the scale of college and career readiness which may be derived as part of the proficiency level or defined as a separate indicator beginning at Grade 3. The establishment of a separate indicator or integration of a college and career readiness indicator should be discussed in the standard setting design submitted as part of this proposal.

Reporting categories established by the Department should be presented with an independent score to document strength or deficiency at that level of reporting. As an example, each student’s writing assessment score should be reported both as a separate score focused on the student’s writing ability and as a factor creating the total English/language arts score. The respondent must develop instructional next steps to include on the individual student report based on the performance level descriptor assigned to each student. The instructional next steps may include links to recommended resources or guidance about the content of activities that educators may use to elicit additional evidence. The instructional guidance may also be tied to specific reporting categories, but is not required at this level of reporting.

Each student’s ILEARN assessment score should be reported as a separate result focused on the student’s proficiency of the Indiana Academic Standards.

For all aspects of the end-of-year summative assessments, Respondents should identify their method of scoring the assessment and how it will produce relevant, timely, valid, reliable, and cost-effective results. The assessments must be scored uniformly across the state, with scoring that expects rigor. Respondent should submit a plan for scoring to include details about the items included in automated scoring and hand scored items. Quality assurance process steps must be defined. Respondent should submit a plan for recruitment and training of Indiana educators for scoring. Hand scored items should be distributed to Indiana educators during the test window and immediately following to expedite the return of results to schools. All preferences for scoring should be given to current Indiana educators. A plan to utilize educators must be submitted as well as considerations for recruitment and completion if the number of educators required is not attained. Training developed for scoring the content of the assessment should be developed as non-secure to be made available to all educators in Indiana for transparency of the scoring process. Respondent is required to develop videos and brief presentations to highlight assessment literacy strategies related to scoring. Respondent is required to develop and release annotated student responses in 2018-19 utilizing Indiana responses to demonstrate quality automated and hand scoring processes.

The end-of-year summative assessments must have the validity, reliability and other attributes adequate for use in the state’s accountability system of tracking student performance. The assessments must produce data, including student achievement data required under Title I of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and all applicable state laws, that can be used to validly inform the following: school effectiveness and improvement; individual principal and teacher effectiveness; individual student gains and performance; and other purposes defined by the State.

The results must be tracked by individual student’s STN, so that the results are both portable over geography (as the student moves from school to school or corporation to corporation) and available over time (as the student rises through grades K-12 to graduation and ultimately into post-secondary education).

The Respondent shall address turn-around time for results, including:

* + QA/cleanup process for demographic data associated with assessment scores
  + Delivery of student, class, school, corporation and state results
  + Timeline for required rescore process
  + Delivery of final electronic data to state to facilitate accountability determinations

The Respondent shall indicate how missing data will be handled.

The Respondent shall provide scale scores for all grade levels and content areas. In addition, the Respondent shall propose two options regarding scale scores for English/language arts. Respondents shall address providing a single, combined score for English/language arts versus providing both a combined ELA score and a stand-alone, valid and reliable score specific to reading. This information should address differences in the blueprint as well as any difference in testing time.

The Respondent shall delineate the psychometric “plan” for scoring and reporting, including any anticipated “special” technical reports and issues, including, but not limited to, the following:

* + Defining an Indiana scale
  + Anomalous student results: Will they be identified or flagged?

The Respondent shall provide results of the end-of-year summative assessments in order to display performance level categorical improvement. These data will be represented graphically, as well as in electronic form (i.e., GRT or flat file). This information will be displayed by teacher to assist in monitoring student progress.

A robust reporting system that meets the needs of all stakeholders and most importantly fosters the communication between parents, educators and students as well as contributes to improved instructional decisions is highly valued by Indiana. Preference will be given to respondents that provide a reporting system that goes beyond minimal requirements and provides innovative solutions to reporting needs and functions for parents and educators utilizing an online portal. Proposals shall describe the following reporting system requirements:

* Data review and correction, prior to, during, and following test administration
* Report security and control of access
* Transfer of return files
* Immediate electronic accessibility of reports for students, parents, and educators that may include mobile apps
* Provide translations or student supports in Spanish, Arabic, Burmese, Mandarin Chinese and may provide translations or student supports in up to one additional IDOE-defined language: Punjabi, Vietnamese, German, Hakha or Falam. If not currently available, timeline for integration must be addressed within the proposal.

Proposals must include details and samples of innovative reporting meeting the needs of parents and educators, which should include, at a minimum, proficiency, and sub-score information:

* State summary
* Corporation summary
* School summary
* Class summary
* Individual student results including actionable instructional next steps, reporting category information with references to depth of knowledge to demonstrate alignment; and
* Other administrative reports as identified by IDOE

Proposals must explain the features and capabilities of the reporting system, including but not limited to the following:

* Data in an exportable format for LEA use (e.g., upload to Corporations SIS)
* Customizability (e.g., headers, external data sets, format, analytics)
* Drill downs
* Aggregation and disaggregation
* Ability for Corporations (or other administrative entities as identified by IDOE) to export PDF copies of customizable reports for distribution to stakeholders (e.g., policy makers, educators, parents, and students)
* Users guides/interpretation information to assist report recipients in appropriately using and interpreting the report information
* Ability to store and report multi-year student-level data.
* Successful proposals may include the ability for LEAs to import unique data sets and create customizable reports.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

The Respondent must attend three TAC meetings on-site annually on behalf of the Department. The respondent will assume all costs associated with sending appropriate representatives from their organization to these annual meetings and have representatives available for phone conferences with the TAC upon request from the STATE. The Respondent will only be responsible for travel costs for their own staff’s participation in the meetings.

The Successful Respondent shall work with IDOE to plan and participate in Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meetings. The Successful Respondent is expected to provide clearly stated questions and supporting background materials three weeks prior for review by IDOE prior to the meetings. All psychometric processes, including test design, scaling, equating, standard setting, and validation procedures must go before the TAC for review and must receive IDOE approval.

**(3o) Rescores**

The Respondent must rescore hand scored items if requested by a parent or school administrator. If the student’s score changes as a result of the rescore, a revised student report and label must be provided and updated in the parent reporting portal. The Respondent must provide, at a minimum, a school-level report of rescores to local schools and corporations. A state summary must be provided to the IDOE.

The rescore application must include a confidentiality statement to protect secure items from being released publicly. The rescore site must have the capability of showing parents and administrators the item, associated student response and rubric. The proposal should include a minimum of three weeks for this rescore window.

**(3p) Pilot Testing**

Due to licensing, some items will be used on ILEARN without being piloted in Indiana. A plan must be documented for equating to ensure that the results during the first two administration cycles align to Indiana students. All pilot samples for new development must be statistically representative of Indiana students. Respondents must describe in detail the processes and procedures they recommend for pilot-testing items developed for Indiana-specific alignment. Respondents are invited to make their best proposal for administering pilot items in a manner that assures the reliability and validity of all items to be used in assessments, while minimizing to the extent possible the time required to pilot-test items. The Respondent shall identify any necessary piloting that would need to take place in Spring 2019 and delineate a plan for any piloting of items that may be necessary subsequent to Spring 2019.

**(3q) Item Analysis**

The Respondent shall be responsible for providing appropriate item statistics and item analyses once an item has been piloted.  Respondents are encouraged to propose analyses based on their experience and emerging statistical theory.  The IDOE reserves the right to require the Respondent to remove and replace any item with poor data, and provide updated reports to the corporation or school.

The Respondent shall engage in annual psychometric analysis of all assessment data. This analysis shall include: data cleaning, classical test theory and item analyses (e.g., p-values, point biserials, reliability analyses, classification analyses, raw score to scaled scores frequency distributions, etc.), Item Response Theory (IRT) analyses for calibrating and scaling the assessment data, analyses to support the use of a unidimensional IRT model, form equating across years, analysis of cross-year scale drift, fairness analyses and DIF, and establishing a new scale. Other analyses may include subgroup analysis, and comparisons to results from other states or national norms.

Data review meetings must be held annually with Indiana educators to review flagged items and ensure that the items can be used operationally with Indiana students. A design for these meetings may be established with the Department based on item licensure.

**(3r) Technical Analysis**

Respondents must ensure the reliability and validity of individual student scores. The technical analyses conducted by the Respondent for ILEARN must meet nationally recognized professional and technical standards, as established by the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing, published jointly by the American Educational Research Association, the American Psychological Association, and the National Council on Measurement in Education. All technical analyses and reports provided by the Respondent shall include appropriate cross-references to the relevant joint standards.

The Respondent shall include a section in the proposal showing evidence of experience identifying technical issues/problems and the subsequent solutions. This may include such things as scaling, equating, test construction, scoring drifts, etc.

Following each test administration, the respondent will conduct appropriate analyses using a combination of classical test theory and item response theory (IRT) to generate initial parameters for the field test items and updated parameters for the core (scored) items. The secure item bank will be updated, and an item bank inventory will be provided to the state on an annual basis.

Item data from the operational assessment must include appropriate IRT item and task parameters (the 3PL model has been used in IN) model fit, distractor analysis, bias/sensitivity analysis, and differential item functioning (DIF) statistics. For the test bias/sensitivity review, either an IRT model or Mantel-Haenszel and other similar statistics, depending on sample size, can be used. The Respondent shall describe its plan for providing each of these item data components and the method to be used for calculations. The proposal shall also describe its approach to item calibration, including its approach to parameter estimation. The Respondent should not employ any proprietary or third party software for this but use commercially available analysis software or open source code used to conduct the analysis so that the estimates can be replicated by others.

The Respondent must provide the state with all appropriate test statistics and information including test information functions, differential test function information, and validity and reliability measures from the field test. Examination of performance task data from the pilot tests and operational assessment must include reliability information, percentages of students in categories, materials used during review, and any other relevant information.

The Respondent will need to establish model fit and individual score reliability for the selected scaling procedure. The Respondent shall identify advantages and potential disadvantages of its proposed scaling procedure within its description. Proposals shall indicate which statistics will be used to establish model fit, student-level score reliability, and the success of various item type score combination methods in maintaining the desired score results across years. If the Respondent deems a different methodology is available that is more suitable for use with the data, they will provide a comparability study to the state before being allowed to make any changes to the analytics.

The respondent will use appropriate statistical procedures to accurately equate the tests and produce raw score to scale score conversion tables. These tables and supporting documentation must be provided to the state for review and approval.

The Respondent will conduct bias, reliability, validity, usefulness studies and include the data from those studies in the technical reports submitted to the state. Validity studies and supporting psychometric analyses should be conducted annually and ongoing. Issues that IN may need to address include validity of test scores, linking to previous assessment results, alignment studies, validity of inferences regarding school and district wide performance; validity of inferences pertaining to student preparation for CCR or post-secondary training/employment, etc.

The Respondent shall provide its plan for conducting the studies necessary to meet all technical requirements of the U.S. Department of Education’s (ED’s) *Standards and Assessment Peer Review Guidance,* especially Sections 3 (Validity) and 4, (Technical Quality). The Respondent must describe its plan for providing the best and most cost effective studies for meeting this requirement. Included in these studies, the Respondent shall describe in detail how it will conduct studies to verify and support the validity of interpretations drawn from test scores. The Respondent shall also propose its strategy for developing studies that investigate the intended and unintended consequences of the state assessment components. The Respondent shall indicate how the studies will support the IDOE’s response to each element of the Peer Review Guidance.

**(3s) Scaling and Equating**

For all elements of ILEARN, the Respondent shall be responsible for proposing psychometric methods for equating and linking test forms. Total test scores shall be equated and raw scores converted to scale scores. The Respondent must provide test results based on pattern scoring.

The Respondent shall propose a detailed plan for building the necessary links for equating from form to form, specify procedures for estimating equating error across years, and propose a system for checking on scale drift. The proposed equating methodology shall be clearly described in the Respondent’s proposal. The Respondent is encouraged to propose alternative equating designs and timelines for establishing equated test forms. For each equating design proposed, the Respondent will provide advantages and disadvantages and make a recommendation for the use of one equating design over the other(s).

The Department expects pre-equating to ensure the quick delivery of student reports. Any exceptions to this design must be fully discussed in the proposal.

**(3t) Validity**

The Respondent shall be responsible for establishing and documenting evidence of the validity of test scores from ILEARN. Evidence of validity shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following:

a. Evidence that subject matter experts have determined that items and test

forms represent an adequate sample of the content frameworks;

* 1. Documentation of the rationale for the relative emphasis assigned to particular standards;
  2. Evidence that test item formats measure the intended content rather than some other construct;
  3. Evidence of the interrelationship among “standard” scores;
  4. Evidence that items were chosen on the basis of the test blueprint; and
  5. Evidence that alternate forms of each test cover the same content.

**(3u) Reliability**

The Respondent will be responsible for establishing and documenting evidence of the reliability of test scores for ILEARN and IREAD-3. Evidence of test score reliability shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, internal consistency of total scores and sub-scores and standard error of measurement.

The Respondent shall propose a detailed plan for how it expects to complete all work associated with this task, including descriptions of designs of reliability studies, plans for conducting proposed studies, timelines, analyses to be conducted, statistics and reports to be provided, and the supporting rationale for the proposed design(s). This plan and associated work will be subject to negotiation and approval by the IDOE.

**(3v) Alignment Studies**

Under the supervision of the IDOE, the Respondent shall conduct alignment studies, as appropriate and necessary utilizing a third-party respondent approved by the Department. The Respondent shall be responsible for all costs of materials and staff support necessary to conduct such studies, complete appropriate analyses, and document the results in a comprehensive report. The IDOE may specify independent consultants to be used as independent facilitators for the alignment studies.

**(3w) Technical Reports**

The Respondent shall prepare a technical report after each year’s administration. The report should include statistical characteristics of assessment instruments (e.g., validity, reliability); design and results of equating and linking; interpretations of assessment results (including analytics that provide student performance data based on variables, including, but not limited to all ESSA subgroups and other information as requested. The final report will be subject to approval by the IDOE and the Technical Advisory Committee.

**(3x) Comparability Studies**

The Respondent shall conduct and report a fullcomparability study each time any portion of ILEARN is delivered in more than one mode during an operational administration. Results of such a study must include the impact (if any) of different modes of testing, and the Respondent must recommend to the IDOE any adjustments to scaling and/or equating that may be required.

**(3y) Scoring Reliability Study**

The Respondent shall double-score at least 10% of the handscored items, during scoring of the online and paper-and-pencil test administrations. ECA retests may require 100% rescore to expedite reporting for graduation following the Spring retest window. Scoring proposals using automated scoring must be detailed related to the proposed item types, but will be considered. The Respondent must define rescore samples, perform rescore studies, and generate reports of representative samples for all operational assessments. The Respondent must also check for drift of scores by using pre-scored samples at specified intervals.

**(3z) Standards (Cut Score) Setting**

Under the supervision of the IDOE, the Respondent shall design and conduct standards setting studies, as appropriate and necessary. The Respondent shall describe the standards settings that are needed and provide details regarding rationale and timing. The Respondent shall be responsible for all costs of materials and staff support necessary to conduct the studies, complete appropriate analyses, and document the results in a comprehensive report. The IDOE will recruit panelists to serve on the Standards Setting committees.

Indiana-specific cut scores are required regardless of the proposed item bank. The proposal shall include a detailed description of the process to be used to establish standards and performance level descriptors given the complexity of the computer adaptive model. The plan should include but not be limited to the following:

* Details for all proposed meetings and workshops, including timelines, participants, and psychometric services assuming nominations and initial recruitment is completed by IDOE
* Proposed methodologies and justification for selection
* Formalization of performance level descriptors collaboratively with the Department
* Details and examples of proposed standards structure and reporting

The Respondent shall work collaboratively with the state to develop preliminary threshold achievement level descriptors (ALDs). The preliminary threshold ALDs will inform the remaining standard setting activities by describing the specific knowledge, skills, and processes that students just entering each achievement level will demonstrate.

The Respondent will design and implement a standard setting workshop with Indiana educators. The state prefers an item-mapping procedure; however, other technically sound standard setting methodologies will be considered. The Respondent’s standard setting process must be framed around the threshold achievement level descriptors. The standard setting design must consider the vertical articulation of recommended cut points across grade levels. The Respondent will present plans for a full standard setting and for a cut score review, including the potential advantages and disadvantages of each. The Respondent’s plan must allow for the revision of the threshold ALDs given the final recommended cut points.

Following standard setting, the Respondent will present IDOE with recommended cut points and impact data, along with suggested revisions to threshold achievement level descriptors. Additionally, the Respondent will develop a technical report of the standard setting that describes the implementation of the standard setting workshop. The Respondent will provide IDOE with an initial draft of the technical report within 30 days of the workshop. The Respondent will provide IDOE with a final technical report within 10 calendar days of receiving state feedback on the initial technical report. The Respondent’s standard setting technical report must meet the recommendations of the current APA/AERA/NCME Standards, as well as U.S. Department of Education Peer Review Guidelines. The standard setting workshop technical report must be provided to IDOE as a standalone document in Adobe PDF format.

**(3aa) Quality Control**

The Respondent is responsible for maintaining high quality control over all testing items, data entry, and processing. Key personnel must be assigned for quality assurance practices. Current quality control and assurance methodologies utilized by the respondent must be defined. Key processes include item development, production, scoring and reporting, data analysis, test delivery.

The fundamental purpose of IDOE is to provide accurate information on student achievement. The respondent will utilize every means required to ensure that information created by the project is correct. The Respondent is responsible for correcting any errors arising from activities that are the responsibility of the Respondent at the Respondent’s expense. This may involve activities such as conducting analyses to identify the cause and extent of errors; reprinting or reproducing products or other materials; replacing files; reproducing reports; shipping replacement products or reports to state or districts using expedited shipping services; and communicating directly with school districts as to the nature and extent of the error, upon approval from the state.

IDOE expects that all products developed and used under this contract will be defect-free. Errors in materials or quality assurance, failures in development, administration, scoring or reporting for any assessment component will not be tolerated. The term “defect” includes, but is not limited to, inaccuracies in grammar, content, format, or directions in any printed or online material or posted materials. The standard for the error rate on all test-related information provided by the respondent is zero (0.0%).

Risk Management and Quality Assurance**.**

Respondents shall specifically address timeline issues, risks, and mitigation and contingency plans for all aspects of the project. These plans should refer to more than just “communication.” Additional details may be provided in the response to relevant requirements and specifications.

The Respondent should highlight its and its proposed subcontractors proven ability to document and enact risk management strategies – especially as they relate to the development, production, shipping and receipt, administration (online assessments), scoring, data processing, reporting, and psychometric activities for high-stakes assessments.

The Respondent should submit sample Risk Assessment documentation used in an existing program to demonstrate the comprehensiveness of its ability to conduct contingency planning for a variety of conditions. This Risk Assessment documentation may be submitted as an attachment to the proposal. This documentation should also highlight internal procedures and protocols for quality assurance in all aspects of delivering large-scale, statewide assessments – including test development, production, shipping and receipt, administration (of paper-based and online assessments), scanning, scoring, data processing, and reporting.

The respondent will ensure that all data operations are subject to multiple QA checks for accuracy before results are released. The respondent should include in the proposal a full and complete description of its QC procedures for IDOE review. The respondent will develop and implement QC procedures for checking the accuracy of all test item information, all student scores and identification, and all summary data.

The respondent will create detail logs that trace the application of QC procedures to the state score reports after each administration. Respondent is responsible for maintaining quality products and services in all aspects of both assessment programs from initial development of items to the production of electronic data files and score reports.

The Successful Respondent must plan and prepare QA schedules that will allow work to flow in a timely, effective manner while maintaining high quality deliverables. IDOE must review and approve the QA schedules annually. The Respondent shall indicate how it proposes to do this.

The respondent will provide the state with a report that summarizes any problems noted in the completed and returned scorable data files. The report will detail any error/problem/discrepancy by district and by school. This report will allow the state to detect any patterns in the errors, problems, and/or discrepancies noted in the report, to use that information to clarify instructions in the district/school test coordinator guides, and to focus and improve the training provided at district test coordinator training sessions.

The respondent will retain student response files documents for possible re-scoring for a designated period agreed upon by the respondent and the IDOE.

The respondent will immediately notify the state when an item error, scoring error, or reporting error is discovered. The respondent and IDOE will develop a plan for correcting the error. The plan will include a description of how timely and forthright information will be communicated to all affected stakeholders. The Respondent shall indicate how it proposes to do this.

**(3ab) Professional Development**

The Respondent should identify how it will provide training for corporation and school personnel on how to use the assessment, the scoring process and any scoring rubrics, interpretation of results, and how to make any needed adjustments to instruction.

**(3ac) Adaptive Algorithms**

Following each operational administration, the respondent will provide all material and documentation necessary for IDOE to fully replicate the algorithms used for delivery of the computer adaptive tests. Evidence of alignment to the provided simulations for each test cycle are required.

**(3ad) Assessment Literacy**

The respondent should supply a comprehensive communications plan that delineates a strategy for outreach to all Indiana schools and relevant personnel. The plan should include messaging strategy, tactics, deliverables and a timeline for communicating with all necessary personnel in Indiana schools. Key deliverables for assessment literacy include: educator-facing blueprint and specifications, guide to test interpretation supporting data and reporting, webinars for the transition to the new assessment system during 2017-18, short video clips highlighting key changes within the assessment during 2017-18, and webinars detailing how to utilize data from the assessment for instruction.