



INDIANA  
DEPARTMENT of  
EDUCATION

# Exit Criteria for English Learners Guidance:

---

## 2026-2027

**Indiana Department of Education**  
Office of English Learners and  
Migrant Education



*Published April 2026*

[in.gov/doe](https://in.gov/doe)

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Indiana English Learner Exit Criteria Defined</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Making English Learner Exit Determinations</b>	<b>4</b>
Eligible Students for Additional Evidence Review	4
Overview of Required Additional Evidence to Determine Proficiency for WIDA ACCESS	5
Overview of Required Additional Evidence to Determine Proficiency for Alternate ACCESS	6
Timeline and Action Steps for Making Exit Determinations	6
End-of-School-Year Exit Determination Considerations	7
Beginning-of-School Year Exit Determination Considerations	8
<b>Compiling Allowable Additional Evidence</b>	<b>8</b>
Allowable Additional Evidence for WIDA ACCESS	9
Allowable Additional Evidence for WIDA Alternate ACCESS	11
Requirements for Selecting Appropriate Evidence	12
<b>Assembling the ILP Committee</b>	<b>13</b>
ILP Committee Members & Decision-Making Process	13
English Learners with Disabilities Factors	14
<b>ILP Committee Steps to Perform an Additional Evidence Review</b>	<b>15</b>
Guiding Questions when Reviewing Individual Pieces of Evidence	16
Guiding Questions for Making an Exit Determination	17
<b>Data Reporting and Documentation</b>	<b>17</b>
ILP Committee Decision-Making Tools	18
Additional Evidence Review Student Verification Submission	18
Accurate Reporting of Exited Students to IDOE via Data Exchange	18
Local Student Information Systems (SIS)	19
IDOE Special Programs Documentation	20
Determinations to Continue EL Services	20
<b>Formal Two-year Monitoring of Exited ELs</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Compliance Monitoring</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Appendix A: ILP Committee Decision-Making Tool for WIDA ACCESS</b>	<b>22</b>
Guiding Questions for Additional Evidence Review	23
ILP Committee Decision-Making Tool (WIDA ACCESS)	24
<b>Appendix B: ILP Committee Decision-Making Tool for WIDA Alternate ACCESS</b>	<b>26</b>
Guiding Questions for Additional Evidence Review	27
ILP Committee Decision-Making Tool (WIDA Alternate ACCESS)	28
<b>Appendix C: Formative Assessment Benchmarks</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Appendix D: Exemplary Decision-Making Tools</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Appendix E: Frequently Requested Revisions</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Change Log</b>	<b>35</b>

# Indiana English Learner Exit Criteria Defined

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as reauthorized by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), requires that states establish “standardized, statewide entrance and exit procedures” for determining students’ English learner (EL) status, thus placing them in a language instruction educational program. These procedures are detailed in each state’s ESSA plan. In the summer of 2024, the U.S. Department of Education approved an amendment to Indiana’s State ESSA Plan which expanded the state’s standardized exit criteria for English learners. The updated language is as follows:

*“An English learner is considered to have demonstrated English language proficiency if the English learner scores a 5.0 overall or higher on the annual WIDA ACCESS assessment. However, students in grade three or above who score between 4.3-4.9 overall on WIDA ACCESS are eligible to have additional evidence reviewed by an Individual Learning Plan (ILP) committee to make an exit determination. Additionally, English learner students with significant disabilities who take Alternate ACCESS as their annual assessment may demonstrate proficiency by scoring a P1 overall (or equivalent proficiency level post-standard setting) and an additional evidence review by an ILP committee and case conference committee.”*

Previously, only an Overall Composite Proficiency Level (Overall PL) of 5.0 or above on WIDA ACCESS would exit a student from EL status, and no pathway existed for Alternate ACCESS testers to exit. The revised, expanded exit criteria will lead to more students reaching proficiency—as shown by results on WIDA assessments, paired with additional academic evidence—and succeeding in English-taught classes without additional language-based services or support.

The table below provides a summary of the exit criteria for ELs:

<b>WIDA ACCESS Overall Score Range</b>	<b>Exit Criteria Details</b>
5.0+ Overall Proficiency	Auto-exit from EL status
4.3 - 4.9 Overall Proficiency	Students may be eligible for a review of a portfolio of additional evidence by an ILP committee to make an exit determination. If the student has an Individualized Education Program (IEP), the case conference committee may convene alongside the ILP committee to make an exit determination.
<b>WIDA Alternate ACCESS Overall Score Range</b>	<b>Exit Criteria Details</b>
Alternate PL 4 +*	Students may be eligible for a review of a portfolio of additional evidence by an ILP committee alongside a case conference committee to make an exit determination.

*\*The ESSA State Plan cites “P1 overall (or equivalent proficiency level post-standard setting).” After a review of the 2023-2024 Alternate ACCESS results and WIDA’s concordance tables, this equivalent proficiency level was determined to be at Alternate PL 4.*

It is important to note that Indiana’s entrance criteria of an Overall PL of 1.0 to 4.9 on a WIDA Screener assessment remains unchanged. See Indiana’s [EL Identification and Placement Guidance Document](#) and chapter two of the [IDOE English Learner Guidebook](#) for detailed information on required procedures for identification of ELs.

This document serves as the official guide for Indiana schools in applying the updated exit criteria and making critical determinations regarding a student’s EL status. All Indiana schools are expected to implement this guidance to meet the federal requirements of procedures being statewide and standardized. **Schools are required to submit documentation for each student exited via additional evidence review to IDOE and receive approval before a student can be formally removed from EL status and services.**

## Making English Learner Exit Determinations

---

### Eligible Students for Additional Evidence Review

To be eligible for an additional evidence review by an ILP committee, the student must be in **grade three or above** when taking the WIDA ACCESS or Alternate ACCESS assessment that initiates the additional evidence review. For example, a student in grade three who takes WIDA ACCESS in the 2025-2026 school year may have the results of the 2026 WIDA ACCESS initiate a portfolio review. However, a student in grade three at the beginning of the 2026-2027 school year may not have their 2026 results initiate a portfolio review, because the student was in grade two when assessed. For that example, the school must wait and then analyze the 2027 results. Students who score an Overall PL of 5.0 or above on WIDA ACCESS automatically exit EL status regardless of grade level.

Additionally, for students taking WIDA ACCESS, only students whose **Overall PL represents scores from a Tier B/C assessment** are eligible for an additional evidence review. The student is not eligible if they were administered ACCESS Paper Tier A or placed in Tier A for ACCESS Online Speaking or Writing, as determined by their performance in Listening and Reading.

Newly enrolling students from outside Indiana who hold WIDA ACCESS or Alternate ACCESS results from the previous school year are not eligible for an additional evidence review by an ILP committee. If a student enrolls with WIDA results that meet Indiana’s EL entrance criteria (1.0-4.9 Overall PL), they must receive EL services and participate in the annual WIDA assessment as required. The results of the annual WIDA assessment taken in Indiana can then be used for making exit determinations. In the case of an additional evidence review, the historical evidence from the past state can inform the ILP committee’s decision-making.

## Overview of Required Additional Evidence to Determine Proficiency - WIDA ACCESS

The [Compiling Allowable Additional Evidence](#) section of this document provides detailed guidance surrounding selecting allowable, appropriate evidence alongside WIDA ACCESS results to demonstrate proficiency. This section provides a general overview of what is permitted.

Additional evidence reviews for eligible students who take WIDA ACCESS must include, at minimum, three total pieces of evidence in the student's portfolio which sufficiently demonstrate that the student is proficient in English. The three pieces of evidence must include the following:

- 1) At least **one** of the following pieces of current evidence (and longitudinal when applicable) from **Category A**:
  - Scoring **at least “Approaching Proficiency”** on the most recent ILEARN English/Language Arts (ELA) assessment\*, meaning students entering grade four are the youngest students for whom this decision can be made;
  - **NEW:** Scoring **at least “Approaching Proficiency”** on at least two of the three most recent ILEARN English/Language Arts (ELA) Checkpoints;
  - Passing the IREAD-3 assessment in grade two or three (allowable for students entering grade four only);
  - Meeting graduation requirements for the SAT, ACT, or ASVAB assessment; or
  - Possessing formative (interim) assessment results (e.g., NWEA, mCLASS, PSAT) demonstrating the student is proficient in English and performing similarly to their native English-speaking peers (i.e., reading results are consistent with grade-level norms or expectations).

**\*Note:** 2026 ILEARN ELA results will not be available until after the Summer 2026 Standard Setting process. ILP committees should use ILEARN Checkpoints for Category A evidence when applicable. See the [Compiling Allowable Additional Evidence](#) section for more information.

- 2) At least **one** of the following pieces of current evidence (and longitudinal when applicable) from **Category B**:
  - Local summative assessment results indicating proficiency;
  - Overall student grades/academic performance (with an assurance of fair and consistent grading practices); or
  - EL teacher or classroom teacher observations and/or student work samples that apply WIDA-developed language proficiency rubrics (WIDA Proficiency Level Descriptors, [WIDA Writing Rubric](#), [WIDA Speaking Rubric](#)).
- 3) A third piece of evidence from either **Category A or Category B** that demonstrates the student's English proficiency is also required.

## Overview of Required Additional Evidence to Determine Proficiency - WIDA Alternate ACCESS

The [Compiling Allowable Additional Evidence](#) section of this document provides detailed guidance surrounding selecting allowable, appropriate evidence alongside WIDA Alternate ACCESS results to demonstrate proficiency. This section provides a general overview of what is permitted.

Additional evidence reviews for eligible students taking Alternate ACCESS must include, at minimum, three total pieces of evidence in the student’s portfolio which sufficiently demonstrate that the student is proficient in English. Schools may select from the following evidence:

- Scoring “**Approaching Proficiency**” or higher on the most recent I AM ELA assessment
- Overall student academic performance on grade level [Content Connectors](#)
- Completion of IEP goals centered on language and/or literacy
- EL, Special Education, or classroom teacher observations and/or student work samples that apply WIDA-developed Alternate language proficiency tools ([WIDA Alternate Proficiency Level Descriptors](#) and/or [Alternate Can Do Descriptors](#))
- Local summative or formative assessments indicating English proficiency

### Timeline and Action Steps for Making Exit Determinations

The additional evidence review and decision-making process requires intentional time and effort dedicated to coordinating the ILP committee, assembling the required pieces of evidence, and making a thorough, informed decision that is in the best interest of the student. To allow schools flexibility in completing the necessary steps to make this determination, IDOE has defined a lengthy timeframe when ILP committees can convene after receiving annual WIDA assessment results. This window begins at the end of a school year after receiving WIDA results and lasts into the first 30 days of the beginning of the next school year. The table below details the action steps to complete an additional evidence review and make an exit determination. Below the table are key considerations for deciding when to hold exit determination ILP committee meetings.

<b>Action Steps for Making Exit Determinations</b>	
1.	Preliminarily identify students who are nearing English proficiency and demonstrating academic achievement. Preemptively collect and organize eligible additional evidence samples.
2.	Review WIDA results and identify eligible students whose Overall Proficiency falls within the eligible score range of 4.3-4.9 for ACCESS, or Overall PL 4 or above on Alternate ACCESS.

3. Review potential portfolio evidence to identify which students are eligible for an additional evidence review by an ILP committee.
4. Coordinate with students' past teachers to receive input and additional evidence. Review these results to inform student's eligibility and if ILP committee meetings are warranted.
5. Schedule ILP committee meetings and compile additional evidence for review. Convene alongside the case conference committee, if applicable.
6. Hold ILP committee meetings, following the <a href="#">ILP Committee Steps to Perform an Additional Evidence Review</a> section of this guidance.
7. Submit the completed Decision-Making Tool to IDOE for review prior to <b>August 21, 2026</b> .
8. After receiving the results of the IDOE review, accurately document the decision-making by following the <a href="#">Data Reporting &amp; Documentation</a> section of this guidance.

### End-of-School-Year Exit Determination Considerations

When making an exit determination at the end of the school year, the following are factors that should be taken into consideration:

- **Timing:** The window of time after WIDA ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS results are released in the spring and the end of the school year is relatively brief. Therefore, it is important to proactively set aside time to compile evidence, convene the ILP committee, and make determinations prior to summer break. It is recommended to preemptively schedule blocks of time for possible ILP committee meetings at the end of the school year before receiving WIDA results.
  - **2026 WIDA Standard Setting:** Beginning in July 2026, WIDA will implement new proficiency level expectations informed by the upcoming standards-setting process. As a result, some students' proficiency levels may shift once those updates take effect. However, the Additional Evidence Review window will continue to operate as currently established, using the proficiency information available in WIDA AMS at the time of review. If any student's updated proficiency level falls outside the eligibility criteria outlined in this document, IDOE will communicate directly with LEAs to provide next steps or clarification. Otherwise, schools should proceed with the Additional Evidence Review process as planned.
  - **ILEARN Summer 2026 Standard Setting:** During the summer, the ILEARN ELA assessment will undergo a standard-setting process as well. As a result, 2026 ILEARN ELA results may not be available during the Additional Evidence Review window. In response, ILEARN Checkpoints have been recategorized to serve as Category A evidence. To meet the benchmark, **at least two of the three** most

recent ILEARN ELA Checkpoints must reflect performance at or above “Approaching Proficiency”. Prior year ILEARN ELA scores may not be used.

- **School Transitions:** If the ILP committee opts to wait until the end of the additional evidence window to conduct a review, it is important for the decision to delay the review be documented and proactively communicated to the next EL ToR and/or next school. Documentation, including any portfolio evidence and a summary of the decision to wait for additional results, must be sent to that school, and the ILP committee would convene at the beginning of the next school year to make a determination.

## Beginning-of-School Year Exit Determination Considerations

When making an exit determination near the beginning of the school year, the following are factors that should be taken into consideration:

- **Coordinating with Past Teachers:** It will likely be necessary to coordinate with the student’s previous school year EL ToR, at the least, to receive input and acquire eligible evidence. The past EL ToR may also participate as a member of the ILP committee to inform decision-making. The student’s previous school year classroom teacher(s) are also able to provide anecdotal input and/or evidence to be taken into consideration for review. This may require effort in determining past school and teacher contact information and making that connection. It is recommended to make direct outreach to the district or school’s EL office, if possible.
- **30-Day Identification Window:** Per ESSA, schools must “not later than 30 days after the beginning of the school year, inform parents of an English learner identified for participation or participating in such a program...”. Because of this 30-day parent communication window, and the time needed to submit Decision-Making Tools for IDOE to review and provide feedback, schools must complete the ILP committee decision-making process by **Friday, August 21, 2026**. Schools may choose to initiate the action steps for a beginning-of-year additional evidence review prior to the start of the school year and the 30-day window opening.

## Compiling Allowable Additional Evidence

---

The purpose of the portfolio of additional evidence is to capture a comprehensive, well-rounded picture of a student’s English proficiency as demonstrated through their academic work and performance. This portfolio serves to supplement WIDA ACCESS or WIDA Alternate ACCESS results, providing further insight into the student’s current level of English proficiency in the four language domains. By including a range of student work—such as other standardized assessment scores, academic performance, work samples, teacher observations, etc.—the portfolio allows ILP committees to evaluate language skills within academic contexts and determine students’ readiness to exit EL services.

## Allowable Additional Evidence for WIDA ACCESS

The portfolio of additional evidence for students taking ACCESS must consist of at least three required evidence pieces: one from Category A, one from Category B, and a third from either category. Allowable evidence and the parameters of their use in this process are detailed in the tables below. Please note that historical WIDA ACCESS results cannot be used as additional evidence.

### Category A Options

Evidence	Required Score	Evidence Parameters
<b>NEW:</b> ILEARN ELA Checkpoints (most recent results)	Approaching proficiency or higher on two out of three checkpoints	Students exiting grade three and entering grade four at the beginning of a school year are the youngest for whom this evidence can be utilized.
ILEARN ELA (most recent results)	Approaching Proficiency or higher	<p>Students exiting grade three and entering grade four at the beginning of a school year are the youngest for whom this evidence can be utilized.</p> <p>Grade eight ILEARN ELA results may be used for students throughout high school.</p> <p><i>*Note: 2026 ILEARN ELA results will not be available until after the Summer 2026 Standard Setting process. ILP committees should use ILEARN Checkpoints for Category A evidence when applicable. Prior year ILEARN ELA scores may not be used.</i></p>
IREAD-3	Pass	<p>IREAD-3 Pass results obtained in grade two can be used for a student who did not have to participate again in grade three.</p> <p>Results from the grade two or grade three administrations may be used for students exiting grade three and entering grade four. Students exiting grade four or higher may not use IREAD-3 scores; use ILEARN ELA results or Checkpoints instead.</p> <p>Retest opportunities in grades four and five may not be used; use ILEARN ELA results or Checkpoints instead.</p> <p>Initial IREAD-3 assessment results for students who move into Indiana in grades four through six and are taking IREAD for the first time may not be used; use ILEARN ELA results or Checkpoints</p>

		instead.
<p>Formative (interim) English language arts assessment results (i.e., NWEA, mClass, PSAT)</p> <p><b>Note:</b> For Category A, formative assessments are standardized, vendor-developed tools that provide normed, reliable, and grade-level benchmarked information about a student's reading and language proficiency.</p>	<p>Results demonstrate the student is proficient in English and performing similarly to their native English-speaking peers (i.e., reading results are consistent with grade-level norms and expectations).</p>	<p>Must be from the current school year and reflect recent results.</p> <p>See the reading and language-based assessments from the <a href="#">IDOE Formative Assessment Grant</a> approved list for examples of usable assessments and <a href="#">Appendix C</a> to access grade-level benchmarks.</p> <p><i>Schools may use additional formative assessments as appropriate, provided they meet the criteria for demonstrating English language proficiency and grade-level academic readiness. However, if benchmarks for an assessment are not provided in this guidance, a student score report must be included with the completed Decision-Making Tool submission for IDOE review to identify the skills being assessed, outline the scoring structure, and provide sufficient context to establish grade-level expectations.</i></p>
SAT/ACT/ASVAB	<p>SAT: <a href="#">Approaching or At College Ready Benchmark</a> - a score of 450 or higher on the Evidence Based Reading and Writing portion</p> <p>ACT ELA: 20 or higher                  ACT English: 18 or higher                  ASVAB: 31 or higher</p>	

**Category B Options**

Evidence	Required Score	Evidence Parameters
<p>Local <b>summative assessment</b> results</p> <p><b>Note:</b> For Category B, local summative assessment results include measures such as curricular assessments, locally-developed benchmark exams, and common formative assessments.</p>	<p>Results demonstrate the student is proficient in English and performing similarly to their native English-speaking peers (i.e., reading results are consistent with grade-level expectations).</p>	<p>Assessment results must be from the same school year as the ACCESS results which caused the review.</p> <p>Allowable evidence under this category also includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional graduation pathway post-secondary ready competencies (e.g., Locally-Created Pathways, CTE concentrator, industry-recognized credentials)</li> <li>• Category 2 Universal Screeners</li> </ul>

		from the <a href="#">IDOE Formative Assessment Grant list</a> .
<b>Overall student grades/academic performance</b>	Results demonstrate the student is proficient in English and performing similarly to their native English-speaking peers (i.e., reading results are consistent with grade-level expectations).	Academic performance must be from the same school year as the ACCESS results that initiated the review.  It must be ensured that fair and rigorous grading practices were established and implemented. When including grades, evidence should demonstrate the maintenance of an A/B average in core academic classes <b>and</b> a cumulative GPA above 2.5. For students with a GPA lower than 3.0, the most recent semester or term grades should also be documented in the Decision-Making Tool.
<b>EL teacher or classroom teacher observations, student work samples, or locally created assessments that apply WIDA-based language proficiency rubrics</b> (i.e., WIDA Proficiency Level Descriptors; <a href="#">WIDA Writing Rubric</a> ; <a href="#">WIDA Speaking Rubric</a> )	When applied, students score within the Proficiency Levels of 4-6.	Observations must be from the same school year as the ACCESS results which caused the review. WIDA rubric scores must be documented in the Decision-Making Tool.

### Allowable Additional Evidence for Alternate ACCESS

The portfolio of additional evidence for a student who takes Alternate ACCESS must consist of three required items in the menu listed below. Please note that these items are not categorized, and multiple pieces of evidence from a single category may be allowable (e.g., multiple, differing observations). However, all three required items may not come from one single category.

Evidence	Required Score	Evidence Parameters
I AM ELA (most recent results)	Approaching Proficiency or higher	Students exiting grade three and entering grade four at the beginning of a school year are the youngest for whom this evidence can be utilized.

		Grade ten I AM ELA results may be used for students throughout high school.
Overall student academic performance on grade level <a href="#">Content Connectors</a>	Results demonstrate the student is proficient in English in light of their disability and able to demonstrate success on grade level Content Connectors.	Academic performance must be from the same school year as the Alternate ACCESS results which caused the review.
Completion of IEP goals centered on language and/or literacy	Successful completion of goals is determined by the Case Conference Committee.	IEP goals must be from the same school year as the Alternate ACCESS results which caused the review, and must have a focus on the student's language or literacy development.
EL, Special Education, or classroom teacher <b>observations and/or student work samples that apply WIDA-developed Alternate language proficiency tools</b> ( <a href="#">WIDA Alternate Proficiency Level Descriptors</a> and/or <a href="#">Alternate Can Do Descriptors</a> )	When applied, students score within the Proficiency Levels of 4-5.	Must be from the same school year as the Alternate ACCESS results which caused the review, and WIDA rubric scores must be documented in the Decision-Making Tool.
Local summative or formative assessments indicating English proficiency	Results demonstrate the student is proficient in English in light of their disability.	Assessment results must be from the same school year as the Alternate ACCESS results which caused the review.

## Requirements for Selecting Appropriate Evidence

Before beginning to compile evidence for eligible students (regardless of whether they took ACCESS or Alternate ACCESS), review the following requirements and considerations to ensure that all portfolio components are appropriate:

- Relevant Evidence:** Local evidence compiled (e.g., from Category B for WIDA ACCESS) must thoroughly represent the student's English language abilities for a particular domain(s), as used in academic settings. Therefore, evidence from content

area courses may be used, provided they reflect a sufficient example of the student's independent academic English proficiency. For example, an essay-based Biology midterm could be used if assessed with the [WIDA Writing Rubric](#), but a problem-based Math assessment with minimal language represented could not.

- **Recent Evidence:** The evidence being compiled must be a representation of the student's current English abilities. Therefore, the three required pieces in the Additional Evidence Portfolio must be from the most recent school year, unless otherwise stated in the "Evidence Parameters" column of the tables above. Generally, this refers to evidence from the same school year that the qualifying WIDA assessment was taken. While older or longitudinal data is informative to show patterns of growth and can be considered in this review, it must only be reviewed alongside the current data being brought forth.
- **Additional Evidence:** While three pieces of evidence are required, it is recommended to bring further evidence to better understand the student's English use and proficiency. Additionally, listening and speaking skills are challenging to assess and not always represented through assessment evidence. If the WIDA ACCESS or Alternate ACCESS results for one or both of those domains are noticeably lower, then it is necessary to include evidence in the portfolio representing the student's proficiency in said domain(s).

## Assembling the ILP Committee

---

### ILP Committee Members & Decision-Making Process

Determining whether an eligible student is proficient, thus exiting EL status, or not yet proficient and continuing to receive EL services, is an important decision with a considerable impact on the student's academic career. This decision must be made collectively by an ILP committee - not by one person. The ILP committee is to be represented by those who have the most in-depth knowledge of the student's English proficiency and academic performance, bringing expertise in language acquisition, grade-level content, and the student's characteristics. The committee makes a collective determination as to the student's English learner status. The ILP committee must consist of, at least, the following individuals:

- The EL Teacher of Record (ToR)
- The student's classroom teacher (or at least one of a middle or high school student's teachers)
- A corporation or building administrator
- A special education teacher, if applicable
- A parent/guardian

The ILP committee may also include other individuals, as appropriate, if they are able to provide meaningful input into the decision-making process. This could include counselors, paraprofessionals, former teachers or administrators, or additional current teachers of the student.

It may be necessary to give background information and context to those being brought together for the ILP committee to orient everyone to the process, topics, and evidence that will be discussed, as well as what evidence, observations, and perspectives they can contribute. Especially if reviewing at the beginning of a school year, it also may be necessary to contact past teachers (i.e., former EL ToR) to be a member of the ILP committee and/or to obtain evidence and input. If the required members of the ILP committee are unable to be assembled, or if those required members do not have the in-depth knowledge of the student required to make a decision (i.e., all new teachers at the beginning of a school year) and/or those that do (i.e., the past school year's EL ToR) are unable to be reached or provide input to the ILP committee, then it should not convene.

The ILP committee may meet either in-person or virtually. However, if done so virtually, there still must be a way for evidence examples to be shared and reviewed by all members. ILP committee meetings can occur before, during, or after the school day, depending on the schedules of its members.

See the [ILP Committee Steps to Perform an Additional Evidence Review](#) section of this document for more information on the decision-making process. Please note that the ILP committee's decision is provisional, and not finalized until documentation is submitted to IDOE for review, verification, and final approval. See the [Data Reporting and Documentation](#) section for more information.

## English Learners with Disabilities Factors

When an EL student also has a disability and receives services documented in an IEP, and is eligible for an additional evidence review based on their results from WIDA ACCESS or WIDA Alternate ACCESS, it is critical to examine the student's English language development in relation to their disability. The following factors related to the disability and accompanying services must be taken into account:

- **Special Education and EL Services:** Confirmation that EL services have been provided in conjunction with special education services with fidelity over the course of the student's academic career is needed. These should be services that have been documented in the student's IEP and ILP, respectively.
- **Less Than Four Domains (LT4):** An EL student whose disability always prevents meaningful participation in one or more domains (e.g., a student who is deaf is unable to participate in Listening) may be exempt from participating in specific domain test(s). ELs who participate in at least two domains have the opportunity to meet exit criteria. LT4 calculations are made to determine an adjusted Overall PL. This adjusted Overall PL is used, like that of any other student, to determine whether the student can exit or is eligible for an additional evidence review. See pages 27 and 28 of the [2025-2026 WIDA Assessment Guidance](#) for information regarding domain exemption accommodations.
- **ILP Committee with Special Education Representation:** To ensure that the disability-related factors are taken into consideration throughout the process, a licensed

special education ToR must also be a member of the ILP committee for EL students with disabilities up for an additional evidence review. The special education ToR will provide insight into how the disability impacts their learning and how it manifests itself in the student's language development.

- **IEP Factors:** The student's IEP goals and their progress, evaluation data, I AM data (when applicable), and other relevant special education-related evidence must be considered in an additional evidence review for an EL student with a disability. It is recommended the Case Conference Committee formally convene after the IDOE has verified the submission to document the decision within the IEP, as applicable.
- **Alternate ACCESS vs. Standard ACCESS:** Determination of Alternate ACCESS participation for students with significant disabilities must follow the [Participation Decision Tree](#) and the guidance provided on pages 30 and 31 of the [2025-2026 WIDA Assessment Guidance](#).

Students may not be placed on an alternate assessment track for the sole purpose of facilitating an exit from EL status based on Alternate ACCESS rather than standard ACCESS. Additionally, it may be appropriate for students performing at high levels on Alternate ACCESS who are continuing to show language growth to take standard ACCESS in future years, rather than exit EL status. This is a determination to be made by the Case Conference Committee.

## ILP Committee Steps to Perform an Additional Evidence Review

---

After the ILP committee has been defined and the additional evidence compiled, the committee can begin its decision-making. The ILP committee must follow these steps to complete an additional evidence review and make a final determination:

1. Determine a note-taker who will document the ILP committee's review on the Decision-Making Tool (see [Appendix A](#) - ACCESS, or [Appendix B](#) - Alternate ACCESS).
2. Review the results of the most recent annual WIDA assessment, including the student's proficiency in each of the four domains (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) and the composite scores (oral language, literacy, comprehension, and overall). For domains with lower proficiencies, it will be important to review additional evidence to further examine those lower-scored domains.
3. Present and review each of the three required pieces of evidence. If additional evidence beyond the requisites is brought forth for review, include it as well. For each, follow the guiding questions below to assess what it demonstrates about the student's language proficiency. Document key details on each piece of portfolio evidence on the ILP Committee Decision-Making Tool.

### Guiding Questions when Reviewing Individual Pieces of Evidence

<b><i>Does the evidence provide an adequate representation of the student's independent English abilities?</i></b>	
<b>If 'Yes':</b>	<b>If 'No':</b>
It is evidence that could be considered in the review.	Consider evidence that provides enough depth and examples of their English abilities in an academic setting.
<b><i>Is there longitudinal data available to be reviewed that may highlight a growth trajectory (i.e., historical ILEARN scores)?</i></b>	
<b>If 'Yes':</b>	<b>If 'No':</b>
Take this into consideration when reviewing the current data to see possible patterns of growth.	It may still be used. However, consider what other pieces of evidence have longitudinal data to show patterns in the student's English use and performance.
<b><i>Is the evidence consistent with the student's performance on other schoolwork or assessments?</i></b>	
<b>If 'Yes':</b>	<b>If 'No':</b>
It is evidence that could be considered in the review.	Consider why it may not be. Find other pieces of evidence that offer a representative example of their independent English proficiency and performance.
<b><i>Does the evidence demonstrate that the student is proficient in English?</i></b>	
<b>If 'Yes':</b>	<b>If 'No':</b>
Make note on the <i>ILP Committee Decision-Making Tool</i> . Continue the review process, as applicable, to determine if other pieces of evidence also demonstrate proficiency.	Make note on the <i>ILP Committee Decision-Making Tool</i> . Continue the review process, as applicable; however, it may not be appropriate to exit the student from EL status.

- After evaluating each piece of evidence using the guiding questions above, the ILP Committee will move to make a decision. Discuss the portfolio of evidence that was reviewed using the following guiding questions to make an exit determination. Make note of the special considerations for students who take Alternate ACCESS.

### Guiding Questions for Making an Exit Determination

<p><i>Does the entire body of evidence support that the student is proficient in English and performing similarly to native English-speaking peers?</i></p> <p><b>Additional Alternate ACCESS Consideration:</b> How does the student's English language abilities compare to those with similar disabilities?</p>
<p><i>Has the student demonstrated English proficiency for a sustained period of time to clearly show that they will continue along that trajectory?</i></p> <p><b>Additional Alternate ACCESS Consideration:</b> What does language learning and growth look like for the student in light of their disability?</p>
<p><i>Is the student demonstrating proficiency in all four language domains (Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing)?</i></p> <p><b>Additional Alternate ACCESS Considerations:</b> What language domains are impacted by the student's disability? How does the student receive and produce language?</p>
<p><i>Would the student continue to demonstrate proficiency and academic success if EL services and the ILP, along with its accommodations and modifications, are removed?</i></p> <p><b>Additional Alternate ACCESS Considerations:</b> What language-related supports and disability-related supports are provided to the student?</p>

If the answers to all of these questions are 'yes', the ILP committee should strongly consider exiting the student from EL status. If the answer to any of these questions is 'no', then the committee must maintain the student's EL status and continue services, an ILP, and annual assessment for the upcoming school year.

- As a committee, make a preliminary determination and document the details on the [ILP Committee Decision-Making Tool](#). Follow the guidance within the [Data Reporting and Documentation](#) section to accurately document and submit the decision for IDOE review and approval.

## Data Reporting and Documentation

After making preliminary exit criteria determinations via an ILP committee's additional evidence review, the decision must be accurately documented and reported within all of the relevant digital information systems. The areas in which this must be addressed include:

- ILP Committee Decision-Making Tool
- [Additional Evidence Review Student Verification Submission](#)
- Accurate Reporting of Exited Students to IDOE via Data Exchange
- Local Student Information System (SIS)
- Statewide ILP System (IDOE Special Programs)
- Determinations to Continue EL Services

## ILP Committee Decision-Making Tools

The ILP Committee Decision-Making Tools - one for WIDA ACCESS and one for Alternate ACCESS - are found in [Appendix A](#) and [Appendix B](#) of this document. The Decision-Making Tool is to be used during the ILP committee convening to document key information regarding the student, the portfolio of additional evidence, and the decision and signatures of the committee members. This document must be maintained in the student's cumulative folder alongside other EL-related documentation (e.g., WIDA results). This may be maintained physically or digitally, however, it is recommended to maintain in both formats, alongside the pieces of evidence used in the review. **This documentation must be sent along with the student in the event of a transfer.** For the 2026-2027 school year, schools will be required to submit the Decision-Making Tool for students who have been determined proficient. IDOE will then review the documentation to ensure compliance prior to approving the exit determination. See the [Additional Evidence Review Student Verification Submission](#) section below for more information.

## Additional Evidence Review Student Verification Submission

After an ILP Committee determines to exit a student via an additional evidence review, the student's information and completed Decision-Making Tool **must** be submitted to IDOE for review and a final determination. This is completed via this Jotform: [Additional Evidence Review Student Verification Submission](#).

Within this form, schools must submit all students who were determined to exit EL status via additional evidence review by Friday, August 21. **Only students who have the 2026-2027 Additional Evidence Review Student Verification Submission reviewed and approved by IDOE will be verified and considered former ELs.** Students for whom the ILP committee determines will continue to receive EL services do not need to be submitted for review.

Once the Additional Evidence Review Student Verification is reviewed by IDOE, the submission contact will receive outreach with either a confirmation, request for additional information, or a denial of the submission. Denials will occur when the process detailed in this guidance is not followed, and can include instances such as: incomplete Decision-Making Tools, using non-allowable evidence, and missing members of the ILP committee. If the submission is denied due to any of these reasons, the student retains their EL status and must continue to receive services, an ILP, and annual WIDA assessment.

## Accurate Reporting of Exited Students to IDOE via Data Exchange

Multilingual student information, including that of current and former ELs, is collected annually via the Data Exchange Multilingual Learner (DEX-LM) data collection on or around October 1. Through this collection, IDOE defines EL student counts for all LEAs; these counts, in turn, generate federal and local EL funding.

In order to accurately report students who are exited via an additional evidence review by an ILP committee and then confirmed by IDOE, the following data fields must be assigned to the students in question and accurately certified in the DEX-LM collection:

DEX-LM Data Field	Details
Student Language	Must be a language other than English.
English Proficiency Level	Aligns to the student’s Overall WIDA scores from previous school year. Eligible students must have scored an Overall PL between 4.3 and 4.9 on WIDA ACCESS (students who participated in a Tier A assessment do not qualify) or an Overall PL 4+ on Alternate ACCESS.
ML Program Association	An “End Date” must be added to the current ML program association. “Regular Education Program - non-EL” must be applied to the student with a begin date and no end date.  <i>Note: If the student is enrolled in a dual language program, continue to report the student with the Dual Language ML Program Association.</i>
Instrument Used	Must be “WIDA ACCESS” or “WIDA Alternate ACCESS.”
Service Descriptor	The Service Descriptor of “ <b>Proficient - Additional Evidence Review</b> ” must be applied to the student.

### Local Student Information Systems (SIS)

LEAs across Indiana use different SISs to store student data, including that collected in the DEX-LM. SISs all have structures in place to capture students’ EL status, such as an “English Learner” flag which may be a manually checked box, or directly tied to scores in the system.

Regardless of how an LEA’s SIS is structured, if a student is approved by the ILP committee to exit EL status via additional evidence review and verified by IDOE, it must be addressed within the local structures established within the SIS. This could include permanently removing any “EL” tags for the student, indicating the student has entered into year one of formal monitoring, and local notation that the student was exited via the portfolio review process. LEAs are encouraged to collaborate with their local SIS vendors to establish systems to best document students being exited in this fashion.

## IDOE Special Programs Documentation

Documentation within the statewide ILP platform is necessary to accurately capture the exit determination. During the summer of 2025, IDOE transitioned from the former Indiana ILP (IILP) platform and launched IDOE Special Programs, hosted by PowerSchool. To ensure the most up-to-date assessment data is reflected and to avoid system overrides, no platform adjustments should be made until after the mid-July year-to-year rollover, when the 2026 WIDA ACCESS results are uploaded.

After receiving IDOE approval, users should upload the final completed Decision-Making Tool in the student's Documents repository within IDOE Special Programs. IDOE is currently working to establish system integration between Data Exchange (DEX) and IDOE Special Programs so that additional evidence review exits are automatically reflected in the platform. Once this integration is complete and the student's information is correctly reported in DEX with the "Proficient - Additional Evidence Review" descriptor, a corresponding flag will appear in the student's EL profile in IDOE Special Programs.

While this integration is being developed, LEAs should:

- Manually update the student's ML status in the EL profile from "English Learner" to "Monitoring - Year 1";
- Upload all communication and the complete portfolio of additional evidence into the student's Documents repository; and
- Proceed with [formal monitoring documentation](#) in accordance with state requirements.

## Determinations to Continue EL Services

The ILP committee may determine that the student is not to be exited from EL status and should continue receiving EL services. If so, no changes are needed within the local SIS or the IILP system. Additionally, while the ILP Committee Decision-Making Tool does not need to be submitted via Jotform for students who will maintain their EL status, it must still be completed and maintained within the student's cumulative folder.

If the ILP committee determines the student is still in need of EL services and supports following an additional evidence review, they may reconvene after receiving the student's ensuing WIDA scores, but only if the results deem them eligible for an additional evidence review. In this case, the previous ILP committee decision and documentation must be taken into consideration. However, more recent evidence must be used within the requisite categories for review.

## Formal Two-year Monitoring of Exited ELs

---

After a student is exited via an additional evidence review, the student must enter a formal two-year monitoring process, as would any other student who auto-exits with a 5.0 Overall PL or higher. ESSA requires that school districts monitor the academic progress of former ELs for at least two years to ensure they are meaningfully participating in the district's educational program

in a manner that is comparable to their native English-speaking peers and other ELs who exited at the same time. Monitoring processes are defined locally, but LEAs must establish rigorous monitoring systems that include benchmarks for expected growth in acquiring academic content knowledge during the school year and take appropriate steps to assist students who are not making adequate progress. The requisites for this federally-required process are defined in chapter six of IDOE's [English Learner Guidebook](#).

The purpose of the monitoring process is to ensure the following:

- Former ELs who have been reclassified as fluent have full access to mainstream curricula;
- Any academic deficits resulting from lack of English proficiency have been addressed and remedied;
- Any recurring language needs identified through the monitoring process are addressed and remedied; and
- Former ELs are meaningfully participating in the standard instructional program in a manner comparable to their native English-speaking peers.

For students who are determined to exit EL status via an additional evidence review, the formal two-year monitoring process is of particular importance. Schools are encouraged to increase the frequency of monitoring check-ins with students' teachers, expand the volume and types of evidence reviewed throughout the academic year, and consult with the students regularly on their academic progress.

## Compliance Monitoring

---

IDOE's EL team conducts regular monitoring of Indiana schools for federal and state EL compliance. Applying the standardized statewide entrance and exit criteria for ELs is a requirement of ESSA [Section 3113]. The updated exit criteria allows schools more autonomy in exiting decision-making. Because of this, IDOE will monitor to confirm that the processes detailed in this guidance are applied and that decision-making is sound as part of the standard monitoring tool. Upon request, schools must be able to provide the following:

- **Decision-making Documentation:** ILP Committee Decision-Making Tool and accompanying evidence; assurance that decision-making guidance was followed.
- **Data Reporting:** Data correctly addressed in the SIS, IDOE Special Programs, and reported to IDOE via DEX-LM as outlined in this guidance.
- **ILP Committee Members:** Evidence that the ILP committee included all of the necessary members.
- **Formal Two-year Monitoring:** Documentation of a responsive formal two-year monitoring process being applied for exited students.

## Appendix A: ILP Committee Decision-Making Tool for WIDA ACCESS

---

The ILP committee must complete the following ILP Committee Decision-Making Tool to properly document the committee's convening, their review of the Additional Evidence Portfolio, and their decision-making process. While a paper template is provided below for reference, a [fillable PDF](#) is available for easier completion. The resulting document should be used as a cover page atop the three required evidence pieces presented. All ILP committee members must sign the document after reaching a determination on the student's EL status. Once complete, the ILP Committee Decision-Making Tool must be submitted via the [Additional Evidence Review Student Verification Submission](#). The questions below can guide the ILP Committee's discussion while completing the Decision-Making Tool.

## Guiding Questions for Additional Evidence Review for WIDA ACCESS

<b><i>Does the evidence provide an adequate representation of the student's independent English abilities?</i></b>	
<b>If 'Yes':</b>	<b>If 'No':</b>
It is evidence that could be considered in the review.	Consider evidence that provides enough depth and examples of their English abilities in an academic setting.

<b><i>Is there longitudinal data available to be reviewed that may highlight a growth trajectory (i.e., historical ILEARN scores)?</i></b>	
<b>If 'Yes':</b>	<b>If 'No':</b>
Take this into consideration when reviewing the current data to see possible patterns of growth.	It may still be used. However, consider what other pieces of evidence have longitudinal data to show patterns in the student's English use and performance.

<b><i>Is the evidence consistent with the student's performance on other schoolwork or assessments?</i></b>	
<b>If 'Yes':</b>	<b>If 'No':</b>
It is evidence that could be considered in the review.	Consider why it may not be. Find other pieces of evidence that offer a representative example of their independent English proficiency and performance.

<b><i>Does the evidence demonstrate that the student is proficient in English?</i></b>	
<b>If 'Yes':</b>	<b>If 'No':</b>
Make note on the <i>ILP Committee Decision-Making Tool</i> . Continue the review process, as applicable, to determine if other pieces of evidence also demonstrate proficiency.	Make note on the <i>ILP Committee Decision-Making Tool</i> . Continue the review process, as applicable; however, it may not be appropriate to exit the student from EL status.

<b>ILP Committee Decision-Making Tool - WIDA ACCESS</b>					
<b>Student Name:</b>		<b>STN:</b>		<b>Grade for SY 26-27:</b>	
<b>ILP Committee Members:</b> EL Teacher of Record: Classroom Teacher(s): Administrator: Parent/Guardian: Other members:			<b>Eligibility Assurances:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Student meets eligibility outlined in the Exit Criteria for ELs Guidance <input type="checkbox"/> WIDA ACCESS overall proficiency score between 4.3-4.9 <input type="checkbox"/> Initial Review of Evidence		
WIDA ACCESS Results					
<b>Most recent scores</b>		<b>Previous school year:</b>		<b>Previous school year:</b>	
Speaking:	Reading:	Speaking:	Reading:	Speaking:	Reading:
Listening:	Writing:	Listening:	Writing:	Listening:	Writing:
Overall Composite Score:		Overall Composite Score:		Overall Composite Score:	
Category A Evidence					
<b>Type of evidence:</b>					
<b>Results:</b>		<b>ILP Committee Notes:</b>			
Category B Evidence					
<b>Type of evidence:</b>					
<b>Results:</b>		<b>ILP Committee Notes:</b>			

Category A/B Evidence	
<b>Type of evidence:</b>	
<b>Results:</b>	<b>ILP Committee Notes:</b>
Guiding Questions for Evidence Portfolio Review	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the entire body of evidence support that the student is proficient in English and performing similarly to native English-speaking peers?</li> <li>• Has the student demonstrated English proficiency for a sustained period of time to clearly show that they will continue along that trajectory?</li> <li>• Is the student demonstrating proficiency in all four language domains (Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing)?</li> <li>• Would the student continue to demonstrate proficiency and academic success if EL services and the ILP along with its accommodations and modifications are removed?</li> </ul>	
ILP Committee Decision	
<b>Provisional Decision of the ILP Committee (<i>check one</i>):</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Exit the student from EL services <input type="checkbox"/> Continue EL Services	
<p><b>Acknowledgement of Provisional Exit Decision</b>  <i>By checking the box below, the ILP Committee members acknowledge that the decision to exit an English Learner (EL) from services via additional evidence review is <b>preliminary</b>. This decision is <b>not final</b> until all required evidence has been submitted to, reviewed, and formally approved by the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE).</i></p> <p><i>All required evidence must be submitted via the following form: <a href="#">Additional Evidence Review Student Verification Submission</a></i></p> <input type="checkbox"/> The ILP Committee acknowledges and agrees to the assurance statement above.	
<b>ILP Committee Signatures:</b>	

## Appendix B: ILP Committee Decision-Making Tool for WIDA Alternate ACCESS

---

The ILP committee must complete the following ILP Committee Decision-Making Tool to properly document the committee's convening, their review of the Additional Evidence Portfolio, and their decision-making process. While a paper template is provided below for reference, a [fillable PDF](#) is available for easier completion. The resulting document should be used as a cover page atop the three required evidence pieces presented. All ILP committee members must sign the document after reaching a determination on the student's EL status. Once complete, the ILP Committee Decision-Making Tool must be submitted via the [Additional Evidence Review Student Verification Submission](#). The questions below can guide the ILP Committee's discussion while completing the Decision-Making Tool.

## Guiding Questions for Additional Evidence Review for WIDA Alternate ACCESS

<b><i>Does the evidence provide an adequate representation of the student's independent English abilities?</i></b>	
<b>If 'Yes':</b>	<b>If 'No':</b>
It is evidence that could be considered in the review.	Consider evidence that provides enough depth and examples of their English abilities in an academic setting.

<b><i>Is there longitudinal data available to be reviewed that may highlight a growth trajectory (i.e., historical ILEARN scores)?</i></b>	
<b>If 'Yes':</b>	<b>If 'No':</b>
Take this into consideration when reviewing the current data to see possible patterns of growth.	It may still be used. However, consider what other pieces of evidence have longitudinal data to show patterns in the student's English use and performance.

<b><i>Is the evidence consistent with the student's performance on other schoolwork or assessments?</i></b>	
<b>If 'Yes':</b>	<b>If 'No':</b>
It is evidence that could be considered in the review.	Consider why it may not be. Find other pieces of evidence that offer a representative example of their independent English proficiency and performance.

<b><i>Does the evidence demonstrate that the student is proficient in English?</i></b>	
<b>If 'Yes':</b>	<b>If 'No':</b>
Make note on the <i>ILP Committee Decision-Making Tool</i> . Continue the review process, as applicable, to determine if other pieces of evidence also demonstrate proficiency.	Make note on the <i>ILP Committee Decision-Making Tool</i> . Continue the review process, as applicable; however, it may not be appropriate to exit the student from EL status.

<b>ILP Committee Decision-Making Tool - Alternate ACCESS</b>					
<b>Student Name:</b>		<b>STN:</b>		<b>Grade for SY 26-27:</b>	
<b>ILP Committee Members:</b> EL Teacher of Record: Special Education Teacher of Record: Classroom Teacher(s): Administrator: Parent/Guardian: Other members:			<b>Eligibility Assurances:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Student meets eligibility outlined in the Exit Criteria for ELs Guidance <input type="checkbox"/> WIDA Alternate ACCESS overall proficiency score of Alternate PL 4 or higher <input type="checkbox"/> Initial Review of Evidence		
<b>WIDA Alternate ACCESS Results</b>					
<b>Most recent scores</b>		<b>Previous school year:</b>		<b>Previous school year:</b>	
Speaking:	Reading:	Speaking:	Reading:	Speaking:	Reading:
Listening:	Writing:	Listening:	Writing:	Listening:	Writing:
Overall Composite Score:		Overall Composite Score:		Overall Composite Score:	
<b>Evidence #1</b>					
<b>Type of evidence:</b>					
<b>Results:</b>			<b>ILP Committee Notes:</b>		
<b>Evidence #2</b>					
<b>Type of evidence:</b>					
<b>Results:</b>			<b>ILP Committee Notes:</b>		

Evidence #3	
<b>Type of evidence:</b>	
<b>Results:</b>	<b>ILP Committee Notes:</b>
Guiding Questions for Evidence Portfolio Review	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the entire body of evidence support that the student is proficient in English and performing similarly to native English-speaking peers? <b><i>How does the student's English language abilities compare to those with similar disabilities?</i></b></li> <li>• Has the student demonstrated English proficiency for a sustained period of time to clearly show that they will continue along that trajectory? <b><i>What does language learning and growth look like for the student in light of their disability?</i></b></li> <li>• Is the student demonstrating proficiency in all four language domains (Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing)? <b><i>What language domains are impacted by the student's disability? How does the student receive and produce language?</i></b></li> <li>• Would the student continue to demonstrate proficiency and academic success if EL services and the ILP along with its accommodations and modifications are removed? <b><i>What language-related supports and disability-related supports are provided to the student?</i></b></li> </ul>	
ILP Committee Decision	
<b>Provisional Decision of the ILP Committee (check one):</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Exit the student from EL services <input type="checkbox"/> Continue EL Services	
<b>Date:</b>	
<p><b>Acknowledgement of Provisional Exit Decision</b>  <i>By checking the box below, the ILP Committee members acknowledge that the decision to exit an English Learner (EL) from services via additional evidence review is <b>preliminary</b>. This decision is <b>not final</b> until all required evidence has been submitted to, reviewed, and formally approved by the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE).</i></p> <p><i>All required evidence must be submitted via the following form: <a href="#">Additional Evidence Review Student Verification Submission</a></i></p> <input type="checkbox"/> The ILP Committee acknowledges and agrees to the assurance statement above.	
<b>ILP Committee Signatures:</b>	

## Appendix C: Formative Assessment Benchmarks

The table below includes a list of selected formative assessments that are allowable as evidence under **Category 1** of the additional evidence review process. These assessments are included in the [IDOE Formative \(Interim\) Assessment Grant](#), which provides funding to schools for formative, interim, benchmark, and similar assessment programs and professional development to increase data-driven instructional practices and enrich learning for all students. While this is not a comprehensive list, schools may use additional formative assessments as appropriate, provided they meet the criteria for demonstrating English language proficiency and grade-level academic readiness. Benchmark and scoring information is available directly from each assessment provider’s website, linked in the table below.

As part of the additional evidence review process, IDOE will use these benchmarks, provided by the vendors, to ensure that submitted evidence reflects grade-level performance comparable to that of English-proficient peers. It is critical that any evidence included clearly indicates that the EL student is performing at or above grade-level expectations. Growth data alone, or scores below grade-level benchmarks, do not meet the requirements for demonstrating readiness to exit EL services. Narrative explanations accompanying the evidence should explicitly connect scores to grade-level benchmarks to support a valid and appropriate exit decision.

Assessment	Benchmarks
Amira Learning & HMH	<a href="#">Amira Benchmarks</a>
Amplify: mCLASS with DIBELS	<a href="#">Amplify Benchmarks</a>
College Board: PSAT	<a href="#">PSAT Benchmarks</a>
Curriculum Associates, LLC: i-Ready Assessments	<a href="#">i-Ready Benchmarks</a>
Edmentum: Exact Path & Study Island	<a href="#">Edmentum Benchmarks</a>
NWEA: MAP Growth and MAP Suite	<a href="#">NWEA Cut Scores (pg. 14)</a>
	<a href="#">MAP Growth Lexile Measures and Ranges</a>
	<a href="#">Percentile to RIT Conversion</a>
	<a href="#">Additional Scoring Information</a>
Renaissance Learning	<a href="#">Renaissance Benchmarks</a>

## Appendix D: Exemplary Decision-Making Tools

ILP Committee Decision-Making Tool - WIDA ACCESS					
Student Name: Sofia Lopez		STN: T98765432		Grade for SY 26-27: Grade 4	
<b>ILP Committee Members:</b> EL Teacher of Record: Tonya Schepers Classroom Teacher(s): Alexis Kashman Administrator: Chelsea Isley (principal) Parent/Guardian: Emily Salinas-Lopez Other members:			<b>Eligibility Assurances:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Student meets eligibility outlined in the Exit Criteria for ELs Guidance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WIDA ACCESS overall proficiency score between 4.3-4.9 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Initial Review of Evidence		
WIDA ACCESS Results					
Most recent scores (2025-2026):		Previous school year: 24-25		Previous school year: 23-24	
Speaking: 4.2	Reading: 3.8	Speaking: 4.5	Reading: 3.2	Speaking: 3.9	Reading: 2.4
Listening: 5.8	Writing: 4.5	Listening: 6	Writing: 4.2	Listening: 5	Writing: 3.8
Overall Composite Score: 4.6		Overall Composite Score: 4.3		Overall Composite Score: 3.7	
Category A Evidence					
Type of evidence: IREAD (students exiting grade 3 or entering grade 4 only ) -					
<b>Results:</b> PASS - 470			<b>ILP Committee Notes:</b> Sofia scored "On Track" on IREAD in 2nd grade and passed in 3rd grade.		
Category B Evidence					
Type of evidence: Student observations including work samples assessed with WIDA rubrics -					
<b>Results:</b> WIDA Writing Rubric: Scored a 4 on science writing assessment			<b>ILP Committee Notes:</b> In her Science class this spring, Sofia wrote an informational essay on how dinosaurs adapted to their environment. This essay was shared with the EL TOR who comments, "Her essay reflects consistent Level 4-5 performance across all domains of the writing rubric. Her essay was coherent, well structured, and supported by precise academic vocabulary and grammatical control. Her ability to explain dinosaur adaptations using grade level scientific language shows readiness for success without EL supports."		

Example Decision-Making Tool for a student exiting Grade 3 and entering Grade 4 for SY26-27

All historical WIDA scores are included in the Decision-Making Tool

IREAD scores are used for a student entering Grade 4 - the student's score (Pass) is noted.

A student work sample was assessed using the WIDA Writing Rubric - the score is included and additional context is provided.

Category A/B Evidence	
Type of evidence: Formative ELA Assessment - NWEA -	
<b>Results:</b> Spring NWEA MAP Reading: RIT 203 (At Proficiency)  Spring NWEA MAP Language Usage: RIT 201 (At Proficiency)	<b>ILP Committee Notes:</b> Sofia scored in the 61st and 59th percentiles on her most recent assessments and consistently performs at or above grade-level expectations. She demonstrates strong comprehension of complex texts and makes appropriate inferences when reading. Additionally, she shows solid control of grammar, sentence structure and writing conventions across academic tasks.
ILP Committee Decision	
<b>Provisional Decision of the ILP Committee (check one):</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exit the student from EL services <input type="checkbox"/> Continue EL Services	
<b>Date:</b> 6/1/26	
<b>Acknowledgment of Provisional Exit Decision:</b> By checking the box below, the ILP Committeemembers acknowledge that the decision to exit an English Learner (EL) from services via additional evidence review is <b>preliminary</b> . This decision is not final until all required evidence has been submitted to, reviewed, and formally approved by the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE).  All required evidence must be submitted via the following form: <a href="#">Exited EL Student Verification Submission</a>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The ILP Committee acknowledges and agrees to the assurance statement above.	
<b>ILP Committee Signatures:</b> EL Teacher of Record: Classroom Teacher(s): Administrator: Parent/Guardian: Other Members: N/A	
Notes: The ILP committee is confident that her current language skills will support continued success.	

NWEA results are used from the most recent administration (spring); Cut scores are included and clearly align with Grade 3 benchmarks.

Signatures for all required ILP Committee members are included, or a note is included indicating that signatures are housed locally.

ILP Committee Decision-Making Tool		
Student Name: <b>Guillermo Rana</b> STN: <b>T23456789</b> Grade for SY 26-27: <b>Grade 10</b>		
<b>ILP Committee Members:</b> EL Teacher of Record: Emily Salinas Classroom Teacher(s): Chelsea Isley (ELA teacher) Administrator: Tonya Schepers (EL Director) Parent/Guardian: Alexis Kashman Other members: Tony Smith (counselor)		<b>Eligibility Assurances:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Student meets eligibility outlined in the Exit Criteria for ELs Guidance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WIDA ACCESS overall proficiency score between 4.3-4.9 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Initial Review of Evidence
WIDA ACCESS Results		
Most recent scores (2025-2026):	Previous school year: 24-25	Previous school year: 23-24
Speaking: 4.2    Reading: 5.8 Listening: 5.1    Writing: 3.5 Overall Composite Score: 4.9	Speaking: 4.7    Reading: 3.3 Listening: 5.9    Writing: 4.7 Overall Composite Score: 4.5	Speaking: 2.9    Reading: 2.5    Listening: 4.9    Writing: 4.8 Overall Composite Score: 4.1
Category A Evidence		
Type of evidence: <b>ILEARN ELA (Approaching Proficiency or higher)</b>		
Results: Approaching Proficiency	ILP Committee Notes: 8th grade ILEARN ELA scores are Approaching Proficiency.	
Category B Evidence		
Type of evidence: <b>Overall student grades (cumulative GPA 2.5 or higher)</b>		
Results: Cumulative GPA 2.8	ILP Committee Notes: Spring 2026 Grades: English: B+                      Algebra II: B-                      Health: A- Chemistry: C-                      U.S. History: B	
Guille's grades are similar to his high school peers. His lower Chemistry grade is due to missing assignments, not difficulty with content, and his performance in other core classes aligns with his English-speaking peers. Overall, his academic progress is stable and shows no underlying concerns.		

Example Decision-Making Tool for a student exiting Grade 9 and entering Grade 10 for SY26-27

All historical WIDA scores are included in the Decision-Making Tool

Grade 8 ILEARN ELA scores are used for a high school student - Approaching Proficiency meets the score benchmark

Because the student's cumulative GPA is below 3.0, core academic grades have been included with additional context to show academic performance and explain outliers.

Category A/B Evidence	
Type of evidence: <b>Local summative assessment results</b>	
Results: As and Bs on his English chapter tests this year	ILP Committee Notes: Guille earned As and Bs on every end-of-unit assessment this year in English. He also did very well on his essays and presentations.
ILP Committee Decision	
Provisional Decision of the ILP Committee ( <i>check one</i> ):                      Date: <b>6/1/26</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exit the student from EL services <input type="checkbox"/> Continue EL Services	
<b>Acknowledgment of Provisional Exit Decision:</b> By checking the box below, the ILP Committeemembers acknowledge that the decision to exit an English Learner (EL) from services via additional evidence review is <b>preliminary</b> . This decision is not final until all required evidence has been submitted to, reviewed, and formally approved by the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE).  All required evidence must be submitted via the following form: <a href="#">Exited EL Student Verification Submission</a>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The ILP Committee acknowledges and agrees to the assurance statement above.	
ILP Committee Signatures: <b>See student file**</b>  EL Teacher of Record: Emily Salinas Classroom Teacher(s): Chelsea Isley (ELA teacher) Administrator: Tonya Schepers (EL Director) Parent/Guardian: Alexis Kashman Other Members: <b>Tony Smith (guidance counselor)</b>	
<b>**Note:</b> The ILP Committee met virtually; all required signatures are documented on the hard copy archived in the student's cumulative file.	

Local summative results are used for A/B evidence; a pattern of As and Bs shows grade-level academic achievement in core ELA classes.

While signatures have not been uploaded, a note is included confirming that all required signatures are available in the student's cumulative file.

## Appendix E: Frequently Requested Revisions

---

The additional evidence review process involves careful attention, collaboration, and thoughtful decision-making from multiple stakeholders. Receiving a request for revisions after completing a submission can be frustrating when significant time has already been invested. To promote smoother reviews and reduce the need for multiple submissions, the following examples highlight frequently requested revisions and areas where additional clarity is often needed to meet the evidence review approval criteria.

- **IREAD scores included in Category A for students above Grade 4:** IREAD-3 scores can only be submitted as Category A evidence for students entering Grade 4. Students entering Grade 5 and higher must use ILEARN ELA results or allowable formative/interim assessments (e.g., NWEA, mCLASS, PSAT) to meet Category A requirements.
- **Student academic performance is not consistent with grade-level norms and expectations:** The portfolio of evidence submitted must demonstrate that the student is performing on par with grade-level expectations. If the evidence provided (e.g., grades, summative assessments, work samples) does not show a consistent pattern of grade-level proficiency, the student cannot be approved to exit EL services. Ensure the Decision-Making Tool reflects a comprehensive picture of the student's abilities. If sufficient evidence is not yet available, wait until the next additional evidence review window to gather documentation that accurately reflects the student's academic performance.
- **Teacher observations and/or student work samples are submitted without applying the relevant WIDA rubrics and scores:** Teacher observations and student work samples must be evaluated using the WIDA Speaking and Writing rubrics, with scores falling within Proficiency Levels 4-6 to be eligible. Scores must be clearly documented and referenced in the Decision-Making Tool. General observations or unscored work samples cannot be accepted as evidence and must be reassessed using the appropriate WIDA Speaking or Writing rubric before submission.
- **Evidence lacking sufficient detail and context on Decision-Making Tool:** Information documented in the Decision-Making Tool must clearly and explicitly demonstrate the student's English proficiency. The details included should provide enough context for an educator unfamiliar with the student (e.g., in the case of a transfer) to easily understand the student's performance and proficiency level. General statements or isolated data points (e.g., a single grade without explanation) do not provide adequate context. Ensure that descriptions offer a complete, coherent picture of the student's abilities and include the necessary detail to support an exit determination.
  - **Category A Formative Assessments:** When a formative assessment submitted for Category A is not listed in [Appendix C](#), a score report must be included with

the Decision-Making Tool and sufficient context must be provided to explain the assessment's benchmarks and how the student's performance aligns with grade-level expectations. Details in the Decision-Making Tool should be clear enough that any educator reviewing the information can understand the student's proficiency and how the assessment supports the exit determination.

- **Evidence submitted does not correspond to the most recent school year:** All evidence submitted for an additional evidence review must come from the same school year as the WIDA ACCESS scores that initiated the review. Evidence from prior school years cannot be used to support an exit determination. For the 2026-2027 review window, 2025 ILEARN ELA scores may not be submitted; instead, use the available ILEARN ELA Checkpoints to document the student's most current academic performance or compile additional Category A evidence.

If any questions arise throughout the additional evidence review window, reach out to the [Office of English Learners and Migrant Education](#) before completing the submission. Connecting with the team early can help ensure that all required evidence is aligned to the guidance and may prevent unnecessary resubmissions.

## Change Log

---

Changes from 2025-2026 to 2026-2027	Section	Page(s)
Updated dates and deadlines throughout the document.	N/A	N/A
Updated links throughout the document.	N/A	N/A
Updated table numbers and appendix letters to account for additionals and order.	N/A	N/A
Added information and guidance regarding 2026 ILEARN standard setting and the inclusion of ILEARN ELA Checkpoints in allowable Category A evidence.	<a href="#">Allowable Additional Evidence for WIDA ACCESS and End-of-School-Year Exit Determination Considerations</a>	5, 7-8, 9
Updated links to the WIDA Writing and Speaking Rubrics to reflect the most recently published versions from WIDA.	<a href="#">Allowable Additional Evidence for WIDA ACCESS and Allowable Additional Evidence for WIDA ACCESS</a>	5, 11
Added information and guidance regarding 2026 WIDA ACCESS standard setting.	<a href="#">End-of-School-Year Exit Determination Considerations</a>	7
Added information regarding IREAD-3 eligibility for grades 4-6 move-ins.	<a href="#">Allowable Additional Evidence for WIDA ACCESS</a>	9-10
Added clarification requiring a student score report when schools submit formative assessments not listed in the guidance or without established benchmarks.	<a href="#">Allowable Additional Evidence for WIDA ACCESS</a>	10
Added definitions clarifying the distinction between Category A formative assessments and Category B local summative assessments.	<a href="#">Allowable Additional Evidence for WIDA ACCESS</a>	10-11
Updated guidance to require documentation of recent semester or term grades for students with a cumulative GPA under 3.0, rather than relying solely on the overall GPA.	<a href="#">Allowable Additional Evidence for WIDA ACCESS</a>	11
Clarified ML program associations should remain active for dual language students after exiting.	<a href="#">Accurate Reporting of Exited Students to IDOE via Data Exchange</a>	19
Updated data reporting guidance to reflect the correct Service Descriptor name: “Proficient – Additional Evidence Review.”	<a href="#">Accurate Reporting of Exited Students to IDOE via Data Exchange</a>	19

Added information regarding the statewide transition from IILP to IDOE Special Programs, including expectations for documentation and timeline considerations.	<a href="#">IDOE Special Programs Documentation</a>	20
Revised fillable PDFs to ensure alignment with current year guidance.	<a href="#">Appendix A</a> and <a href="#">Appendix B</a>	22, 26
Updated formative assessment table and benchmarks to align with current-year assessments from the IDOE grant list.	<a href="#">Appendix C</a>	30
Added exemplary Decision-Making Tools as reference examples.	<a href="#">Appendix D</a>	31-32
Added common reasons for revisions to promote cleaner initial submissions.	<a href="#">Appendix E</a>	33-34
Created a Change Log to document and track all updates to the Exit Criteria guidance.	<a href="#">Change Log</a>	35-36