

Items that Require Additional Information or Revision in New Hampshire’s Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority Plan

August 31, 2018

PROGRAM REQUIREMENT

Regulatory Requirement	Required information from the SEA
<p>Consultation. Evidence that the SEA or consortium has developed an innovative assessment system in collaboration with--</p> <p>(1) Experts in the planning, development, implementation, and evaluation of innovative assessment systems, which may include external partners; and</p> <p>(2) Affected stakeholders in the State, or in each State in the consortium, including--</p> <p>(i) Those representing the interests of children with disabilities, English learners, and other subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act;</p> <p>(ii) Teachers, principals, and other school leaders;</p> <p>(iii) Local educational agencies (LEAs);</p> <p>(iv) Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State;</p> <p>(v) Students and parents, including parents of children described in paragraph (a)(2)(i) of this section; and</p> <p>(vi) Civil rights organizations.</p>	<p>Provide a description for how the State has monitored the LEA consultation with those representing the interests of children (including children with disabilities, English learners, and other sub-groups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the ESEA).</p> <p><i>Addendum 7/31/18</i></p> <p>If the IADA is approved, please provide a detailed description of the guidance that will be provided to LEAs regarding parent consultation and the PACE project within 30 days of the date of approval.</p> <p>NH DOE Response 8/31/18</p> <p>NH DOE notified all participating districts at the September 7th districts leads meeting that, upon approval of the IADA, they will have to engage with parents of ALL students, especially parents of students with disabilities and English language learners, participating in the PACE initiative to explain the following and solicit the parents’ input:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How the competency-based instructional as part of the PACE initiative approach differs and is similar to what their students have experienced previously. 2. Why the district is engaging in this approach to education and what it means for their students. 3. How their students will be assessed on competencies and how this information will be reported. 4. How their students’ annual determinations as part of the PACE initiative will be produced and what they mean compared to NH SAS. <p>At the September 7th meeting, the NH DOE and its partners will discuss with the district leads about how we can best support them in these efforts such as common PowerPoint presentations and/or short parent-friendly briefs. In addition to these materials, NH DOE and its partners will invite participating districts to suggest methods for successfully engaging parents and other stakeholders in these materials including presentations at school board meetings, parent information nights, back-to-school nights, parent-teacher conferences, website postings, press releases, partnering with parent-teacher organization,</p>

Regulatory Requirement	Required information from the SEA
	<p>and other opportunities. NH DOE will use the first PACE monthly meeting to solicit additional ideas and suggestions from the professional educational leaders of PACE about how best to approach this issue, recognizing that different approaches might work better in different districts depending on context. NH DOE will require all participating districts to report on their efforts on or before the December 7th district leads meeting. NH DOE will submit this documentation to USED by December 31, 2018.</p>
<p>(ii) Generate results, including annual summative determinations as defined in paragraph (b)(7) of this section, that are valid, reliable, and comparable, for all students and for each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, among participating schools and LEAs in the innovative assessment demonstration authority. Consistent with the SEA’s or consortium’s evaluation plan under 34 CFR 200.106(e), the SEA must plan to annually determine comparability during each year of its demonstration authority period;</p>	<p>See information required under 4(i) above.</p> <p>Addendum 7/31/18 NH DOE should clarify that students are reported in all subgroups that apply when reporting PACE results and provide the data broken out consistent with the ESEA requirements.</p> <p>NH DOE Response 8/31/18 NH DOE has been reporting PACE performance by student group since it was granted its first waiver in 2015. NH has been presenting the disaggregated results following the approach in NH’s approved NCLB waiver where students are counted in only one category according to a defined and federally-approved hierarchy. However, NH DOE will now follow the business rules used to operationalize NH’s approved ESSA State Accountability Plan where the disaggregation rules follow the exact requirements of ESSA. In other words, students will be classified into all categories in which they fall (e.g., SWD and Economically Disadvantaged) and the subgroup will be reported as long as the number of students in the group meets or exceeds NH’s approved min-n of 11 students.</p>
<p>(5)(i) Provide for the participation of all students, including children with disabilities and English learners;</p> <p>(ii) Be accessible to all students by incorporating the principles of universal design for learning, to the extent practicable, consistent with 34 CFR 200.2(b)(2)(ii); and</p> <p>(iii) Provide appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act;</p>	<p>See information requested in requirement (1) above.</p> <p>Addendum 7/31/18 (5)(i) NH DOE should clarify that students are reported in all subgroups that apply when reporting PACE results and provide the data broken out consistent with the ESEA requirements.</p> <p>NH DOE Response 8/31/18 See response to (ii) above.</p>

Regulatory Requirement	Required information from the SEA
<p>(8) Provide disaggregated results by each subgroup of students described in 34 CFR 200.2(b)(11)(i)(A)-(I) and sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) and 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Act, including timely data for teachers, principals and other school leaders, students, and parents consistent with 34 CFR 200.8 and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(x) and (xii) and section 1111(h) of the Act, and provide results to parents in a manner consistent with paragraph (b)(4)(i) of this section and part 200.2(e);</p>	<p>A report which demonstrates specifically the disaggregated results of all students in participating PACE schools in the PACE assessment is required.</p> <p>Addendum 7/31/18 NH DOE should clarify that students are reported in all subgroups that apply when reporting PACE results and provide the data broken out consistent with the ESEA requirements.</p> <p>NH DOE Response 8/31/18 See response to (ii) above.</p>
<p>(9) Provide an unbiased, rational, and consistent determination of progress toward the State’s long-term goals for academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(A) of the Act for all students and each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act and a comparable measure of student performance on the Academic Achievement indicator under section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the Act for participating schools relative to non-participating schools so that the SEA may validly and reliably aggregate data from the system for purposes of meeting requirements for--</p> <p>(i) Accountability under sections 1003 and 1111(c) and (d) of the Act, including how the SEA will identify participating and non-participating schools in a consistent manner for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement under section 1111(c)(4)(D) of the Act; and</p> <p>(ii) Reporting on State and LEA report cards under section 1111(h) of the Act.</p>	<p>See information requested under (8) above.</p> <p>Addendum 7/31/18 NH DOE should clarify that students are reported in all subgroups that apply when reporting PACE results.</p> <p>NH DOE Response 8/31/18 See response to (ii) above.</p>

Regulatory Requirement	Required information from the SEA
<p><u>Initial implementation in a subset of LEAs or schools. If the innovative assessment system will initially be administered in a subset of LEAs or schools in a State--</u></p> <p>(1) A description of each LEA, and each of its participating schools, that will initially participate, including demographic information and its most recent LEA report card under section 1111(h)(2) of the Act; and</p> <p>(2) An assurance from each participating LEA, for each year that the LEA is participating, that the LEA will comply with all requirements of this section.</p>	<p>NH DOE must provide an assurance from each LEA that that the LEA will comply with all requirements of the IADA, as applicable.</p> <p><i>Addendum 7/31/18</i></p> <p>No additional information is now required for this program requirement.</p>

SELECTION CRITERIA

Application Selection Criteria	Required information from the SEA
<p>(a)(1) The rationale for developing or selecting the particular innovative assessment system to be implemented under the demonstration authority, including--</p> <p>(i) The distinct purpose of each assessment that is part of the innovative assessment system and how the system will advance the design and delivery of large-scale, statewide academic assessments in innovative ways; and</p> <p>(ii) The extent to which the innovative assessment system as a whole will promote high-quality instruction, mastery of challenging State academic standards, and improved student outcomes, including for each subgroup of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act;</p>	<p>NH DOE must provide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A specific description of how each component of PACE (local summative tests, common performance tasks and local performance assessments) contributes to the annual summative determination for each grade/subject in the pilot. 2. A clear description of how the PACE assessment design affords students multiple ways to demonstrate that they have mastered the content. <p><i>Addendum 7/31/18</i></p> <p>Please confirm that each student’s annual summative determination is based upon the collection of individual assessment chosen by the teacher, including at least one PACE common assessment task. Also confirm that the weight of each individual local assessment in each individual annual summative determination is determined by the State using a quantitative procedure applied to all students at the end of each school year.</p>

Application Selection Criteria	Required information from the SEA
	<p data-bbox="865 198 1207 224">NH DOE Response 8/31/18</p> <p data-bbox="865 230 1879 328">NH DOE and its technical consultants at the Center for Assessment have engaged in a multi-step approach to producing valid and comparable annual determinations for each student and aggregated for each school and LEA.</p> <p data-bbox="865 365 1894 495">The first step in this process involves evaluating the cross-district comparability of local district scoring based on the results of each PACE Common Assessment. The competency scores for each grade level/content area within each district are “adjusted” based on the comparability findings. This is a state determination.</p> <p data-bbox="865 532 1879 896">The second step in producing annual determinations involves computing average competency scores for each subject and grade level for each district. These average competency scores are based only on summative assessments (e.g., end of unit assessments) used to inform competency determinations. The procedure for computing these average competency scores are determined by the NH DOE and its technical consultants. The weighting of the individual assessments that comprise the average competency scores is dependent on the number and nature of the assessments administered, which varies locally. Based on our review of local assessment maps and generalizability analyses, the number of summative assessments ranges from a low of six (6) to a high of approximately 25 assessments with a median of approximately 18 assessments for each course.</p> <p data-bbox="865 933 1894 1096">While these assessments are informed by the local teacher, the assessments used to inform competency determinations are approved by each LEA. In most cases, the LEA will require teachers that are all teaching the same course/grade to adopt a common approach for determining competency. In other words, these decisions are not left up to each individual teacher.</p> <p data-bbox="865 1133 1894 1258">The third step involves integrating the standard setting results (described elsewhere) with the average competency scores for each grade level and subject area to produce the cutscores on the competency scale. These cutscores are used to define the comparable annual determinations.</p>

Application Selection Criteria	Required information from the SEA
	<p>All of these methodological decisions are made by the NH DOE and the Center for Assessment, informed by the PACE technical advisory committee¹. The Center employs this common framework for the calculation of annual determinations for each grade and subject area for each LEA.</p>
<p>(a)(2) The plan the SEA or consortium, in consultation with any external partners, if applicable, has to--</p> <p>(i) Develop and use standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, methods, or other strategies for scoring innovative assessments throughout the demonstration authority period, consistent with relevant nationally recognized professional and technical standards, to ensure inter-rater reliability and comparability of innovative assessment results consistent with 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4)(ii), which may include evidence of inter-rater reliability; and</p> <p>(ii) Train evaluators to use such strategies, if applicable;</p>	<p>A plan to continue, for all participating PACE LEAs, during the period of the demonstration authority:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Performance standards validations. 2. Local scoring audit activities (known as body of work samples). <p>Addendum 7/31/18</p> <p>Evidence that affirms that NH DOE will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Requires all new LEAs entering PACE will be required to complete Body of Work audits; and 2. Draw a representative, random sample from among ongoing LEAs to complete Body of Work audits each year throughout the life of the IADA. <p>NH DOE Response 8/31/18</p> <p>NH DOE will require all new LEAs to participate in the Body of Work audits as well as using a sampling approach for existing districts. However, rather than using a random sample, the NH DOE proposes to use a systematic sampling procedure to ensure that samples are collected from all grade levels and subject areas across PACE districts. Further, because we are still trying to perfect the Body of Work methodology for the innovative assessment system, the Center for Assessment, under direction from NH DOE, will work closely with the specific teachers identified through the sampling approach to help curate high-quality samples to better take advantage of the Body of Work methodology. These Body of Work samples can then be used as exemplars to provide guidance to all PACE districts to ensure that the Body of Work method works as intended.</p>
<p>(a)(3) If the system will initially be administered in a subset of schools or LEAs in a State--</p> <p>(i) The strategies the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, will use to scale the innovative assessment</p>	<p>A projected schedule for the inclusion of additional LEAs into the PACE pilot assessment that includes specific targets/goals for expansion during each year of the demonstration period.</p>

¹ The PACE project was fortunate to have a national technical advisory committee (TAC) during the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 school years, as a result of support from the Hewlett Foundation. We hope to secure additional funding in order to reconvene the TAC.

Application Selection Criteria	Required information from the SEA
<p>to all schools statewide, with a rationale for selecting those strategies;</p> <p>(ii) The strength of the SEA’s or consortium’s criteria that will be used to determine LEAs and schools that will initially participate and when to approve additional LEAs and schools, if applicable, to participate during the requested demonstration authority period; and</p> <p>(iii) The SEA’s plan, including each SEA in a consortium, for how it will ensure that, during the demonstration authority period, the inclusion of additional LEAs and schools continues to reflect high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse LEAs and schools, or contributes to progress toward achieving such implementation across demographically diverse LEAs and schools, including diversity based on enrollment of subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the Act and student achievement. The plan must also include annual benchmarks toward achieving high-quality and consistent implementation across participating schools that are, as a group, demographically similar to the State as a whole during the demonstration authority period, using the demographics of initially participating schools as a baseline.</p>	<p>Addendum 7/31/18 NH DOE should clarify how and under what conditions the “alternative means of demonstrating competency for students in schools ...otherwise participating in the [statewide assessment]” (page 23 of the addendum) would be implemented, and how those results would be used for annual summative determinations.</p> <p>NH DOE Response 8/31/18 NH DOE wishes to clarify its earlier statements regarding “alternative means of demonstrating competency...”</p> <p>As part of its effort to expand PACE within NH’s local control approach to education, NH DOE will offer current non-PACE LEAs the opportunity to try out PACE Common Performance Tasks. The use of these tasks in non-PACE LEAs will NOT count toward individual student or aggregate annual determinations of proficiency. Rather, NH DOE will support such LEAs to report the PACE Common Task results to parents and students so that they will be able to have a more complete picture of proficiency than might be available otherwise. Similarly, the NH SAS will be available as an alternative assessment that may be used to provide deeper understanding of student performance in PACE schools. Likewise, however, these NH SAS results will not count toward individual student or aggregate annual determinations of proficiency.</p>
<p>(b)(1) The extent and depth of prior experience that the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, and its LEAs have in developing and implementing the components of the innovative assessment system. An SEA may also describe the prior experience of any external partners that will be participating in or supporting its demonstration authority in implementing those components. In evaluating the extent and depth of prior experience, the Secretary considers—</p> <p>(i) The success and track record of efforts to implement innovative assessments or innovative</p>	<p>See information requested under (a)(3) above.</p> <p>Addendum 7/31/18 See information requested under addendum to (a)(3) above.</p> <p>NH DOE Response 8/31/18 See response to (a)(3) above.</p>

Application Selection Criteria	Required information from the SEA
<p>assessment items aligned to the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act in LEAs planning to participate; and</p> <p>(ii) The SEA’s or LEA’s development or use of--</p> <p>(A) Effective supports and appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR part 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act for administering innovative assessments to all students, including English learners and children with disabilities, which must include professional development for school staff on providing such accommodations;</p> <p>(B) Effective and high-quality supports for school staff to implement innovative assessments and innovative assessment items, including professional development; and</p> <p>(C) Standardized and calibrated tools, rubrics, methods, or other strategies for scoring innovative assessments, with documented evidence of the validity, reliability, and comparability of annual summative determinations of achievement, consistent with 34 CFR part 200.105(b)(4) and (7).</p>	
<p>(2) The extent and depth of SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, and LEA capacity to implement the innovative assessment system considering the availability of technological infrastructure; State and local laws; dedicated and sufficient staff, expertise, and resources; and other relevant factors. An SEA or consortium may also describe how it plans to enhance its capacity by collaborating with external partners that will be participating in or supporting its demonstration authority. In evaluating the extent and depth of capacity, the Secretary considers--</p> <p>(i) The SEA’s analysis of how capacity influenced the success of prior efforts to develop and implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items;</p>	<p>Provide specific examples of successful risk mitigation (from previous PACE experience) or provide descriptions of strategies for mitigating the risks associated with implementing the innovative assessment system.</p> <p>Addendum 7/31/18</p> <p>It appears, based on the description provided, that NH DOE contemplates a school participating in the pilot to select which test, PACE or the statewide assessment results; this is inconsistent with the requirements of the program, which are important to ensure directly comparable data to guide educators and inform parents and the public, that all students in a grade in a participating school take PACE.</p>

Application Selection Criteria	Required information from the SEA
<p>and</p> <p>(ii) The strategies the SEA is using, or will use, to mitigate risks, including those identified in its analysis, and support successful implementation of the innovative assessment.</p>	<p>NH DOE Response 8/31/18</p> <p>See response to (a)(3) above.</p> <p>Further, NH DOE is offering to scale PACE statewide by allowing LEAs to engage with PACE for only specific grade levels/subject areas combinations. For example, rather than requiring participating LEAs to participate in PACE at the elementary, middle, and high school levels for each mathematics, English language arts, and science, LEAs may elect to begin engaging with PACE by focusing first on middle school mathematics. Assuming this tryout is successful, the LEA might expand to include middle school ELA or elementary school mathematics. Again, this is just an example. LEAs could choose another configuration to begin engaging with PACE. Importantly, for whatever partial configuration an LEA chooses, all students in the PACE-participating grades/subjects would be required to use the PACE assessment system. Likewise, all students in the grades/subjects not participating in PACE would take the NH Statewide Assessment System.</p>
<p>(3) The extent and depth of State and local support for the application for demonstration authority in each SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, as demonstrated by signatures from the following:</p> <p>(i) Superintendents (or equivalent) of LEAs, including participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority period.</p> <p>(ii) Presidents of local school boards (or equivalent, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority.</p> <p>(iii) Local teacher organizations (including labor organizations, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority.</p> <p>(iv) Other affected stakeholders, such as parent organizations, civil rights organizations, and business organizations.</p>	<p>None required.</p>
<p>(c)(1) The extent to which the timeline reasonably demonstrates that each SEA will implement the system statewide by the end of the requested demonstration authority period, including a description of--</p> <p>(i) The activities to occur in each year of the requested</p>	<p>NH DOE must provide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A timeline for activities during the demonstration authority period designed to scale up the number of districts toward a statewide implementation of the innovative assessment system was provided (e.g., recruitment activities). 2. A plan and timeline for conducting research studies in response to the

Application Selection Criteria	Required information from the SEA
<p>demonstration authority period;</p> <p>(ii) The parties responsible for each activity; and</p> <p>(iii) If applicable, how a consortium’s member SEAs will implement activities at different paces and how the consortium will implement interdependent activities, so long as each non-affiliate member SEA begins using the innovative assessment in the same school year consistent with 34 CFR part 200.104(b)(2);</p>	<p>recommendations from the external evaluation was provided. (This may also be addressed in the information requested in (e)(1) below.)</p> <p>Addendum 7/31/18</p> <p>If granted, the IADA, NH DOE should provide a proposed calendar within 90 days of receiving the authority to 1) implement the recruitment activities described and 2) implement specific recommendations of the 2017 external evaluation. This calendar should provide at minimum quarterly targets to complete or implement specific activities or strategies.</p> <p>NH DOE Response 8/31/18</p> <p>NH DOE has adopted a multi-pronged approach for expanding PACE to other school districts in NH. NH DOE is in the process of developing a detailed calendar of recruitment activities. A key aspect of NH DOE’s approach involves partnering with key educational organizations within the state to help spread the message of PACE and to help in recruiting efforts. These organizations include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ NH School Boards Association ✓ NH School Administrators Association ✓ NH National Education Association (NH NEA) ✓ NH Learning Initiative (NH LI) ✓ NH Business in Education Alliance ✓ Regional organizations of curriculum and assessment directors <p>Additionally, NH NEA and NH LI, in partnership with NH DOE and the Center for Assessment will continue to offer performance assessment trainings and related workshops for educators and leaders not currently involved in PACE. The forthcoming calendar will include quarterly targets that will document specific requirement efforts and events (e.g., presentations at statewide meetings) with the various partner organizations.</p> <p>NH DOE has already begun implementing all of the recommendations from the 2017 PACE evaluation. This is further described in Appendix A.</p>
<p>(2) The adequacy of the project budget for the duration of the requested demonstration authority period, including Federal, State, local, and non-public sources of funds to support and sustain, as applicable, the</p>	<p>NH DOE must provide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A projected budget for each year of the demonstration authority period considered in the application. 2. A projected budget for planned evaluation activities (see also (e)(1) below).

Application Selection Criteria	Required information from the SEA
<p>activities in the timeline under paragraph (c)(1) of this section, including--</p> <p>(i) How the budget will be sufficient to meet the expected costs at each phase of the SEA’s planned expansion of its innovative assessment system; and</p> <p>(ii) The degree to which funding in the project budget is contingent upon future appropriations at the State or local level or additional commitments from non-public sources of funds.</p>	<p>Addendum 7/31/18</p> <p>No additional information is needed at this time.</p>
<p>(d) (1) The extent to which the SEA or consortium has developed, provided, and will continue to provide training to LEA and school staff, including teachers, principals, and other school leaders, that will familiarize them with the innovative assessment system and develop teacher capacity to implement instruction that is informed by the innovative assessment system and its results;</p>	<p>NH DOE must provide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A description of the training or support that is provided to PACE teachers regarding their making appropriate linkages between the student performance on the assessment tasks and instruction in class. 2. A description of the specific training requirements that all participating PACE teachers must complete prior to administering pilot assessments. This description should include information regarding teachers who do not complete required training in terms of PACE participation. <p>Addendum 7/31/18</p> <p>NH DOE should provide a description of procedures for when teachers in PACE districts do not complete required training activities (e.g., are the teacher’s students required to take the statewide assessment instead?).</p> <p>NH DOE Response 8/31/18</p> <p>As described previously, it is essentially impossible for a teacher in PACE district to participate in PACE activities without receiving training because PACE is a full system. In other words, PACE is not a single assessment but is a fully integrated instruction and assessment system. Each participating school and district ensures that all of its teachers understand how to provide students with appropriate learning opportunities related to course and district competencies and then assesses the degree to which those students have achieved those competencies. In other words, teachers engaged in the regular practice of teaching in a competency-based approach are already “trained” to administer the PACE local and common assessments. Districts are responsible for providing the professional development necessary to ensure that all of its teachers are prepared to provide effective instruction and assessment. That said, NH DOE and its partners have taken the following steps to ensure that all teachers administering the PACE Common</p>

Application Selection Criteria	Required information from the SEA
	<p>Performance Tasks are prepared to do so:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Extensive teacher administration directions are included on each PACE Common Task. These directions have been refined through several rounds of pilot testing and include specific information about the use of accommodations and other supports necessary for successful administration. . 2. Each participating PACE district provides training to all of its teachers on the administration and data collection associated with the PACE Common Tasks. 3. Each district has a PACE Leader, a Teacher Lead, Content Experts (teachers who have been trained to lead task development), and teachers who participate in the task development work. The content experts and task developers are available to provide additional training to teachers in their schools and districts to ensure that all teachers understand the expectations associated with administering PACE tasks. <p>We feel confident that this multi-pronged approach ensures that all teachers are appropriately trained for providing appropriate learning and assessment opportunities for all of their students. However, NH DOE will add the specific requirements for ensuring that all teachers are trained to administer PACE Common Tasks in the assurance that each district will sign. In the extremely rare case where districts are unable to provide such assurances for any teacher, the teacher’s students would be required to participate in the NH Statewide Assessment System.</p>
<p>(2) The strategies the SEA or consortium has developed and will use to familiarize students and parents with the innovative assessment system;</p>	<p>NH DOE must provide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A description of standardized collateral materials about PACE and standardized recommendations to support LEAs in communicating with parents about PACE. This information should reference the information requested under (a)(1) above. 2. A description of how the State and LEAs will familiarize students with the PACE, in terms of both how the tasks and rubrics work in practice as well as how their performance on the tasks accrues to an annual proficiency score. This information should reference the information requested under (a)(1) above. <p><i>Addendum 7/31/18</i> No additional information required.</p>
<p>(3) The strategies the SEA will use to ensure that all students and each subgroup of students under section 1111(c)(2) of the Act in participating schools receive the support, including appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR part 200.6(b) and (f)(1)(i) and</p>	<p>NH DOE must clearly describe teachers will receive training and support in implementing appropriate accommodations when administering performance tasks.</p> <p><i>Addendum 7/31/18</i> No additional information is needed at this time.</p>

Application Selection Criteria	Required information from the SEA
<p>section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act, needed to meet the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act;</p>	
<p>(4) If the system includes assessment items that are locally developed or locally scored, the strategies and safeguards (e.g., test blueprints, item and task specifications, rubrics, scoring tools, documentation of quality control procedures, inter-rater reliability checks, audit plans) the SEA or consortium has developed, or plans to develop, to validly and reliably score such items, including how the strategies engage and support teachers and other staff in designing, developing, implementing, and validly and reliably scoring high-quality assessments; how the safeguards are sufficient to ensure unbiased, objective scoring of assessment items; and how the SEA will use effective professional development to aid in these efforts.</p>	<p>NH DOE must provide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evidence that sufficient quality control procedures exist for the scoring of local tasks which are equivalent to quality control processes used for scoring common tasks (this may be partially addressed by information requested under (4)(i) and (a)(2) above). 2. Evidence of a process where all locally developed tasks and assessments are reviewed for quality (such as by another educator). This evidence should address how the local task review process is consistent with professional standards and practice for student assessment. <p>Addendum 7/31/18</p> <p>NH DOE will provide the process review locally developed tasks and assessments for quality (such as by another educator). This evidence should address how the local task review process is consistent with professional standards and practice for student assessment. If the process is a new procedure for the PACE assessments, then a detailed plan and timeline for implementation in the first year of the IADA should be provided.</p> <p>NH DOE Response 8/31/18</p> <p>The NH DOE has engaged in a systematic approach for evaluating the quality of local assessments for the past two years. The review tool that we are currently using is attached as Appendix B. This quality review tool is designed to provide evaluation and feedback on key aspects of task quality, including alignment, cognitive complexity, fairness, and accessibility, but is streamlined to allow for an efficient review of each task.</p> <p>NH DOE plans to expand the quality reviews of local tasks from an expert review to include peer reviews in addition to expert reviews. The use of trained peers will help expand the assessment literacy levels among teacher reviewers and will allow for a much more extensive and efficient set of reviews than we have been able to accomplish with expert reviews only. The experts at the Center for Assessment will continue to oversee the process and sample from the peer-reviewed tasks to check on both the quality of the tasks and the quality of the reviews to provide feedback on both.</p>

Application Selection Criteria	Required information from the SEA
	Additionally, the NH DOE will submit the required peer review documentation for the PACE project on June 30, 2019.
(e)(1) The strength of the proposed evaluation of the innovative assessment system included in the application, including whether the evaluation will be conducted by an independent, experienced third party, and the likelihood that the evaluation will sufficiently determine the system’s validity, reliability, and comparability to the statewide assessment system consistent with the requirements of 34 CFR part200.105(b)(4) and (9);	<p>NH DOE must provide a specific plan and timeline to conduct an external evaluation of the innovative assessment system during the course of the demonstration period.</p> <p><i>Addendum 7/31/18</i> No additional information is required at this time.</p>
(2) The SEA’s or consortium’s plan for continuous improvement of the innovative assessment system, including its process for-- (i) Using data, feedback, evaluation results, and other information from participating LEAs and schools to make changes to improve the quality of the innovative assessment; and (ii) Evaluating and monitoring implementation of the innovative assessment system in participating LEAs and schools annually.	<p>NH DOE must provide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A description of how it will monitor how continuous improvement feedback is implemented by participating PACE LEAs (this includes feedback from activities requested under (a)(2) above). 2. A description of how it will annually assess the satisfaction and attitudes of educators in participating PACE LEAs regarding PACE activities (this may be part of the external evaluation plan requested in (e)(1) above). <p><i>Addendum 7/31/18</i> No additional information is required at this time.</p>

APPENDIX A

The following table outlines the ten HumRRO recommendations along with notes documenting the NH DOE and partner actions that have already occurred and the actions that will be occurring in the near future.

HumRRO Recommendation (Direct Quote)	Ongoing/completed	In Progress
<p>Recommendation 1: Monitor and Support District Engagement. PACE should regularly gauge local leadership support and target interventions when district leaders voice concerns or reduce their district’s involvement with the program. PACE has done this for one district by helping support a PACE coordinator within the district with experienced consultants. As the program expands, these checks and interventions should become more routinized to ensure that all districts maintain adequate support for the educators implementing the program.</p>	<p>The monthly PACE Leadership meetings provide a regular check on district engagement. If any concerns or issues are detected, more directed actions are taken with the district.</p>	
<p>Recommendation 2: Evaluate Effectiveness of Collaboration Methods. PACE should evaluate the effectiveness of the new collaboration methods. While task development meetings with teachers from all Tier 1 districts were becoming unwieldy, one of the attributes teachers reported as positive was having direct input into the program. Findings from the survey indicate that those teachers who had not participated in cross-district collaborations tended to have less favorable ratings of PACE. If the new collaboration methods reduce opportunities for cross-district collaborations, then teachers may perceive less personal value in PACE. Regular monitoring and adjustments can help safeguard against this potential issue.</p>	<p>New collaboration methods have not yet been introduced in light of the caution called for by this recommendation. However, as PACE expands and new technology-based collaboration approaches are required, the PACE leadership team will closely monitor through surveys and focus groups the engagement of participating educators.</p>	<p>The Center for Assessment will survey teachers participating in online asynchronous task development and scoring activities following the summer 2019 calibration activities to better understand how teachers view their participation through the digital platform compared to in-person events.</p>
<p>Recommendation 3: Consider Additional Training/Supports for Teachers Not Directly Involved in Common Task Development. As the percentage of PACE participants directly involved in future common task development decreases (either through including a smaller number of teachers in a meeting or by expanding into additional districts), the professional development and training stemming from those activities may need to be supplemented with</p>	<p>PACE Teacher Leaders, content leads, and task developers have been provided instructions and supports to better transmit institutional knowledge to all teachers in their respective districts.</p>	<p>Expanding opportunities for performance assessment development training for all interested NH schools and districts. Developing set of common resources for assessment literacy</p>

<p>additional training.</p>	<p>The Libguides have been used to share broadly all key documents and resources.</p>	<p>across all levels of PACE participation. The Center for Assessment is currently producing a “Performance Assessment Toolkit” that will be fully operational by April 30, 2019.</p>
<p>Recommendation 4: Infuse Equity and Accommodations Training into PACE Activities. Include training on scaffolding and accommodations as part of the regular schedule of PACE activities. Despite quality documentation and training, teachers continued to report uncertainty regarding equity issues, especially for accommodating students with disabilities (SWD). Scaffolding should be available to all students, including SWD, and is currently built into task development activities.</p>	<p>This is a continuing area of work and emphasis for the PACE leadership. All content leads (the teacher leads responsible for task development) have been trained on the use of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and the use of accommodations and/or other supports are listed on the task templates. Additionally, the project assessment leaders have been provided training tools on the use of UDL to support increased fairness and accessibility.</p>	<p>The Center for Assessment and NH DOE have already incorporated specific requirements for UDL as part of the task templates. The first content leads meeting on September 18th will include specific training on the connections between UDL and Evidence Centered Design and how to ensure the principles of UDL are fully addressed in task design. We will also work with the content leads to ensure that the teacher directions for each task includes specific attention to incorporating UDL in both instruction and assessment.</p>
<p>Recommendation 5: Investigate the Impact of Reading/Writing Requirements on Accessibility. Investigate the impact of the reading and writing demands of the PACE tasks on accessibility and student performance. If, for instance, we are interested in knowing whether students understand and can perform computations associated with a mathematics concept, including a long reading passage to set up the task might interfere with a student demonstrating her math abilities. We recommend examining score patterns among the PACE tasks, course grades, and performance on comparison measures (e.g., Smarter Balanced) for students with and without disabilities as one</p>	<p>Similar to the response to recommendation #4 above, this is a continuing area of work and emphasis for the PACE leadership and relies on thoughtful employment of Universal Design for Learning principles and techniques.</p>	<p>Again, as part of the content leads training on September 18th and again January 11, 2019, the Center for Assessment will train the leads about how to evaluate issues of construct-irrelevance (e.g., writing and reading demands interfering with demonstrating math or science knowledge) as part of the cognitive laboratories that occur as</p>

<p>way to investigate whether the reading and writing requirements may be impacting students' scores.</p>		<p>part of the task development process. NH DOE and the Center will document the findings from these cognitive laboratories relative to the construct-irrelevance question.</p>
<p>Recommendation 6: Routinize Timely Reviews of Local Performance Tasks. Evaluate the quality of the locally developed performance tasks and rubrics. As the pool of locally developed tasks expands, it is important to ensure that the tasks and rubrics are of sufficient quality to be used to generate student scores and annual determinations. Teachers report that their skill level in developing these tasks improves with each year of PACE participation, so it stands to reason that the validity and reliability of students' scores should improve with time.</p>	<p>The Center for Assessment provides on-going training to build the cadre of experts available to review a sample of tasks from each participating district.</p>	<p>Expand the use of the peer and expert review approach and work to move this online so it can be completed asynchronously. The Center for Assessment will summarize the task reviews for 2018-2019 and compare the results to the 2017-2018 reviews to describe changes in quality over the past years. This documentation will happen every year as a way to document the changes in task quality over time.</p>
<p>Recommendation 7: Plan for Future Research on the Impact of PACE on Teaching and Learning. The positive impacts of PACE on teaching and learning should continue to be externally verified beyond this evaluation. This may be part of a future research agenda when it becomes possible to evaluate the predictive strength of PACE results on college and career performance. In the interim, it may be possible to compare PACE versus non-PACE student performance on Smarter Balanced assessments, college entrance exams, or other measures.</p>	<p>Annual evaluation of student performance on standardized assessments for both achievement and growth.</p>	<p>Seeking funding from philanthropies to more deeply understand the connection between learning and engagement in complex performance assessments.</p> <p>Begin to longitudinally track trends in career and college readiness (e.g., persistence in college), but this is dependent upon being able to gather quality data from NH's Institutions of Higher Education.</p>

<p>Recommendation 8: Evaluate the Benefit of Time in Program on Outcomes. As the system expands, it may be possible to investigate the benefits of time in the program on instructional practice and student learning. It would not be surprising if there was a direct correlation between years in the program and benefits; both perceived and realized, on assessment practice and student learning. We would not expect this correlation to be perfect, however. Contextual factors such as district size, fidelity of implementation, and the effectiveness of district or school teams could certainly impact the effects of time in the program.</p>	<p>We have begun conducting research into the potential influence of time in PACE on student outcomes and initial results are promising, especially for students with disabilities (Evans, 2017). However, due to the non-random inclusion of districts/schools in PACE, we must approach such analyses cautiously.</p>	
<p>Recommendation 9: Consider Systematically Recycling Tasks. After the operational year, common tasks may still be used in place of, or in addition to, local tasks. PACE should consider some method of systematically repeating tasks across years as another check on the consistency of scoring. If tasks were repeated, previously scored “check sets” of student work from the prior year could be included in the current year. Score consistency across years could then be checked in a more systematic way.</p>	<p>We will be working with the PACE content leads to develop plans for task recycling. This includes relying on the larger number of teachers involved in task development to develop and field test multiple tasks for each subject/grade combination during this year’s task development cycle.</p>	<p>We will continue this process of adding to the task bank each year in order to continue to grow the number of tasks available for local use. Such tasks will include the rubrics, teacher materials, and annotate samples of student work. The highest quality tasks will be reserved from the main task bank for potential reuse as operational tasks.</p>
<p>Recommendation 10: Begin Tracking Performance from Year to Year. The PACE system has the potential for variability across years. Comparing performance across years will allow PACE to see where there are large changes in the proportions of students at each achievement level in any district and to investigate potential reasons for those changes. Early reports to USED comparing student performance on PACE with performance on Smarter Balanced within and across years, as well as the data analyses completed for this evaluation, should be repeated annually. This will allow for continuous monitoring and by investigating anomalous results, PACE may be</p>	<p>This has become a regular part of our analyses, both in terms of tracking student longitudinal performance, especially as students move from PACE to the state summative assessment and vice versa, as well as changes in cohort performance at the school and district levels.</p>	

<p>better able to identify potential threats to reliability and validity. Note: These analyses have now been conducted and are discussed on pages 8-9 of this document and are explained in great detail in Appendices G & H.</p>		
---	--	--

APPENDIX B

Aligned Summative Assessments Review Tool School Year 2017-18

District: _____
Subject: _____
Grade: _____
Assessment: _____
Reviewer(s): _____

The NH DOE and Center for Assessment are collecting and reviewing one assessment map and three aligned summative assessments from all PACE districts for each of the following grade and subject combinations: Gr 3, 6, Algebra Math; Gr 5, 7, 10 ELA; and Gr 4, 8, Life Science. The sample of grades and content areas may rotate each year. The assessment maps and aligned assessments provide one level of assurance and documentation that all state model competencies and content standards are addressed in the assessment system and that students are assessed at the depth of knowledge appropriate for the state model competencies and content standards. The purpose of reviewing the assessment maps and aligned assessments is to ensure all students are provided with an equitable opportunity to learn the required grade level content standards and competencies. *The feedback provided to districts using the review tools below is intended to be formative.* Feedback in black indicates that the assessment map or aligned summative assessments meets expectations. Comments in red provide recommendations for the district. Documents do not need to be re-submitted.

SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT REVIEW CRITERIA AND FEEDBACK TO DISTRICTS

Part 1: Assessment Profile
Brief Description of the Summative Assessment Submitted:
Part 2: Alignment
A high quality summative assessment should be ... Aligned
To what extent do you see a content match between the submitted summative assessment and the standards?
<input type="checkbox"/> Full/Close match – all or most aspects of the task or items address or exceed the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding standard(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Partial match – Some aspects of the task or items address or partially address the skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Minimal/No match – Few or no aspects of the task or items match some relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard(s)
Estimate the Depth-of-Knowledge range of the standards measured by the assessment (see Webb’s DOK charts; check all that apply):
<input type="checkbox"/> DOK 1: recall and reproduction
<input type="checkbox"/> DOK 2: skills and concepts
<input type="checkbox"/> DOK 3: strategic thinking/reasoning; requires deeper cognitive processing
<input type="checkbox"/> DOK 4: extended thinking; requires higher-order thinking including complex reasoning, planning, and developing of concepts.
Is the summative assessment reviewed as cognitively challenging as the standards? In other words, the summative assessment elicits sufficient evidence for judging the level of student understanding related to the competencies and standards identified. Use the definitions below to select your rating:
<input type="checkbox"/> More rigor – the summative assessment reviewed is at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the state standard(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Similar rigor – the summative assessment reviewed is similar to the DOK range indicated for the state standard(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Less rigor – the summative assessment reviewed is lower than the DOK range indicated for the state standard(s)
Comments/Suggestions for Improving Alignment (if any)
Relevant evidence to justify ratings:

Part 3: Rubric

A high quality summative assessment should be ... Scored using Clear Guidelines and Criteria

Note: This section may not apply. It will only be completed if a rubric was submitted with the summative assessment.

Is the rubric aligned to the assessment task and/or standards identified?

- Fully aligned
- Partially aligned
- Not aligned

Are the score categories clearly defined and represent a sensible progression of knowledge and skills across performance levels?

- Yes
- Partial
- No

Is it clear which aspects of the task will be evaluated by this rubric?

- Yes
- Partial/Unclear
- No

Based on your review of the rubric would the scoring rubric most likely lead different raters to arrive at the same score for a given response?

- Yes
- Partial/Unclear
- No

Comments/Suggestions for Improving Rubric(s) (if any)

Relevant evidence to justify ratings:

Part 4: Fair and Unbiased

(the areas below should be discussed relative to the needs of ELLs, gifted and talented students, and students with disabilities)

A high quality summative assessment should be...Fair and Unbiased

To what extent is the summative assessment visually clear and uncluttered (e.g., appropriate white space and/or lines for student responses, graphics and/or illustrations are clear and support the test content, the font size seems appropriate for the students)?

- Formatting is visually clear and uncluttered**
- Formatting is somewhat confusing or distracting**
- Formatting is unclear, cluttered, and inappropriate for students**

Are the directions and questions presented in as straightforward a way as possible for a range of learners?

- Yes**
- Partial/Unclear**
- No**

Is the vocabulary and context(s) presented by the summative assessment free from cultural or other unintended bias?

- Yes**
- Partial/Unclear**
- No**

Comments/Suggestions for Improving Fair and Unbiased (if any)

Relevant evidence to justify ratings:

Part 5: Appropriateness of Text/Visual Resources

A high quality summative assessment should...include appropriate reading and visual materials

Note: This section may not apply. It will only be completed if reading or visual materials were included.

The texts and visual resources support the topic and prompt:

- Yes
- Partial/Unclear
- No
- N/A

The texts have characteristics relative to grade-level expectations of a:

- Simple Text
- Somewhat Complex Texts
- Complex Texts
- Very Complex Texts
- N/A

Note: Refer to the *Text Complexity Rubric for Literary Texts or Informational Texts*

The amount of texts and visual resources are:

- Appropriate for the grade level and the time allotted for the task
- Appropriate for the grade level, but may exceed the time allotted for the task
- Burdensome for the grade level and the time allotted for the task
- No texts and/or resources are included
- N/A

Comments/Suggestions for Improvement for Fair and Unbiased (if any)

Relevant evidence to justify ratings:

Overall Recommendation

- No changes needed

- Minor changes suggested (please specify up to three suggestions)**
- Substantial changes suggested (please specify up to three suggestions)**

Discussion: