

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Score Summary: Averages Across Five Reviewers**

**Application B: New Hampshire**

***(a) Project narrative. (40 points total)***

(a)(1) \_\_\_\_\_ 4.2

+(a)(2) \_\_\_\_\_ 20.4

+(a)(3) \_\_\_\_\_ (if applicable) 7.4

**Total Score(a) Project Narrative 32**

***(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support. (15 points total)***

(b)(1) \_\_\_\_\_ 4.4

+(b)(2) \_\_\_\_\_ 3.4

+(b)(3) \_\_\_\_\_ 3.8

**Total Score(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support 12**

***(c) Timeline and budget. (15 points total)***

(c)(1) \_\_\_\_\_ 3.6

+(c)(2) \_\_\_\_\_ 6.6

**Total Score(c) Timeline and budget 10**

***(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents. (25 points total)***

(d)(1) \_\_\_\_\_ 3.2

+(d)(2) \_\_\_\_\_ 2.2

+(d)(3) \_\_\_\_\_ 4

+(d)(4) \_\_\_\_\_ (if applicable) 6.2

**Total Score(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents. 16**

***(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement. (15 points total)***

(e)(1) \_\_\_\_\_ 1.2

+(e)(2) \_\_\_\_\_ 2.8

**Total Score(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement. 4**

**Total Score (a+b+c+d+e) 73**

**Individual Reviewer Forms with comments follow**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Instructions:**

- The Panel Monitor will provide deadlines for submitting preliminary scores and comments.
- Review and score each application independently.
- Enter preliminary scores and comments into the Preliminary TRF.
- Send completed TRF to the Panel Monitor.
- The Panel Monitor will review scores and comments and ask you to clarify or elaborate if needed, so that comments clearly reflect and justify your scores.
- All scores and comments must be completed before panel discussions can be held.
- After discussion, revise your Preliminary TRF to reflect any changes you want to make.

Writing strengths and weaknesses:

- Make clear, evaluative statements about the substance of the criterion being discussed.
- Substantiate all evaluative statements using evidence from the application narrative, evidence tables, performance measures, appendices, and/or budgets.
- You may comment on information that is missing or inconsistent with other parts of the application.
- Write for a broad audience. Avoid expressions and jargon that might not be commonly understood.

Scoring:

- You may choose to break comments down by subcriteria, which will make them easier to read and review. This is preferred but optional.
- When awarding points, you should NOT break down scores by sub-criteria. Each criterion receives one total score as directed in the TRF (for example, (a)(1)(i-ii) receives one score).
- A few criteria may not be applicable to every application. If so, follow the instructions in the TRF.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**(a) Project narrative. (40 points total)**

The quality of the SEA's or consortium's plan for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the plan, the Secretary considers--

***(1) The rationale for developing or selecting the particular innovative assessment system to be implemented under the demonstration authority, including--***

- (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
- (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;

***Score for (a)(1)                    if factor (a)(3) is applicable   5   of 5 points;  
    if factor (a)(3) is not applicable     of 10 points***

Strengths

The NHDOE innovative assessment system is an extension of a pilot project (PACE) that has two performance assessment components which align with and complement the State's end-of-year (NH SAS) assessments. This is a unique assessment structure, relying more on high quality local performance assessments (given throughout the school year) to provide the bulk of information relative to student achievement of State standards. Common performance tasks provide a comparability check for the local assessments, as does the statewide achievement tests (i.e., NH SAS). The purpose of using locally developed formative assessments is that they are linked closely to both curriculum and classroom instruction, and allow students to demonstrate mastery through multiple performance assessment measures, not just on a single end-of-year test.

The premise of PACE is that assessments must be closely linked with curriculum and instruction if they are to provide instructionally useful information. NH staff believe that once per year assessments are not enough to drive and support deeper learning. In addition, students must have multiple means to demonstrate academic attainment and growth, and one standardized end-of-year test is not sufficient. This PACE structure and theory of action is supported by research, and

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

an evaluation of PACE supports this integrated curriculum-instruction-assessment approach, especially for under-performing groups of students.

Overall, the application's theory of action and rationale for local and common assessments in addition to statewide standardized tests is supported by recent research and early PACE implementation. Combined with the LEA buy-in and extensive staff development components, the PACE system seems to be reasonable and aligned sufficiently to promote higher student learning outcomes.

Weaknesses

None noted

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(2) The plan the SEA or consortium, in consultation with any external partners, if applicable, has to--***

(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

(ii) Train evaluators to use such strategies, if applicable;

***Score for (a)(2) if factor (a)(3) is applicable 25 of 25 points;  
if factor (a)(3) is not applicable     of 30 points***

**Strengths**

The application provides sufficient narrative and supporting information in appendices to describe a well-planned and thorough process of designing common performance tasks as well as the local performance items. The process includes a principled assessment design (see Appendix D), which follows nationally recognized professional and technical standards. Tasks are designed, reviewed by experts, piloted, reviewed a second time by experts, and approved by NH using thorough, standard process.

PACE uses several strategies to train school staff in developing and scoring performance assessments, including Content Leaders at the state level, Teacher Leaders in LEAs and schools, and summer institutes for professional development to train teachers on task development and scoring. Overall, this should be an effective system to train LEA and school staff in the processes of performance item development and scoring.

**Weaknesses**

None noted.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(3) If the system will initially be administered in a subset of schools or LEAs in a State--***

- (i) The strategies the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, will use to scale the innovative assessment to all schools statewide, with a rationale for selecting those strategies;
- (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
- (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.

***Score for (a)(3) if factor (a)(3) is applicable   9   of 10 points;  
if factor (a)(3) is not applicable no points awarded***

**Strengths**

The application details an extensive and principled process to determine when districts and schools can become involved in using PACE common performance assessments and designing local performance tasks. The key element is building local assessment literacy capacity. This capacity building is essential for valid, reliable, and comparable locally-built performance assessments. A strength of this process, is that assessment literacy will also impact classroom instruction, thus impacting both the student learning process and evaluation of student knowledge and skills.

The strategy for scaling is presented in Figure 7, which highlights the flow of LEAs and schools through stages of readiness and partial implementation of PACE to full implementation. The strategy allows flexibility for LEAs and schools to decide their initial PACE implementation

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

starting point and how fast they progress, with the State intent of having all LEAs participating in PACE within the IADA timeframe.

The narrative states that NHDOE is committed to ensuring that any additional schools and LEAs implementing PACE will be done without sacrificing quality and consistency, and implementation will be across demographically diverse schools/LEAs that reflect the State as a whole, including subgroups of students, student achievement, socioeconomic groups, and racial/ethnic demographics. Table 2 in the narrative provides information on the racial/ethnic distribution in the State and in current PACE districts (but not schools).

The application notes that the State commits to maintain the demographic representation (which is close to the State as a whole) of PACE students as it adds new districts, and will purposely recruit more diverse LEAs to fully, and successfully, participate in PACE.

**Weaknesses**

The narrative does not include specific annual benchmarks toward achieving high-quality and consistent implementation across participating schools that are demographically similar to the State as a whole, using the demographics of initially participating schools as a baseline.

**Total Score(a) Project Narrative      (a)(1) \_5\_\_**  
**+ (a)(2) \_25\_\_**  
**+ (a)(3) \_9\_\_ (if applicable)**  
**\_39\_\_ of 40**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support. (15 points total)**

***(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—

(i) The success and track record of efforts to implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items aligned to the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act in LEAs planning to participate; and

(ii) The SEA's or LEA's development or use of--

(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;

(B) Effective and high-quality supports for school staff to implement innovative assessments and innovative assessment items, including professional development; and

(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).

***Score for (b)(1)   5   of 5 points***

Strengths

The NHDOE and LEAs participating in the PACE implementation have been successful in attaining the 10 criteria for success over the last four years. This provides substantial support that NHDOE would be successful in expanding the implementation of the innovative assessment within the IADA.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

For the IADA, the NH DOE will use a consistent set of supports and accommodations across the innovative assessments and the Statewide NH SAS, with the accommodations on assessments mirroring those provided to students during instruction. Therefore, accommodations for students taking the PACE Common Performance and local performance assessments should be as useful during those tasks as for the end-of-year NH SAS.

Teacher training for PACE includes substantial professional development (PD) activities, with a large focus on assessment literacy. The multi-faceted approach to PD within the PACE implementation process has been shown to be successful (see Appendix K) in the initial rollout of PACE, and therefore should have the same impact within the IADA, given similar fidelity of implementation.

The support systems within PACE, the structured professional development sessions around performance item development, and the review-pilot-expert review strategy should be sufficient to continue creation of Common and local performance assessment items that have sufficient, documented levels of reliability and validity. The training provided to teachers on scoring performance tasks, if done with fidelity, should continue to produce overall assessment results that are comparable to those on the NH SAS assessment.

Weaknesses

None noted.

***(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--

- (i) The SEA's analysis of how capacity influenced the success of prior efforts to develop and implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items; and

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

(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.

***Score for (b)(2)   4   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

The NH DOE implemented the first phase of PACE, and realized that to further scale and sustain PACE, a new software system was needed. The NH DOE has secured funding for this and contracting for the new system is underway, which indicates commitment to ensuring successful expansion of PACE.

The application notes that PACE is a priority of the NH DOE, and the department structure ensures a high level of oversight, integration, communication, and day-to-day operations of the IADA project. In addition, the Department is able to leverage its expertise and resources for the PACE project. The NH DOE has several partners for the IADA project (i.e., NHLI and Center for Assessment), which have provided expertise and resources in the past for the Department.

Overall, the narrative provides substantial support that NH DOE has examined what it needs to successfully implement an expanded PACE, and secured partners and new software systems to facilitate that process.

**Weaknesses**

The narrative did not include strategies the SEA is using, or will use, to mitigate risks, as required by the criteria.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(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:

- (i) Superintendents (or equivalent) of LEAs, including participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority period.
- (ii) Presidents of local school boards (or equivalent, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority.
- (iii) Local teacher organizations (including labor organizations, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority.
- (iv) Other affected stakeholders, such as parent organizations, civil rights organizations, and business organizations.

***Score for (b)(3)   4   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

The application includes 14 letters of support from LEAs that have participated at some level in the initial PACE implementation. The letters include signatures of school superintendents, local teacher organizations, local board of education presidents, and parents' organizations. Overall, the letters indicate a broad level of support within the LEAs and schools that would participate in the IADA initial implementation.

**Weaknesses**

The LEAs and schools that signed letters of support all have some level of PACE implementation. Thus, each should have some unique perspective on the success of PACE and challenges experienced during implementation in their LEA/school. This level of uniqueness would have made the letters of support stronger, rather than signing basically identical letters.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Total Score(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder  
support (b)(1) \_5\_\_**

**+(b)(2)\_4\_\_**

**+(b)(3)\_4\_\_**

**\_13\_\_ of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**(c) Timeline and budget. (15 points total)**

The quality of the SEA's or consortium's timeline and budget for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the timeline and budget, the Secretary considers--

***(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--***

- (i) The activities to occur in each year of the requested demonstration authority period;
- (ii) The parties responsible for each activity; and
- (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);

***Score for (c)(1)   4   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

The narrative (see Table 3) provides a high-level, detailed-by-yearly-quarter timeline of activities for the IADA project. The responsible agents for implementing a particular activity are provided for each line in the table. The overall timeline would be repeated yearly during the IADA project. The timeline provides sufficient detail on the major project activities to determine that major implementation tasks are identified, and tasks are distributed among project partners.

**Weaknesses**

The application is not clear on the timing of using common tasks. The timeline indicates administration only in the spring but other portion of the narrative do not specify this, suggesting that common tasks can occur anytime during the school year.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(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 activities in the timeline under paragraph (c)(1) of this section, including--***

- (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
- (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.

***Score for (c)(2)   6   of 10 points***

**Strengths**

The narrative provides a thorough, complete budget overview for the 2018-19 school year. Eight main components are funded, with activity detail subareas under most of the components. This level of detail is sufficient to determine that adequate funds are allocated to each main component, as well as sufficient funds for the major activities within each category. The narrative denotes that continued State, partner, and other foundation support is needed each year of the IADA project.

**Weaknesses**

Only the 2018-19 budget is provided in the narrative. The application does not specify which items, if any, will need additional funds each succeeding year, and which activities may not need as much funding in future years. The application does not provide sufficient detail on funding past the 2018-19 year to determine that a viable stream of partner and foundation funds will be available each year of the IADA project to ensure sustainability throughout the entire timeframe. The budget does not include any funds for evaluation activities, which is an essential activity.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Total Score(c) Timeline and budget**

**(c)(1) \_\_4\_\_**

**+(c)(2) \_\_6\_\_**

**\_\_10\_\_ of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents. (25 points total)**

The quality of the SEA or consortium's plan to provide supports that can be delivered consistently at scale to educators, students, and parents to enable successful implementation of the innovative assessment system and improve instruction and student outcomes. In determining the quality of supports, the Secretary considers--

***(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;***

***Score for (d)(1) if factor (d)(4) is applicable 3 of 5 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable     of 9 points***

Strengths

The NH DOE has designed and implemented a multi-faceted system of support for teachers and other school staff for PACE. During the initial PACE roll-out, the SEA and its partners have been able to provide effective support to local educators, as documented in the independent formative PACE evaluation (see Appendix K). The project's theory of action is supported by specific design features (see Figure 10) that focus on increasing teacher knowledge and skills with direct classroom instruction applicability. Overall, the PACE IADA system design includes strategies that should have direct and sustained impact on classroom instruction and improved student academic achievement, and features that should be able to be delivered at scale throughout the IADA timeframe.

Weaknesses

The narrative does not explicate how the PD offered will specifically develop teachers' capacity to implement instruction informed by the innovative assessment system. The narrative does not provide information on the rate of teacher attendance/participation in PD activities. That is, of

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

the total number of teachers who should have been involved in specific PD training, the number that actually participated. This is important, as the teachers eligible to score local assessments the next school year is dependent on their receiving PD during the summer.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(2) The strategies the SEA or consortium has developed and will use to familiarize students and parents with the innovative assessment system;***

***Score for (d)(2) if factor (d)(4) is applicable   2   of 5 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable      of 8 points***

**Strengths**

The application states that LEAs have taken the lead in ensuring that parents and students are acquainted with and supportive of the innovative assessment system. The narrative provides four brief examples of efforts in communicating information about the PACE system to parents and the community.

**Weaknesses**

The narrative does not describe any real strategies for engaging students and communicating to them about the PACE project. Rather, students' understanding about the project is a by-product of the system (e.g., teachers discussing with students authentic and engaging tasks). Thus, the student perspective depends upon the amount of time individual teachers discuss their changing instructional practices. Similarly, the application provides examples of how parents might be informed of the project but does not include a detailed menu or examples of parent communication strategies for PACE from the SEA that LEAs can use or modify as needed.

***(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 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;***

***Score for (d)(3) if factor (d)(4) is applicable   5   of 5 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable      of 8 points***

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Strengths**

The application notes that the process of developing Common Tasks incorporates the principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL). Teachers are trained to incorporate UDL when designing local assessment tasks and assessments. In addition, PACE Common Task developers consider three factors in developing performance tasks: 1) the extent to which multiple means of representation are available for students to acquire information, 2) the extent to which multiple means of expression are available for students to demonstrate knowledge, and 3) ensuring multiple means of engagement are available to motivate students and tap into interests. The PACE system incorporates all of the accommodations available to students for the NH SAS tests. Overall, the use of UDL in training and development of PACE Common and local tasks, and deliberate strategies to ensure tasks provide multiple avenues for student learning, engagement, and expression should provide the IADA project with strong strategies for addressing underachieving students and Students with Disabilities in meeting the challenging State academic standards.

**Weaknesses**

None noted.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(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(10 points if applicable)

***Score for (d)(4) if factor (d)(4) is applicable 7 of 10 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable no points awarded***

**Strengths**

The application provides ample evidence that the NH DOE and its PACE partners provide sufficient training to teachers for quality control in task development and scoring to ensure adequate level of reliability and validity for local performance assessments. Figure 1 provides an overview of the process used to establish an evidence-base for valid, reliable and comparable annual determinations, which incorporate local performance assessment tasks scored by teachers. An extensive presentation of evaluating comparability in the application is detailed (e.g., it addresses both content and score comparability) and thoroughly provides information on how NH DOE will address comparability across assessment systems, across LEAs, and within LEAs. The application also includes details on the process NH DOE will assure reliable scoring, which include principles of scoring student work, calculation of inter-rater reliability estimates, and generalizability analyses. Overall, the application provides sufficient evidence to conclude that the NH DOE PACE processes, if followed with fidelity, will produce results that are valid and reliable for their intended purposes.

**Weaknesses**

The application notes that only some of the local performance assessment tasks are reviewed for quality. However, best practice is that all performance tasks would be reviewed for content

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

validity and quality prior to use. The application is not clear on how the local performance assessment task scores are integrated into overall student competency scores.

**Total Score(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents.**

**(d)(1) \_3\_\_**

**+(d)(2)\_2\_\_**

**+(d)(3)\_5\_\_**

**+(d)(4)\_7\_\_(if applicable)**

**\_17\_\_ of 25**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement. (15 points total)**

The quality of the SEA's or consortium's plan to annually evaluate its implementation of innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers—

***(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); (10 points) and

***Score for (e)(1)   1   of 10 points***

**Strengths**

The application provides a summary of a recent formative evaluation performed by HumRRO on the initial PACE implementation in LEAs and schools. The evaluation examined buy-in from staff in LEAs and schools, collaboration among participating districts/schools, the impact of PACE on instruction and student learning, and varying contextual factors. HumRRO found that PACE was functioning largely as intended and provided NH DOE with 10 recommendations to consider.

**Weaknesses**

The narrative does not present any plan for an external evaluation of the IADA project. The budget as presented in the application does not allocate any funds for an external evaluation of the IADA project. Although the initial implementation of PACE received an external evaluation, the IADA project must be evaluated to assess the implementation of an extended roll out of the PACE system, along with any enhancements to the system for IADA (i.e., the new computer system). This would match best practice.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(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. (5 points)

***Score for (e)(2)   3   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

The narrative provides specific examples of how NH DOE uses data to make changes to improve the quality of local and Common assessment tasks. Results from yearly calibration and standard-setting activities are provided to participating LEAs and schools to improve their scoring processes the following year. Also, LEAs receive feedback on the quality of their assessment maps and local assessment tasks to improve subsequent activities. Finally, NH DOE and its technical partners provide feedback throughout the year on the quality of local assessment tasks. Overall, the NH DOE provides ongoing and yearly feedback to LEAs and schools on the quality of both local and Common assessment tasks.

**Weaknesses**

The application does not provide sufficient information on how NH DOE evaluates and monitors implementation of the PACE in LEAs and schools. For example, how does the SEA monitor the quality of local performance tasks that are not reviewed by the current task development process, and there is no description of how the SEA monitors the quality of local task administration.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Total Score(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement.**

**(e)(1) \_\_1\_\_**

**+(e)(2) \_\_3\_\_**

**\_\_4\_\_ of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:2

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Final Score Summary New Hampshire:**

<i>(a) Project narrative</i>	<b>39</b>	<b>of 40</b>
<i>(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support</i>	<b>13</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<i>(c) Timeline and budget</i>	<b>10</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<i>(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents</i>	<b>17</b>	<b>of 25</b>
<i>(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement</i>	<b>4</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<b>Total:</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>of 110</b>

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Instructions:**

- The Panel Monitor will provide deadlines for submitting preliminary scores and comments.
- Review and score each application independently.
- Enter preliminary scores and comments into the Preliminary TRF.
- Send completed TRF to the Panel Monitor.
- The Panel Monitor will review scores and comments and ask you to clarify or elaborate if needed, so that comments clearly reflect and justify your scores.
- All scores and comments must be completed before panel discussions can be held.
- After discussion, revise your Preliminary TRF to reflect any changes you want to make.

Writing strengths and weaknesses:

- Make clear, evaluative statements about the substance of the criterion being discussed.
- Substantiate all evaluative statements using evidence from the application narrative, evidence tables, performance measures, appendices, and/or budgets.
- You may comment on information that is missing or inconsistent with other parts of the application.
- Write for a broad audience. Avoid expressions and jargon that might not be commonly understood.

Scoring:

- You may choose to break comments down by subcriteria, which will make them easier to read and review. This is preferred but optional.
- When awarding points, you should NOT break down scores by sub-criteria. Each criterion receives one total score as directed in the TRF (for example, (a)(1)(i-ii) receives one score).
- A few criteria may not be applicable to every application. If so, follow the instructions in the TRF.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**(a) Project narrative. (40 points total)**

The quality of the SEA's or consortium's plan for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the plan, the Secretary considers--

***(1) The rationale for developing or selecting the particular innovative assessment system to be implemented under the demonstration authority, including--***

- (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
- (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;

***Score for (a)(1)                    if factor (a)(3) is applicable 4 of 5 points;  
if factor (a)(3) is not applicable    of 10 points***

<p>Strengths</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The overall system of classroom-embedded authentic performance assessments aligned to the state standards and designed to allow students to show what they know and can do in alternative ways has the potential to provide teachers quality information about their students' learning in a timely way so that teachers can differentiate and personalize learning to optimize students' achievement. In addition, these types of performance assessments are far more engaging and motivating for students than traditional assessments, and are thereby more likely to produce more valid and complete performance from students than traditional assessments.</li><li>2. Including teachers and LEAs in the design, development, and scoring of the performance assessments can be a powerful source of professional development for teachers.</li><li>3. It is laudable that even though students in the state tend to perform relatively well on standardized tests, the state is interested in moving the system from "good" to "great."</li><li>4. Having the performance assessments interspersed with the annual state assessment across grades and content areas provides a good balance of formative and summative data.</li></ol>
--

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Weaknesses**

Using a competency, mastery-based approach that only allows students to move on to more advanced work when they meet certain benchmarks can meet the needs of all students only if classroom supports are designed to address these deficits quickly and effectively. However, in classrooms with less effective instructional approaches, what can occur is that lower-achieving students start to get further and further behind their peers. While the application speaks to the professional development of teachers regarding their learning how to design and score the performance assessments, there is minimal description of professional development regarding the use of the information from the performance assessments to help teachers effectively differentiate for students of varying achievement levels. Preliminary results from a research study described in Appendix H does indicate that lower achieving students tended to exhibit "small positive differential effects." This is heartening, but it will be very important for the state to keep close tabs on students who are not making adequate annual progress, and to ensure that teachers are well equipped to provide the timely interventions needed to keep all students on track, especially as the system scales up to more districts.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(2) The plan the SEA or consortium, in consultation with any external partners, if applicable, has to--***

- (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
- (ii) Train evaluators to use such strategies, if applicable;

***Score for (a)(2) if factor (a)(3) is applicable 22 of 25 points;  
if factor (a)(3) is not applicable     of 30 points***

**Strengths**

1. The entire system of scoring that the state has put into place for their PACE assessment system, including the development and calibration of tasks, rubrics, scoring methods, and the assurance of acceptable inter-rater reliability, is based on relevant current nationally recognized professional and technical standards.
2. Using well-constructed common performance tasks as a way to calibrate the design and scoring of local performance tasks is an excellent way to not only calibrate the local tasks, but also to provide models for teachers as they work on the development and scoring of local tasks.
3. The comparability of the PACE assessments is strongly addressed in multiple ways, including comparability within districts, across districts, and between the performance assessment and the annual state assessment. The methods being used to assess comparability are well established and sound in both technical and common-sense ways.
4. The training of teachers to do scoring is well conceptualized and not only helps teachers to score more reliably but also helps teachers develop a better understanding of the tasks and what high quality evidence from students looks like.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Weaknesses**

1. The application states that the state does not plan to do the performance standards validation every year of the Demonstration period, but does not indicate if they plan to do it any year during this time. Additionally, although the application states that results of the body of evidence audits from three years are available upon request and provide evidence of the validity of the PACE performance standards, there are no details or summaries provided to describe the validity that has been found.
2. The application states that results from two or three years of study regarding three measures of comparability (percent proficient across the two assessment systems, concurrent comparability evaluation, and nonconcurrent comparability evaluation) are available upon request, but no details or summaries of results are provided in the application nor in the Appendices. While the descriptions about how the studies were conducted are rather detailed, the lack of results being presented is a notable missing link.

***(3) If the system will initially be administered in a subset of schools or LEAs in a State--***

- (i) The strategies the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, will use to scale the innovative assessment to all schools statewide, with a rationale for selecting those strategies;
- (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
- (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.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***Score for (a)(3) if factor (a)(3) is applicable 6 of 10 points;  
if factor (a)(3) is not applicable no points awarded***

**Strengths**

1. Letting LEAs choose different levels of PACE implementation to start with, from simply participating in relevant professional learning offerings to partial implementation in a grade or content, to full implementation, is sensible in that it will allow teachers to begin to get comfortable with the foundational concepts that undergird the performance assessment system.
2. Given the time, effort, and resources on the part of teachers and district leadership that are necessary to effectively participate in PACE, the criteria that the state is using to include new LEAs in PACE appear to be reasonable and prudent.
3. The demographics of the current PACE student participants in terms of ethnicity very closely match the ethnic make-up of students statewide.
4. The state has given attention to ensuring effective implementation of PACE in the participating LEAs, as evidenced in the detailed protocols designed for teacher use, regular meetings with district leadership, and comprehensive professional development opportunities.

**Weaknesses**

1. No information is provided regarding demographics of PACE participants or students statewide in terms of students on free/reduced meal status, English Language learners, or Special Education students.
2. No benchmarks are provided in terms of expected numbers of districts to join the PACE system over the course of the Demonstration period. While it is stated that 14 LEAs are currently in full implementation and a total of 30 LEAs participate to some degree, it is unclear how many total districts there are in the state, and therefore it is unclear what percentage of LEAs are fully or partially implementing the system at this point in time.
3. Given the relatively stringent criteria the state is using to determine when an LEA may join the PACE system, it is unclear how long the state estimates it will take to scale up PACE statewide, or even if the SEA expects that at some point all LEAs will be using it.



**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Score for (b)(1)   5   of 5 points**

**Strengths**

1. Because the SEA has already been allowed by the USED to develop and implement PACE in a small subset of LEAs, they have proven their ability to develop this system of performance-based assessments aligned to the state standards and to implement it effectively.
2. The PACE system is using the same accommodations for English learners and students with disabilities that are used on the state assessment and has provided professional development for their teachers on the expected use of the accommodations in the instructional setting as well as in the assessment. Therefore, the accommodations have already been proven to be appropriate.
3. The SEA has in place several types of professional development for teachers on the design, development, scoring, and use of the performance tasks in the PACE districts, and is planning to provide professional development for all teachers across the state regarding the ideas underlying the use of high quality performance tasks in the classroom. Evidence that PACE teachers have found this professional development to be valuable is supported by the study by HumRRO in which teachers across districts expressed that PACE has had a positive impact on increasing the depth of knowledge at which they teach and gives them real-time feedback that they can use to make "on-the-spot" adjustments to their instruction to better meet the needs of their students.
4. Because the PACE system is already in place in a few LEAs, the SEA has demonstrated their track record in the use of standardized and calibrated scoring tools, rubrics, and protocols in the scoring of the performance assessments, and has in place high quality processes for determining the reliability, validity, and comparability of the innovative assessment.

**Weaknesses**

None found.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(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--

- (i) The SEA's analysis of how capacity influenced the success of prior efforts to develop and implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items; and
- (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.

***Score for (b)(2)   3   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

1. The SEA is in the process of working with a software company to develop a fully customized technology system for PACE that will decrease the current data burden on participants. This is particularly important since the HumRRO study found that about one-fourth of the participating teachers indicated that the time and effort required by PACE was not worth the benefit. So, any improved systems that will automate some of the work currently done by LEA staff will be important for the success of the assessment system.
2. Legislation passed in 2017 gave the SEA explicit permission and policy support for scaling PACE statewide. This state legislative support sends an important message to non-participating LEAs regarding the importance for them to "get onboard."
3. The state's external partners – the Center for Assessment and other partners – have the expertise to provide services in the areas of technical support, data analysis, and professional development.

**Weaknesses**

1. While the SEA does have a three-year track record of the state working with LEAs to implement PACE, the number of LEAs has been small, and it is not clear how the SEA will

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

address the internal capacity that will be needed to help support a much larger number of participating LEAs.

2. The application states that the SEA has shown its ability to mitigate risks but provides no examples of how they have done this.

3. Within the NH DOE, the PACE program is situated in both the assessment and the accountability divisions. It appears from the organizational chart that the assessment division provides support for operations and professional development while the accountability division provides support in terms of data, but it is not clear how staff in the two areas coordinate the work across the divisions. Instead of resumes provided for the three NH DOE staff listed as Project Director and Key Personnel, the application provides generic job descriptions for these three staff members. While the job description for the project director is specific to PACE, the other two job descriptions do not clarify the role of those two staff members in the PACE initiative.

***(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:

- (i) Superintendents (or equivalent) of LEAs, including participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority period.
- (ii) Presidents of local school boards (or equivalent, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority.
- (iii) Local teacher organizations (including labor organizations, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority.
- (iv) Other affected stakeholders, such as parent organizations, civil rights organizations, and business organizations.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Score for (b)(3) 4 of 5 points**

**Strengths**

The application includes letters of support from the 14 LEAs that are currently in full implementation of PACE, with signatures from all 14 Superintendents, 9 School Board representatives, 5 parent representatives, 4 teacher associations, 2 principals, and 1 student representative.

**Weaknesses**

There are no letters of support or commitment from LEAs that are in partial implementation, nor any letters from LEAs that are not currently using PACE but plan to start in the first year of the Demonstration period.

**Total Score(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support**

**(b)(1) 5**

**+(b)(2) 3**

**+(b)(3) 4**

**12 of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**(c) Timeline and budget. (15 points total)**

The quality of the SEA's or consortium's timeline and budget for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the timeline and budget, the Secretary considers--

***(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--***

- (i) The activities to occur in each year of the requested demonstration authority period;
- (ii) The parties responsible for each activity; and
- (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);

***Score for (c)(1)   3   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

The SEA provides a calendar of typical events that occur within any given school year, and the parties responsible for each activity, based on the work they have done so far. They describe these events as occurring each year of the demonstration authority period. The timeline for these activities appears reasonable and appropriate.

**Weaknesses**

1. The application does not address a timeline of activities during the demonstration authority period designed to scale up the number of districts toward a statewide implementation of the innovative assessment system. For example, it is unclear how new districts will be recruited and what activities the SEA will undertake to move districts from simply attending professional development events to partial implementation up to full implementation.
2. While the timeline mentions that the PACE common tasks can be administered whenever they fit within a district's curricular scope and sequence, it is unclear when the other components of the operational assessment system are administered.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

3. In the HumRRO report, the SEA indicates they will be conducting research studies in response to the recommendations, but there is no mention of this activity in the timeline.

***(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 activities in the timeline under paragraph (c)(1) of this section, including--***

- (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
- (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.

***Score for (c)(2)   7   of 10 points***

**Strengths**

1. Since the project budget is based on actual costs accrued over the first four years of the assessment initiative, the expected costs appear to be reasonable and appropriate.
2. Having various partners share the costs (e.g., state legislature, LEAs, the teachers association) not only helps to support the budget, but also builds a feeling of ownership across the various partners.
3. Having the New Hampshire Learning Initiative help raise funds from philanthropic foundations to support PACE is a very helpful support for the project and increases the awareness of community organizations in the work of the state toward improving assessment and instruction.

**Weaknesses**

1. It is unclear the extent to which non-participating LEAs might be reluctant to implement the PACE system due to the LEA costs of covering substitute stipends, content lead stipends, and

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

professional development offerings. Securing the additional funding listed in the budget would certainly help to mitigate that as a possible barrier.

2. Costs are provided only for 2018-19. While the SEA points out that the costs of running the assessment system were higher at the beginning with four LEAs participating than it is now with 14 LEAs participating, it seems highly likely that the costs of scaling up will naturally rise as the number of LEAs starts to approach state-wide implementation.

3. In the HumRRO report, the SEA indicates they will be conducting research studies in response to the recommendations, but there is no mention of this activity in the budget.

**Total Score(c) Timeline and budget**

**(c)(1)   3**

**+(c)(2)   7**

**10   of 15**

**(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents. (25 points total)**

The quality of the SEA or consortium's plan to provide supports that can be delivered consistently at scale to educators, students, and parents to enable successful implementation of the innovative assessment system and improve instruction and student outcomes. In determining the quality of supports, the Secretary considers--

***(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***

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***implement instruction that is informed by the innovative assessment system and its results;***

***Score for (d)(1) if factor (d)(4) is applicable 4 of 5 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable \_\_\_ of 9 points***

**Strengths**

The SEA has created a very comprehensive system of training for LEA and school staff of participating PACE districts that includes summer institutes for all PACE teachers regarding task development, reviewing student bodies of evidence, and cross-district calibration; specialized training for teacher leaders; and advanced training for content leaders. All of the professional development, while designed to help teachers more effectively implement PACE, is likely to also build assessment literacy across the participating teachers. Based on research regarding the importance of job-embedded professional development, the description of these professional development activities suggests that the PACE training is powerful in helping teachers improve their assessment and instructional practices.

**Weaknesses**

1. It is unclear what support is provided to teachers regarding their making appropriate linkages between the student performance on the assessment tasks and instruction in class.
2. It is unclear if all participating teachers are required to participate in training, and whether a teacher is not allowed to score if they did not attend training.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(2) The strategies the SEA or consortium has developed and will use to familiarize students and parents with the innovative assessment system;***

***Score for (d)(2) if factor (d)(4) is applicable 2 of 5 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable \_\_\_ of 8 points***

**Strengths**

Providing student work showcases and parent nights where parents are given sample performance tasks to take themselves can be a very effective way to help parents understand the benefits of performance assessments over traditional assessments.

**Weaknesses**

1. Leaving it up to LEAs to ensure that students and parents are well-acquainted with and supportive of the innovative assessment system, without regularly checking on how or if this is accomplished, allows for the possibility of parents and students in some LEAs being less well informed than others.
2. Beyond the parent nights, it is unclear what other communications are provided to parents to familiarize them with PACE and how it works.
3. While it is true that having students take authentic performance assessments increases their engagement and interest, it is unclear how students are introduced to the way PACE works and what the expectations are for students. It is also not clear the extent to which students are given the opportunity to paraphrase rubrics into "student language," do self-assessment, and/or do peer assessment, to better understand the expectations of the tasks.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(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 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;***

***Score for (d)(3) if factor (d)(4) is applicable 3 of 5 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable \_\_\_\_ of 8 points***

Strengths

1. Using a system of classroom-based performance tasks allows teachers the flexibility to provide differentiation and feedback for all students, and especially for students with disabilities or other risk factors, on a timely as-needed basis. This is very important aspect of support for all students and students in each subgroup.
2. The accommodations used in the assessments are the same as the accommodations used throughout instruction, which is necessary and appropriate to ensure consistency of the supports provided.

Weaknesses

1. The application states that "early research suggests that while the PACE innovative assessment system is beneficial for improving outcomes for all students (as measured by the statewide assessment), it may be particularly beneficial for low performing students." The summary of the research study conducted by Evans (in the Appendix) clarifies this information by stating that "lower achieving students tended to exhibit small positive differential effects whereas male students tended to exhibit small negative differential effects. There were inconclusive findings related to special education and free-and-reduced price lunch students." It is important for the SEA to recognize that not all sub-groups may be experiencing positive effects, even if they are not experiencing negative effects, and to closely monitor the learning and needed supports for all sub-groups of students.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

2. It is not clear what professional development teachers are given to provide effective differentiation and support for all sub-groups of students.

***(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(10 points if applicable)

***Score for (d)(4) if factor (d)(4) is applicable 8 of 10 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable no points awarded***

**Strengths**

The SEA has developed and implemented a rather robust system for ensuring that the development and scoring done by LEAs is of high quality and is valid and reliable. The PACE system includes performance task templates, rubrics, scoring tools, quality control procedures, inter-rater reliability checks, and audit plans that are detailed and meet professional and technical standards for the development of performance tasks and accompanying scoring tools. Some of the strategies the state uses that meet these criteria include: (1) using common performance tasks that are highly vetted by the state as a check on the local assessments, (2) using double blind scoring on select tasks, (3) having teachers participate in range-finding exercises to identify anchor papers, and (4) providing very detailed protocols for PACE teachers to follow that not only ensure quality but also basically define for teachers what a good assessment entails. Supported by ongoing professional development for the teachers through content and teacher leaders as well as meetings and workshops, these safeguards appear to be sufficient to ensure unbiased, objective scoring of the assessment tasks.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

Weaknesses

Having only a sample of local tasks be checked for quality is allowing the possibility of low quality tasks to be a part of the state assessment system. It would be important for the SEA to use the same process for local task review that is used for the common tasks.

**Total Score(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents.**

**(d)(1)   4**

**+(d)(2)   2**

**+(d)(3)   3**

**+(d)(4)   8   (if applicable)**

**17   of 25**

**(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement. (15 points total)**

The quality of the SEA's or consortium's plan to annually evaluate its implementation of innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers—

***(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

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

statewide assessment system consistent with the requirements of 34 CFR part200.105(b)(4) and (9); (10 points) and

***Score for (e)(1)   3   of 10 points***

**Strengths**

1. The PACE assessment system has already had an evaluation conducted by an independent, experienced third party (HumRRO). This evaluation looked at aspects of the system with regard to implementation, using interviews, observations, and surveys of various participants, and made several recommendations to which the state has responded with actions they plan to take. This evaluation study provided useful formative information to the state in terms of considerations for improving the system especially as the state scales up the number of participating districts.
2. The system's validity, reliability, and comparability have been determined by the state working in conjunction with the Center for Assessment as an ongoing part of the implementation of the program with the early sets of participants.
3. In their response to the HumRRO study, the state indicated that they have commissioned research studies to track longitudinal district performance.

**Weaknesses**

1. The application indicates that since the HumRRO evaluation has just recently been completed, they do not plan to do another evaluation for "at least another few years." However, the HumRRO evaluation explicitly points out the need for the state to do a number of investigations as they scale up the system, including: monitoring the level of support provided by district leadership, evaluating the effectiveness of the new collaboration methods, investigating the impact of reading/writing requirements on accessibility and student performance, routinizing timely reviews of local performance tasks for quality, studying the impact of PACE on teaching and learning as new districts come onboard, and tracking performance from year to year. The state should not consider the evaluation of the system with the first few highly motivated districts to be necessarily representative of how well the system will work as more and more districts become involved. In addition, the questions to be answered by an evaluation would be different as new districts come onboard compared to the questions asked and answered in the early stages of the system implementation.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

2. There is no evidence of a plan for an independent external evaluator to conduct an evaluation on an annual basis.
3. While the SEA indicates they plan to do research studies in response to the HumRRO report, there is no mention of this in either the timeline or in the budget.

***(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. (5 points)

***Score for (e)(2) 3 of 5 points***

**Strengths**

1. The state indicates that they will be implementing an assessment map review with aligned assessment audit to evaluate the quality of the local performance tasks and providing feedback to districts related to their assessments as well as providing targeted assistance to districts in need of additional guidance. This is especially important since the local tasks are the ones with the highest likelihood of not meeting all necessary quality criteria.
2. The state has a system to provide ongoing feedback to districts regarding yearly calibration and standard setting, the task development process, and the quality of local and common tasks in order for districts to improve their performance. With the various communication mechanisms in place such as the use of content and teacher leaders and regular meetings between state and local educators, there is a relatively high probability that ongoing improvement by LEAs will be occurring.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Weaknesses**

1. It is unclear if the state will be doing a systematic evaluation of the implementation of the PACE system on an annual basis. For example, while there are regular processes in place for state feedback to LEAs regarding their implementation of the system, it is unclear what type of follow-up the SEA has in place to determine if these improvements are taking place, what the LEA has done to address any issues that have surfaced, and if the LEA actions have in fact had a positive impact.
2. It is not clear what actions the SEA takes or interventions that are implemented when LEAs are not in fact effectively using the feedback they receive. This will be especially important as a greater number of potentially less motivated districts begin to participate.

**Total Score(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement.**

**(e)(1)   3**

**+(e)(2)   3**

**6   of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:3

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Final Score Summary (New Hampshire):**

<i>(a) Project narrative</i>	<b>32</b>	<b>of 40</b>
<i>(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support</i>	<b>12</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<i>(c) Timeline and budget</i>	<b>10</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<i>(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents</i>	<b>17</b>	<b>of 25</b>
<i>(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement</i>	<b>6</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<b>Total:</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>of 110</b>

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Instructions:**

- The Panel Monitor will provide deadlines for submitting preliminary scores and comments.
- Review and score each application independently.
- Enter preliminary scores and comments into the Preliminary TRF.
- Send completed TRF to the Panel Monitor.
- The Panel Monitor will review scores and comments and ask you to clarify or elaborate if needed, so that comments clearly reflect and justify your scores.
- All scores and comments must be completed before panel discussions can be held.
- After discussion, revise your Preliminary TRF to reflect any changes you want to make.

Writing strengths and weaknesses:

- Make clear, evaluative statements about the substance of the criterion being discussed.
- Substantiate all evaluative statements using evidence from the application narrative, evidence tables, performance measures, appendices, and/or budgets.
- You may comment on information that is missing or inconsistent with other parts of the application.
- Write for a broad audience. Avoid expressions and jargon that might not be commonly understood.

Scoring:

- You may choose to break comments down by subcriteria, which will make them easier to read and review. This is preferred but optional.
- When awarding points, you should NOT break down scores by sub-criteria. Each criterion receives one total score as directed in the TRF (for example, (a)(1)(i-ii) receives one score).
- A few criteria may not be applicable to every application. If so, follow the instructions in the TRF.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**(a) Project narrative. (40 points total)**

The quality of the SEA's or consortium's plan for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the plan, the Secretary considers--

***(1) The rationale for developing or selecting the particular innovative assessment system to be implemented under the demonstration authority, including--***

- (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
- (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;

***Score for (a)(1)                    if factor (a)(3) is applicable   3   of 5 points;  
   if factor (a)(3) is not applicable     of 10 points***

**Strengths**

(i) NH DOE asserts that once a year state-level assessments are insufficient for students to learn deeply and meet the diverse needs of students and therefore embraces the use of the PACE innovative assessment system. PACE permits schools and districts to provide multiple types of assessments for students to demonstrate academic achievement and growth. The PACE assessments include (1) locally developed assessments, usually performance-based assessments, and (2) PACE common performance assessments.

The purpose of the local assessments is to provide the "bulk of the information relative to student achievement of State academic standards and competencies." The purpose of the common performance assessments is to "provide a means for evaluating and establishing comparability (calibration) among PACE schools . . . and provide visible learning targets and performance expectations for all New Hampshire students." The common assessments also are intended to build local assessment literacy capacity to develop local assessments. The information from these two assessments is used together to comprise the student-level competency scores.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

(ii) Two of the claims of PACE indicate that implementing PACE assessment system will foster high-quality instruction and improved student outcomes. Feedback from teacher assessment task writers indicates that working with other teachers to develop performance-based assessments enhances their instruction. The incorporation of UD concepts in the task template will prompt task developers to consider all learners.

**Weaknesses**

(i) There is no description of how each of these assessments-summative tests, and local performance assessments weighted to result in a district-level competency score, which then, combined with PACE common performance task, contributes to PACE-Comparable Annual Determinations and thus a student's reported achievement level.

The narrative indicates that learning and assessments are personalized for each student, that there are multiple ways for students to demonstrate that they have mastered the content, but a description of how this is accomplished is not provided. It is also not clear what is meant by individual students are on individual learning paths toward mastery of academic standards. How does this concept convey during instruction and assessment?

(ii) It is not clear how the training provided for task development and scoring translates to teacher instruction and student learning. There is a dearth of information about the curriculum and instructional processes.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(2) The plan the SEA or consortium, in consultation with any external partners, if applicable, has to--***

- (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
- (ii) Train evaluators to use such strategies, if applicable;

***Score for (a)(2) if factor (a)(3) is applicable   10   of 25 points;  
if factor (a)(3) is not applicable      of 30 points***

**Strengths**

- (i) Each summer at the PACE Summer Institute, teachers from fully implementing districts score common performance tasks from other districts. They collaborate to select anchor papers and annotate the scores for district use. This collaboration is a strong model for professional development. Appendix J suggests: (a) a process for grade level individual teachers or teams to identify anchor papers, and (b) a process for individual teacher scoring of his/her student responses to the PACE common task.
- (ii) The proposal states, "all teachers implementing PACE undergo within-district training on task implementation and scoring including - calibration sessions."

**Weaknesses**

- (i) The proposal does not include a clear description of relevant nationally recognized professional and technical standards, to ensure inter-rater reliability and comparability of innovative assessment results. NH DOE externally audits only a sample of papers to determine consistency in scoring. The following professional standards for scoring are not addressed in this application: What training do individual teacher scorers receive other than receiving Principles of Scoring Work, a 1-page handout? How is it determined that a teacher-scorer understands the rubric and is prepared to score the rubric? What feedback do teacher scorers receive during the scoring process – validity checks? Are all papers double-scored? Are statistics developed? Are

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

teachers retrained if they are not scoring the rubric? Teacher scorers across the state may not be using the same anchor papers; what process is used to ensure that all anchor papers reflect the rubric?

NH DOE argues that there are numerous quality control processes and procedures in the PACE system to ensure technical quality of each assessment and of the full assessment system, and that because PACE operates as a well-functioning system, the whole is greater than the sum of the parts. However, the quality control processes and procedures appear to rely only on sampling procedures to determine technical quality of performance tasks and scoring procedures.

(ii) A thorough description of how teacher scorers are trained to score is not provided.

***(3) If the system will initially be administered in a subset of schools or LEAs in a State--***

(i) The strategies the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, will use to scale the innovative assessment to all schools statewide, with a rationale for selecting those strategies;

(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

(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.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Score for (a)(3) if factor (a)(3) is applicable 5 of 10 points;  
if factor (a)(3) is not applicable no points awarded**

**Strengths**

(i) NH DOE describes a rationale for each of the proposed continuum of five models to support PACE implementation in LEAs; one model describes full implementation of PACE assessment system in some districts, two models describe partial implementation, partial implementation I (permit districts to implement in one content area in all grades or in one grade span implement all three content areas) and partial implementation II (permit districts to implement in one content area in one grade span); a fourth model, personalized learning and assessment opportunities for all students is "an important near-term goal for NH DOE to create a limited number of shorter performance tasks that can be embedded in mini-curricular units for any school to use, and the fifth model is performance assessment and deeper learning opportunities for all NH educators and students, which involves an "effort to prepare the ground for a statewide group of assessment literate educators and to enable more schools to enter into PACE more seamlessly, NH DOE will expand the focus of professional learning offerings to all NH educators.

(ii) NHDOE lists the required activities for a district to participate in PACE. NH DOE asserts, "we have confidence that we will be able to have all NH schools participating in PACE within the period of the Demonstration of Authority."

(iii) "NH DOE commits that it will continue to maintain this demographic representation as it adds new districts throughout the Demonstration Authority while ensure (sic) high-fidelity implementation of PACE."

**Weaknesses**

(i) Based on the description provided, it is unclear how NH DOE expects to fully scale PACE in all districts during this demonstration period.

(ii) However, it is not indicated if these required activities are only for full participation or for one of the other four models in the PACE continuum of participation. A timeline to approve additional districts and schools is not provided. A timeline for implementing the various models on the continuum is not provided. Without timelines and clear plans for building the capacity of



**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application “B” Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support. (15 points total)**

***(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—

(i) The success and track record of efforts to implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items aligned to the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act in LEAs planning to participate; and

(ii) The SEA’s or LEA’s development or use of--

(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;

(B) Effective and high-quality supports for school staff to implement innovative assessments and innovative assessment items, including professional development; and

(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).

***Score for (b)(1) \_3\_ of 5 points***

**Strengths**

(i) In the past four years (2014-2018) NH DOE implemented PACE in 9 districts. Currently over 30 districts are involved in PACE at various levels of participation. The current model permits

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

school districts to participate in PACE although the readiness of every school, content area, or grade span may differ across a district. Scaling permits gradual implementation by school districts.

(ii) (A) Performance task development requires the use of universal design principles and the availability of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities and English learners. In their response to the evaluation study, NH DOE indicates that all content leads have been trained in the use of universal design principles and accommodations.

(ii) (B) Support extended to all teachers in PACE schools includes within-district training on task development and scoring, including calibration; opportunity to participate in PACE Summer Institute which has multiple strands of topics, and NH DOE Summer Summit, open to all NH teachers. Content leads and Teacher leads, select PACE teachers, receive advanced or specialized training in assessment design, development, and implementation. District leadership in PACE participating districts attend monthly meetings. NH DOE intends to increase the number of regions to match the seven NH professional development regions in the state. However, the rationale and proposed impact of this intention is not explained.

(ii) (C) Teachers select and annotate anchor papers, teacher scorers receive copies of the anchor papers for the tasks to be scored and the Principles of Scoring Work, a one-page handout to be used to guide their scoring of his/her students responses to the PACE Common Task. Districts can share anchor papers.

**Weaknesses**

(i) Based on initial implementation NH DOE now permits several models of gradual implementation in the schools and districts due to lack of observed simultaneous readiness in schools, content areas, and grades. Although it is stated that it is expected that all districts will be PACE schools within demonstration authority, a timeline for districts to communicate such readiness for full PACE implementation is not provided. NH DOE states, "the timing of the transition toward full implementation would be decided by the district leadership and local school board in consultation with the NH DOE."

(ii) (A) The evaluation report suggests that teachers should receive training on universal design and the provision of accommodations. Although the content leads have been trained on these

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

concepts, it is not stated how the content leads interact with the teachers who are developing the performance tasks and if these teachers have had such training.

(ii) (B) NH DOE proposes avoiding an "all or none" participation rule for PACE, thus allowing "NH DOE to provide capacity building resources and supports around competency-based education and performance assessment to LEAs at their point of readiness." However, there is no timeline, nor plan presented that describes that the resources for professional development will be adequate to support this plan of multiple models of implementation, in relation to the stated expectation that all districts will be expected to "eventually move toward full implementation." It is not clear what professional development is provided to every teacher in every school that participates even partially in PACE.

(ii) (C) A detailed description of how teachers are trained to score is not provided. Are teachers assessed to determine that they can properly scoring the rubric? Are all papers double-scored and is there a resolution process? Are validity checks administered during the scoring process to be certain that the scoring rules are applied correctly, including read behinds? These are acceptable professional scoring practices to ensure valid and reliable student scores.

***(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--

- (i) The SEA's analysis of how capacity influenced the success of prior efforts to develop and implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items; and
- (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.

***Score for (b)(2)   2   of 5 points***

Strengths

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

(i) The NH DOE has implemented PACE in 14 districts in the past four years. PACE leadership team is working with a software company to aide in the scaling and sustainability of PACE and ease the data collection tasks performed in the districts. Organizationally, PACE responsibilities reside with both the assessment and accountability divisions.

(ii) Not stated

**Weaknesses**

(i) NH DOE does not state how many districts are not yet implementing PACE. Although PACE has been implemented in 14 districts and NH DOE has now identified five models of PACE implementation, it is not clear if the DOE has the capacity to scale PACE to all districts in NH based on the information provided.

(ii) Strategies NH DOE is using or will use to mitigate risks during the implementation of PACE are not provided.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(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:

- (i) Superintendents (or equivalent) of LEAs, including participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority period.
- (ii) Presidents of local school boards (or equivalent, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority.
- (iii) Local teacher organizations (including labor organizations, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority.
- (iv) Other affected stakeholders, such as parent organizations, civil rights organizations, and business organizations.

***Score for (b)(3)   3   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

- (i) Letters of commitment and support are provided from 13 superintendents and one head of a charter school in currently collaborating LEAs.
- (ii) Nine Board of Education presidents or vice presidents in currently collaborating LEAs
- (iii) Four teacher organizations in currently collaborating LEAs
- (iv) Four parent organizations and a student government president in currently collaborating LEAs .

**Weaknesses**

There is a lack of stated support from at least four board of education authorities, 10 teacher organizations, and 10 parent organizations from the fourteen PACE districts. No letters of support are provided from any new participants in PACE.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

--

**Total Score(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support**

**(b)(1) \_\_\_3\_\_**

**+(b)(2)\_\_\_2\_**

**+(b)(3)\_\_\_3\_\_**

**\_\_\_8\_ of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**(c) Timeline and budget. (15 points total)**

The quality of the SEA's or consortium's timeline and budget for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the timeline and budget, the Secretary considers--

***(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--***

- (i) The activities to occur in each year of the requested demonstration authority period;
- (ii) The parties responsible for each activity; and
- (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);

***Score for (c)(1)   3   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

- (i) Table 3 provides an overview of the PACE quarterly timeline, activities, and responsible agent(s) during the course of a typical school year.
- (ii) Specific organizations are cited as responsible parties for each activity.
- (iii) N/A

**Weaknesses**

- (i) There is no indication in this "typical school year" timeline of the scaling activities that PACE will be implementing statewide during the requested demonstration authority period. The timeline does not reflect the activities that are recommended in the HumRRO report.
- (ii) None
- (iii) N/A.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(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 activities in the timeline under paragraph (c)(1) of this section, including--***

- (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
- (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.

***Score for (c)(2)   5   of 10 points***

**Strengths**

- (i) NH DOE asserts that the costs of implementing the expansion of PACE are nonlinear; that adding additional districts, will not incur costs. It appears that additional funds needed to develop a digital platform will be provided by NHLI.
- (ii) "NH DOE and its partners, especially NHLI, intend to search for an additional \$364,000 for 2018-2019." NH DOE states that it "recognizes that at least for the near term, the sustainability of PACE is contingent on continued state and external funding."

**Weaknesses**

- (i) The budget does not indicate the expected costs at each phase, each year, costs of scaling to more than 200 districts during the next five years, the ongoing costs of the technology system, or the costs to implement recommendations in the HumRRO report.
- (ii) NH DOE states that it "recognizes that at least for the near term, the sustainability of PACE is contingent on continued state and external funding." However, NH DOE does not define what it means by the "near term" and what will be different at a later point in terms of sustainability and the need for external funding.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Total Score(c) Timeline and budget**

**(c)(1) \_\_3\_\_**

**+(c)(2) \_\_5\_**

**\_\_8\_\_ of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents. (25 points total)**

The quality of the SEA or consortium's plan to provide supports that can be delivered consistently at scale to educators, students, and parents to enable successful implementation of the innovative assessment system and improve instruction and student outcomes. In determining the quality of supports, the Secretary considers--

***(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;***

***Score for (d)(1) if factor (d)(4) is applicable   3   of 5 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable      of 9 points***

**Strengths**

NH DOE describes their theory of action which includes claims that implementing the performance assessments as intended enhances and extends desired instructional practices and that student engagement and student learning increases/deepens when performance assessments are implemented as intended.

A continuum of professional development is provided to local education leaders in districts where PACE is implemented. The professional development includes (a) involving local leaders in designing and implementing the accountability system and thus become a part of organizational change, and (b) training for local district leaders in technical, policy, and practical issues related to the system design and implementation.

Professional development opportunities for teachers are focused on the development and use of performance assessments in their classrooms, task implementation and scoring, and during the PACE Summer Institute, strands of professional development including training in cross-district calibration, reviewing of student bodies of work, task development, and leadership training.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Weaknesses**

Descriptions of the training provided to teachers to enhance their knowledge, understanding, and skill to use performance assessments to inform competency-based approaches to learning and instruction are not provided, although one of the design features is use of competency-based approaches to learning, instruction, and assessment, which structure learning opportunities for students to gain meaningful knowledge and skills at a depth of understanding, etc. Another design feature is the use of locally designed and curriculum-embedded performance assessments throughout the years. It is not clear how the training provided for task development and scoring translates to teacher instruction and student learning. It is not stated that teachers are required to attend the PACE Summer Institute on a yearly basis, or that every teacher must participate in scoring the performance assessments, which is presented as a professional development opportunity.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(2) The strategies the SEA or consortium has developed and will use to familiarize students and parents with the innovative assessment system;***

***Score for (d)(2) if factor (d)(4) is applicable   1   of 5 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable      of 8 points***

Strengths

Only one example is provided regarding how parents are familiarized with PACE; school districts host student work showcases and parent nights where parents and school board members are given example performance assessments.

Students and parents receive more frequent feedback about student achievement.

Weaknesses

NH DOE does not present strategies or plans to develop strategies, such as prepared presentations, newsletters, etc., that districts and schools can use to familiarize parents with PACE. No description of how students are informed about PACE is provided.

***(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 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;***

***Score for (d)(3) if factor (d)(4) is applicable   3   of 5 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable      of 8 points***

Strengths

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

The NH DOE "ensures that students have access to effective supports and appropriate accommodations . . ." PACE adopted the same policies and set of accommodations as Smarter Balanced and NH DOE intends to be consistent with the statewide system as the state transitions to the new assessment. Appendix A lists the assessment accommodations available to students with disabilities and English learners. These accommodations are standard practice and address the use of accommodations that may invalidate the construct of the assessment.

A statement included from a blog asserts that performance assessments, ". . . can improve engagement, student voice, and ownership of learning and they offer flexibility in how student learning is demonstrated." These attributes support the learning of all students, including students with disabilities.

**Weaknesses**

The evaluation report suggests that teachers should receive training on universal design and the provision of accommodations. Although the content leads have been trained on these concepts, it is not stated how the content leads interact with the teachers who are developing the performance tasks and if these teachers have had such training.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(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(10 points if applicable)

***Score for (d)(4) if factor (d)(4) is applicable 5 of 10 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable no points awarded***

**Strengths**

The proposal describes how PACE-participating districts conduct the local component of the assessment system, what is assessed and how, and that samples of locally developed performance tasks and samples of scored assessments are monitored each year. Each district must submit, by a specified timeline, a sample of assessment maps to indicate what assessment will be used to assess each standard; these assessment maps include short summative, unit tests, PBA, and PACE Common Task assessments. Additionally, districts must submit to NH DOE a sample of PACE Common Tasks in one subject area, student work samples from nine students who represent a range of performance, Body of Work samples throughout the year, PACE Common Task scores, Teacher Judgment Surveys, full set of student competency scores, electronic gradebook score data, and a sample of within-district double scored locally developed performance tasks. These submissions are peer reviewed to determine comparability in the evaluation of student work across districts.

**Weaknesses**

There is no description of how much weight each of these assessments contributes to a student's achievement score. There is no rationale provided for the application of differing quality control procedures for both the development and scoring of locally developed performance tasks in

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

contrast to those applied to the common performance tasks. The locally developed performance tasks do not undergo the same quality control procedures as the common Pace performance assessments. Only a sample of teacher-developed performance based assessments and their rubrics must be submitted for review, as delineated in Figure 6. Additionally, the same quality control procedures are not applied to the scoring of locally developed performance tasks; only a sample of double-blind scored tasks is submitted for review. A description about training provided to teachers who will develop and score performance based assessments is not provided. Other than the audit plan, no additional description of quality control features is provided. A description of district-expectations, based on the audit is not described.

**Total Score(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents.**

**(d)(1) \_\_3\_\_**

**+(d)(2) \_\_1\_\_**

**+(d)(3) \_\_3\_\_**

**+(d)(4) \_\_5\_\_ (if applicable)**

**\_\_12\_\_ of 25**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement. (15 points total)**

The quality of the SEA's or consortium's plan to annually evaluate its implementation of innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers—

***(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 part 200.105(b)(4) and (9); (10 points) and

***Score for (e)(1)   0   of 10 points***

Strengths

None

Weaknesses

NH DOE did not submit a plan to annually evaluate its implementation of IADA. Additionally, although the HumRRO formative evaluation report includes numerous suggestions for enhancing the PACE assessment system, there is no plan to evaluate the implementation of these recommendations. NH DOE does state that it will be valuable for an external evaluator's perspective as PACE is scaled in coming years. NH DOE states that it does not "foresee conducting a large scale evaluation for another few years.

***(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. (5 points)

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Score for (e)(2)   2   of 5 points**

**Strengths**

(i) Districts are provided the yearly calibration and standard setting results so they understand how to improve their scoring processes in subsequent years, as well as yearly feedback on the quality of their assessment maps and local assessments.

(ii) Districts must submit their assessment maps, a sample of tasks, and a sample of scored student papers every year for review.

**Weaknesses**

(i) Although districts receive feedback on the various processes each year, a description of the explicit expectations for addressing the feedback to promote continuous district and school improvement is not provided. How NH DOE uses these data to make changes in the assessment system is not discussed. NH DOE does not explain how the recommendations in the HumRRO report will be implemented to improve the quality of the innovative assessment.

(ii) A description of additional monitoring processes, such as on-site monitoring during assessments, is not provided.

**Total Score(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement.**

**(e)(1)   0**

**+(e)(2)   2**

**2   of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID: 4

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Final Score Summary New Hampshire:**

<i>(a) Project narrative</i>	<b>18</b>	<b>of 40</b>
<i>(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support</i>	<b>8</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<i>(c) Timeline and budget</i>	<b>8</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<i>(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents</i>	<b>12</b>	<b>of 25</b>
<i>(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement</i>	<b>2</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<b>Total:</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>of 110</b>

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application “B” Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Instructions:**

- The Panel Monitor will provide deadlines for submitting preliminary scores and comments.
- Review and score each application independently.
- Enter preliminary scores and comments into the Preliminary TRF.
- Send completed TRF to the Panel Monitor.
- The Panel Monitor will review scores and comments and ask you to clarify or elaborate if needed, so that comments clearly reflect and justify your scores.
- All scores and comments must be completed before panel discussions can be held.
- After discussion, revise your Preliminary TRF to reflect any changes you want to make.

Writing strengths and weaknesses:

- Make clear, evaluative statements about the substance of the criterion being discussed.
- Substantiate all evaluative statements using evidence from the application narrative, evidence tables, performance measures, appendices, and/or budgets.
- You may comment on information that is missing or inconsistent with other parts of the application.
- Write for a broad audience. Avoid expressions and jargon that might not be commonly understood.

Scoring:

- You may choose to break comments down by subcriteria, which will make them easier to read and review. This is preferred but optional.
- When awarding points, you should NOT break down scores by sub-criteria. Each criterion receives one total score as directed in the TRF (for example, (a)(1)(i-ii) receives one score).
- A few criteria may not be applicable to every application. If so, follow the instructions in the TRF.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**(a) Project narrative. (40 points total)**

The quality of the SEA's or consortium's plan for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the plan, the Secretary considers--

***(1) The rationale for developing or selecting the particular innovative assessment system to be implemented under the demonstration authority, including--***

- (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
- (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;

***Score for (a)(1)                    if factor (a)(3) is applicable \_\_5\_\_ of 5 points;  
   if factor (a)(3) is not applicable \_\_ \_\_ of 10 points***

**Strengths**

- (i) The State's rationale for developing PACE is well-articulated and connected to a robust theory of action. In incorporating extended performance assessments into statewide academic assessment systems, PACE is advancing the state of assessment practice in an innovative way.
- (ii) PACE sends a strong and positive signal about what is valued in the State's education system, promoting high-quality instruction, mastery of challenging academic content standards, and improved student outcomes for all of the State's students.

**Weaknesses**

- (i) and (ii) None.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(2) The plan the SEA or consortium, in consultation with any external partners, if applicable, has to--***

- (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
- (ii) Train evaluators to use such strategies, if applicable;

***Score for (a)(2) if factor (a)(3) is applicable 20 of 25 points;  
if factor (a)(3) is not applicable     of 30 points***

Strengths

- (i) The State has a robust, multilayered strategy for using standardized methods to ensure inter-rater reliability and comparability of PACE, including methods for comparability within PACE LEAs, across PACE LEAs, and between PACE LEAs and non-PACE LEAs.
- (ii) PACE trains evaluators through grade-level calibration sessions, social moderation pairings, and in the PACE Summer Institute.

Weaknesses

- (i) It is not clear why PACE does not plan to continue to conduct body of evidence audits.
- (ii) None.

***(3) If the system will initially be administered in a subset of schools or LEAs in a State--***

- (i) The strategies the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, will use to scale the innovative assessment to all schools statewide, with a rationale for selecting those strategies;

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application “B” Applicant Name: New Hampshire

(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

(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.

***Score for (a)(3) if factor (a)(3) is applicable 8 of 10 points;  
if factor (a)(3) is not applicable no points awarded***

**Strengths**

(i) The State’s strategy for scaling PACE statewide is based on its experience with the program. The strategy is gradual, based on a continuum of implementation tied to a school’s readiness for adopting the innovation. The plan is flexible, with adoption at the school level rather than (necessarily) district-wide.

(ii) The State already has 14 districts participating in the innovation.

(iii) The State has a set of requirements, called “guardrails,” for districts participating in PACE, which are certified through a systematic interview and vetting process. NH DOE commits to continuing to maintain racial ethnic representation in its expansion of PACE.

**Weaknesses**

(i)-(ii) None.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

(iii) The State does not appear to track adoption and expansion of the innovation so that it meets representation along EL, SWD, and socioeconomic status variables.
--

**Total Score(a) Project Narrative**      **(a)(1) \_5\_\_**  
**+ (a)(2) \_20\_\_**  
**+ (a)(3) \_8\_\_ (if applicable)**  
**\_33\_\_ of 40**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application “B” Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support. (15 points total)**

***(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—

(i) The success and track record of efforts to implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items aligned to the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act in LEAs planning to participate; and

(ii) The SEA’s or LEA’s development or use of--

(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;

(B) Effective and high-quality supports for school staff to implement innovative assessments and innovative assessment items, including professional development; and

(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).

**Score for (b)(1)   4   of 5 points**

Strengths

(i) The State has demonstrated capacity to implement innovative assessments by implementing PACE for the past four years, and securing Education approval to do so, annually.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

(ii)

(A) Effective supports and appropriate accommodations are demonstrated in Appendix A of the submission.

(B) Task and rubric development support is provided to teachers. The State has responded to PD-related recommendations in the HumRRO evaluation by expanding its training. The State is working on a more comprehensive technology support solution.

(C) Rubrics are developed by training teachers, and the tasks and rubrics are calibrated through the PACE system for calibrating assessments.

**Weaknesses**

(i) Although ten success criteria for PACE are outlined, there is no narrative explaining how the State has succeeded in meeting, or progress toward meeting, these criteria, except to note "The NH DOE has submitted PACE technical reports annually to USED that provide evidence of success on the criteria."

(ii)

(A) None.

(B) None.

(C) None.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(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--

- (i) The SEA's analysis of how capacity influenced the success of prior efforts to develop and implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items; and
- (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.

***Score for (b)(2)   3   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

- (i) The State is aware of its technology-related capacity limitations with respect to scaling PACE; it plans to contract with a technology vendor to address specific capacity issues.
- (ii) The application makes a good case that the State's track record with PACE shows that its strategies can effectively mitigate risks.

**Weaknesses**

- (i) I understand that USED limited scale of innovation in the first three years. However, there are very few districts participating after 4 years, in relation to number of districts in the State. Thus, it is hard to see how the State will be able to scale to full implementation in the demonstration period.
- (ii) No specific risks are identified.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(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:

(i) Superintendents (or equivalent) of LEAs, including participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority period.

(ii) Presidents of local school boards (or equivalent, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority.

(iii) Local teacher organizations (including labor organizations, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority.

(iv) Other affected stakeholders, such as parent organizations, civil rights organizations, and business organizations.

***Score for (b)(3)   4   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

(i) These are provided.

(ii) These are provided.

(iii) These are provided.

(iv) PTO signatures are provided.

**Weaknesses**

(i) None.

(ii) None.

(iii) None.

(iv) None.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

Would have liked to see letters of support from schools / districts anticipating becoming PACE schools / districts, rather than just from current participants.

**Total Score(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support**

**(b)(1) \_\_4\_\_**

**+(b)(2)\_3\_\_**

**+(b)(3)\_4\_\_**

**\_\_11\_\_ of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**(c) Timeline and budget. (15 points total)**

The quality of the SEA's or consortium's timeline and budget for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the timeline and budget, the Secretary considers--

***(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--***

- (i) The activities to occur in each year of the requested demonstration authority period;
- (ii) The parties responsible for each activity; and
- (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);

***Score for (c)(1)   4   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

- (i) The State lists PACE activities in a typical year, by time of year. The application also contains detailed activities in its budget for 2018-2019.
- (ii) The parties responsible for each activity are clearly delineated in the budget.
- (iii) Not applicable.

**Weaknesses**

- (i) Would have liked to see a timeline item related to selection/vetting of new districts, especially since there are many remaining non-PACE districts.
- (ii) None.
- (iii) Not applicable.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(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 activities in the timeline under paragraph (c)(1) of this section, including--***

- (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
- (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.

***Score for (c)(2)   7   of 10 points***

**Strengths**

- (i) A budget is provided for 2018-2019; it is reasonable and should be sufficient to cover expected costs.
- (ii) The specific degree to which the project budget is contingent on future appropriate or additional commitments is shown in the budget, by activity.

**Weaknesses**

- (i) The application does not consider costs for subsequent years, which may be higher due to the increased number of districts / schools to support, or it may be the same or lower due to economies of scale and/or increase efficiencies brought about by technology. The application could have at least commented on costs for scaling up through the entire demonstration period.
- (ii) None.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Total Score(c) Timeline and budget**

**(c)(1) \_\_4\_\_**

**+(c)(2)\_7\_\_**

**\_\_11\_\_ of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents. (25 points total)**

The quality of the SEA or consortium's plan to provide supports that can be delivered consistently at scale to educators, students, and parents to enable successful implementation of the innovative assessment system and improve instruction and student outcomes. In determining the quality of supports, the Secretary considers--

***(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;***

***Score for (d)(1) if factor (d)(4) is applicable   3   of 5 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable      of 9 points***

Strengths

The State has developed and provided extensive training to LEA and school staff on the innovative assessments; the application states in several places that they will continue to do so.

Weaknesses

The application should have been more explicit about how it is developing teacher capacity **to implement instruction** that is informed by their work with PACE. In other words, for this factor it is not sufficient that the innovation develop teacher capacity only in the area of assessment.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(2) The strategies the SEA or consortium has developed and will use to familiarize students and parents with the innovative assessment system;***

***Score for (d)(2) if factor (d)(4) is applicable 3 of 5 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable      of 8 points***

**Strengths**

The application states that LEAs have taken the lead in familiarizing students and parents with the innovative assessments.

The State has found that student work showcases and parent nights, where parents are invited to take the assessments, have been very effective.

**Weaknesses**

None.

Without statewide and districtwide strategies to familiarize students and parents with PACE, the implementation of effective strategies could be uneven, send inconsistent messages, and possibly disadvantage students in those districts or schools with fewer resources.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(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 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;***

***Score for (d)(3) if factor (d)(4) is applicable   5   of 5 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable      of 8 points***

**Strengths**

The strategies indicated in the application include the supports and accommodations provided in the statewide assessments.

**Weaknesses**

None.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(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(10 points if applicable)

***Score for (d)(4) if factor (d)(4) is applicable 5 of 10 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable no points awarded***

**Strengths**

“Evidence regarding alignment and assessment quality comes from 1) reviews of local assessment maps and 2) reviews of local task quality. Evidence regarding reliable scoring comes from process-based evidence (e.g., principles of scoring student work, calibration and anchor paper protocols for the PACE Common Task and local tasks, double scoring protocols), as well as audits on inter-rater reliability and the generalizability of local assessment scores.”

The state also performs social moderation comparability audits for comparisons of assessments across LEAs

**Weaknesses**

The application indicates that only a sample of locally-developed tasks are reviewed. This is not consistent with standard assessment practice, which is to review all test items for quality.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Total Score(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents.**

**(d)(1) \_\_3\_\_**

**+(d)(2) \_\_3\_\_**

**+(d)(3) \_\_5\_\_**

**+(d)(4) \_\_5\_\_ (if applicable)**

**\_\_16\_\_ of 25**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement. (15 points total)**

The quality of the SEA's or consortium's plan to annually evaluate its implementation of innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers—

***(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); (10 points) and

***Score for (e)(1) \_\_0\_ of 10 points***

Strengths

None.

Weaknesses

HumRRO's evaluation, while valuable, was explicitly formative, and not designed to "determine the system's validity, reliability, and comparability to the statewide assessment system."

No specific plan is presented for any future evaluation.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(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. (5 points)

***Score for (e)(2)   3   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

(i) The application shows a commitment to continuous improvement, evidenced by monthly leadership meetings where current and future design and implementation of PACE are discussed.

The HumRRO evaluation further highlights the State's commitment to continuous improvement.

(ii) None.

**Weaknesses**

(i) None.

(ii) Could not identify a process for annually evaluating and monitoring implementation of PACE in participating LEAs and schools.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Total Score(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement.**

**(e)(1) \_\_0\_\_**

**+(e)(2) \_\_3\_\_**

**\_\_3\_\_ of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:5

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Final Score Summary New Hampshire:**

<i>(a) Project narrative</i>	<b>33</b>	<b>of 40</b>
<i>(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support</i>	<b>11</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<i>(c) Timeline and budget</i>	<b>11</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<i>(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents</i>	<b>16</b>	<b>of 25</b>
<i>(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement</i>	<b>3</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<b>Total:</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>of 110</b>

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application “B” Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Instructions:**

- The Panel Monitor will provide deadlines for submitting preliminary scores and comments.
- Review and score each application independently.
- Enter preliminary scores and comments into the Preliminary TRF.
- Send completed TRF to the Panel Monitor.
- The Panel Monitor will review scores and comments and ask you to clarify or elaborate if needed, so that comments clearly reflect and justify your scores.
- All scores and comments must be completed before panel discussions can be held.
- After discussion, revise your Preliminary TRF to reflect any changes you want to make.

Writing strengths and weaknesses:

- Make clear, evaluative statements about the substance of the criterion being discussed.
- Substantiate all evaluative statements using evidence from the application narrative, evidence tables, performance measures, appendices, and/or budgets.
- You may comment on information that is missing or inconsistent with other parts of the application.
- Write for a broad audience. Avoid expressions and jargon that might not be commonly understood.

Scoring:

- You may choose to break comments down by subcriteria, which will make them easier to read and review. This is preferred but optional.
- When awarding points, you should NOT break down scores by sub-criteria. Each criterion receives one total score as directed in the TRF (for example, (a)(1)(i-ii) receives one score).
- A few criteria may not be applicable to every application. If so, follow the instructions in the TRF.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**(a) Project narrative. (40 points total)**

The quality of the SEA's or consortium's plan for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the plan, the Secretary considers--

***(1) The rationale for developing or selecting the particular innovative assessment system to be implemented under the demonstration authority, including--***

- (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
- (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;

***Score for (a)(1)                    if factor (a)(3) is applicable 4 of 5 points;  
   if factor (a)(3) is not applicable \_\_\_ of 10 points***

**Strengths**

The intended and observed benefits of local and common performance assessment tasks is described in several places throughout the application. Table 1 also makes explicit the careful implementation of PACE elements across grade levels and content areas to insure educators are monitoring progress of students at all grades and in all content areas. The state has taken a slow and steady approach to implementing performance assessment, acknowledging its challenges particularly in scoring; frequently seeking and responding to feedback and advice from educators and experts.

The PACE system as a whole not only integrates high order thinking during assessment instances, but also promotes transparency of the learning targets, allowing educators to acquire clear understanding of what it means to "know and be able to do" a particular academic standard.

The proposal clearly describes how the assessment components are designed using principles of assessment design rather than retrofitting, and also describes the integration of universal design

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

to insure accessibility by all. The state describes its sensitivity to all population subgroups and how the assessment system aims to permit students to show what they know without being constrained or pigeon-holed as can happen with traditional, selected response tests. What safeguards will be in place to support students who move relatively slowly to attain state standards on an acceptable timeline.

**Weaknesses**

*Comment:* Not intended as a weakness: It would be useful to have a mocked-up example of how the system is experienced by a student in each year and across years. How many tasks? When during each year is each task implemented? Similarly, how is the PACE system experienced by a teacher (elementary/middle and HS)? What are some anecdotes or specific examples of what teachers have gained or learned by using PACE tasks?

Appendix Bb lacks clarity in terms of which types of assessments in each grade are included in the PACE system and which types of assessments are used to support the development and calibration of PACE components (e.g., unit tests, short summative tests).

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(2) The plan the SEA or consortium, in consultation with any external partners, if applicable, has to--***

(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

(ii) Train evaluators to use such strategies, if applicable;

***Score for (a)(2) if factor (a)(3) is applicable 25 of 25 points;  
if factor (a)(3) is not applicable \_\_\_ of 30 points***

Strengths

The state has engaged with the Center for Assessment and noted *The Joint Standards* and other relevant literature in describing the processes it has used thus far and will continue to use to insure human scoring of common performance tasks produce reliable, valid, and comparable scores. The state employs contrasting groups to examine the relationships between students' scores on different assessments in order to calibrate assessments to produce accurate achievement level classifications. The state considers relationships among several variables within district, across districts, within grade levels, across grade levels, within state assessments and across state assessments to examine comparability.

Inter-rater reliability studies achieved 75% exact agreement.

As noted above, comparability is examined in a number and variety of ways in accordance with nationally accepted technical standards and advice from experts.

Educators participate in the entire assessment process, from task design to implementation to rubric development and scoring. At least three types of state-led professional development opportunities are available for educators to learn how to score and to practice scoring. Local PD is also available in participating districts. And recently the state created a buddy system for pairs of LEAs to support each other in implementing the PACE system.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

Weaknesses

***(3) If the system will initially be administered in a subset of schools or LEAs in a State--***

- (i) The strategies the SEA, including each SEA in a consortium, will use to scale the innovative assessment to all schools statewide, with a rationale for selecting those strategies;
  
- (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
  
- (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.

***Score for (a)(3) if factor (a)(3) is applicable 9 of 10 points;  
if factor (a)(3) is not applicable no points awarded***

Strengths

Scaling has been in early stages for 4 years. The state proposes to offer LEAs a continuum of implementation options. The proposal describes three assessment implementation options in particular. Prior to adoption the first experience in a district focuses on opportunities for deeper learning by teachers and students, and the second experience focuses on personalized learning and assessment. The proposal suggests after these two periods of becoming acquainted with



**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application “B” Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support. (15 points total)**

***(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—

(i) The success and track record of efforts to implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items aligned to the challenging State academic standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the Act in LEAs planning to participate; and

(ii) The SEA’s or LEA’s development or use of--

(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;

(B) Effective and high-quality supports for school staff to implement innovative assessments and innovative assessment items, including professional development; and

(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).

***Score for (b)(1) \_5\_ of 5 points***

Strengths

The state has substantial experience with the PACE system, as it has been in a pilot but growing situation for 4 years already. The state lists the Center for Assessment as a technical consulting

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

partner and the NHLI as a state body that will support the effort through garnering public support and additional funding.

The proposal describes the use of principled assessment design for all PACE tasks, which inherently involves an iterative approach to insuring that tasks align to the depth and breadth of the state's rigorous academic content standards. Furthermore, these tasks aim to also permit several entry points as well as opportunities for students to show their knowledge using various representations.

By including educators throughout the assessment development process (noted previously), the state purposefully engages educators in learning more about how and why assessment can improve learning.

The state describes a robust plan to increase assessment expertise among all educators. Training opportunities involve teachers in practice scoring and learning about assessment development.

From above: The state has engaged with the Center for Assessment and noted *The Joint Standards* and other relevant literature in describing the processes it has used thus far and will continue to use to insure human scoring of performance tasks produce reliable, valid, and comparable scores. The state employs contrasting groups to examine the relationships between students' scores on different assessments in order to calibrate assessments to produce accurate achievement level classifications. The state considers relationships among several variables within district, across districts, within grade levels, across grade levels, within state assessments and across state assessments to examine comparability.

Since many of the materials within the PACE system are locally developed and scored, one particular strength of the proposal is its priority to engage and develop teachers as assessment experts.

Weaknesses

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(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--

- (i) The SEA's analysis of how capacity influenced the success of prior efforts to develop and implement innovative assessments or innovative assessment items; and
- (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.

***Score for (b)(2)   5   of 5 points***

Strengths

The state has secured funding and a vendor to increase its technological capacity to take the PACE assessment system to scale. Planned development will decrease the burden on LEAs by streamlining training, test development, scoring, and data management in an online software solution.

The state will continue to integrate the management of the PACE program within its overall education functions. The proposal includes a chart of key staff and their roles in implementing the PACE innovated assessment system. This with the state's track record of recent pilot activities provide evidence of its ability to mitigate risks and support successful implementation.

Weaknesses

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(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:

- (i) Superintendents (or equivalent) of LEAs, including participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority period.
- (ii) Presidents of local school boards (or equivalent, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority.
- (iii) Local teacher organizations (including labor organizations, where applicable), including within participating LEAs in the first year of the demonstration authority.
- (iv) Other affected stakeholders, such as parent organizations, civil rights organizations, and business organizations.

***Score for (b)(3) \_4\_ of 5 points***

**Strengths**

Proposal included letters with signatures of at least one person in each of the four categories. Several signatures of superintendents and school board presidents were included.

**Weaknesses**

No letters of support were provided from districts not yet participating who will join the PACE program during the demonstration period.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Total Score(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder  
support (b)(1) \_5\_\_**

**+(b)(2)\_5\_\_**

**+(b)(3)\_4\_\_**

**\_14\_\_ of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**(c) Timeline and budget. (15 points total)**

The quality of the SEA's or consortium's timeline and budget for implementing the innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the timeline and budget, the Secretary considers--

***(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--***

- (i) The activities to occur in each year of the requested demonstration authority period;
- (ii) The parties responsible for each activity; and
- (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);

***Score for (c)(1) \_4\_ of 5 points***

**Strengths**

The activities in a typical year (of this existing program) are listed with the responsible party for each activity. The state notes that the timeline of activities has been proven to work based on the past three years of pilot work.

**Weaknesses**

The state does not indicate in the timeline when it will recruit new participating districts.  
The timeline does not indicate when operational tasks will be implemented.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(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 activities in the timeline under paragraph (c)(1) of this section, including--***

- (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
- (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.

***Score for (c)(2)   8   of 10 points***

**Strengths**

The budget is described in terms of actions, cost, and funding source. The state has secured funding for the PACE program through available allocations, NHLI, and other funders secured by NHLI but unnamed in the proposal. The state notes that since this proposal offers to continue an existing program, scaling should not cost as much as what the past several years cost (relatively speaking) as much of the needed infrastructure is already in place.

The funding for this project does not appear to depend upon future appropriations except for those typically supplied to states for educational programs.

**Weaknesses**

No scaling indicated for the budget. Budget included in the proposal lists 2018-2019. What budget expenses are anticipated for the subsequent years?

Technology platform budget appears to be low. Does this include technology to support distributed scoring?

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Total Score(c) Timeline and budget**

**(c)(1) \_4\_\_**

**+(c)(2)\_8\_\_**

**\_12\_\_ of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents. (25 points total)**

The quality of the SEA or consortium's plan to provide supports that can be delivered consistently at scale to educators, students, and parents to enable successful implementation of the innovative assessment system and improve instruction and student outcomes. In determining the quality of supports, the Secretary considers--

***(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;***

***Score for (d)(1) if factor (d)(4) is applicable   3   of 5 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable      of 9 points***

**Strengths**

The proposal includes a theory of action that was developed/revised based on an independent formative review of the existing PACE assessment system. The theory is positive in nature, meaning it follows logically from principled assessment design, and focuses on faithful implementation of a program focused on improving the teaching and learning of students in the state. As such, the state acknowledges its responsibility to provide educators with needed supports and professional development, noting that faithful implementation rests on teacher preparation to carry out the intended program of instruction and assessment.

**Weaknesses**

The SEA should make explicit what training and support teachers will receive regarding how to use information gleaned from students' responses to performance tasks, both common and local.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

The SEA should also indicate how it expects teachers and administrators to respond to trends in student responses that may imply the need for adjustments to instructional programs and to improve student learning.

The SEA should track teacher attendance and available trainings.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(2) The strategies the SEA or consortium has developed and will use to familiarize students and parents with the innovative assessment system;***

***Score for (d)(2) if factor (d)(4) is applicable 3 of 5 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable      of 8 points***

**Strengths**

Communications about the PACE program have used multi-media outlets, including online video, radio, local video, and written reports. The proposal states that LEAs have taken the lead thus far on communicating with their communities, which is a strength for particular communities because such communications are likely perceived to be personal.

**Weaknesses**

The state should consider preparing large scale materials and recommendations to support LEAs in communicating with their communities in ways that are perceived as consistent across different LEAs and populations within the state.

No information is provided about how the state and LEAs will familiarize students with the innovative assessment program, both how the tasks and rubrics work in practice as well as how their performance on the tasks accrues to an annual proficiency score.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(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 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;***

***Score for (d)(3) if factor (d)(4) is applicable   4   of 5 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable      of 8 points***

**Strengths**

A preliminary study indicates that PACE materials, while effective for all students, may be particularly effective for students with disabilities because of the accessibility built into the tasks and range of possible ways in which students can show their knowledge when responding to performance tasks.

**Weaknesses**

It is unclear how teachers will receive training and support in implementing appropriate accommodations when administering performance tasks. This training is particularly important as some accommodations could jeopardize the integrity of the task and the validity of the results.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(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(10 points if applicable)

***Score for (d)(4) if factor (d)(4) is applicable 6 of 10 points;  
if factor (d)(4) is not applicable no points awarded***

**Strengths**

From above: many of the materials within the PACE system are locally developed and scored, one particular strength of the proposal is its priority to engage and develop teachers as assessment experts.

The state's plan includes processes to train teachers on all aspects of the system from task development to faithful implementation to scoring. The plan includes several specific ways in which teachers can be trained to score effectively. The state also includes anchor tasks that are used across multiple districts, and the state studies the results of how common tasks are scored to insure reliability, validity, and comparability. Thus the state is using a proactive approach to train teachers to score and a data-based, reflective approach to regularly evaluate the statistical properties of the scoring processes and results.

**Weaknesses**

The proposal indicates only a sample of local tasks is reviewed for quality. This practice is inconsistent with best practices in test development. The SEA is advised to review all local tasks, provide feedback, and to require an approval process for use of only tasks that are certified as high-quality by the SEA or test vendor.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

The proposal lacks evidence of sufficient quality control procedures for the scoring of local tasks. Similar quality control processes as those used for scoring common tasks should be implemented for local tasks. For example, to strengthen the consistency of local scoring, over time, a state-wide cadre of expert scorers could be developed for scoring of local tasks. Such scorers could be vetted through back-reading by the same scorers involved in the scoring of common tasks and tracking records of high consistency.

The language of the proposal indicated that appropriately rich professional development will be available to interested teachers, but the proposal did not specify requirements at the LEA or lower levels for the number or percent of teachers who will be expected to participated in professional development and scoring activities. This leaves the possibility of unequal implementation if some schools or districts participate in PD at high rates and others do not.

**Total Score(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents.**

**(d)(1) \_3\_\_**

**+(d)(2)\_3\_\_**

**+(d)(3)\_4\_\_**

**+(d)(4)\_6\_\_(if applicable)**

**\_16\_\_ of 25**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement. (15 points total)**

The quality of the SEA's or consortium's plan to annually evaluate its implementation of innovative assessment demonstration authority. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers—

***(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); (10 points) and

***Score for (e)(1)   2   of 10 points***

**Strengths**

The Center for Assessment is evaluating the reliability, validity, or comparability of the assessment program's results. However, these evaluation steps are not provided by an independent party.

The Humrro report provided valuable formative insights for the state to consider regarding sustainability. The state responded to several points made in this evaluation report and suggested that they will request another external evaluation in a few years. However, this evaluation did not address the reliability, validity, or comparability of the assessment program's results.

**Weaknesses**

What plans does the state have to annually evaluate the effectiveness of the innovative assessment system through an independent, experienced third party evaluator, or otherwise?

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

***(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. (5 points)

***Score for (e)(2)   3   of 5 points***

**Strengths**

The state recently added administrative staff to disperse help to LEAs. There is now an overall curriculum coordinator for PACE task development; 30 content leads were named to help develop grade-level and content area specific activities; and districts are being paired as buddies to assist each other during PACE implementation.

The state contracted with HuMRro to provide an external evaluation. The report provides valuable formative insights for the state to consider regarding continuous improvement and sustainability. The state responded to several points made in this evaluation report already.

The state noted the use of a feedback loops annually to collect information from LEAs about implementation and overall response to the PACE assessment system.

**Weaknesses**

Humrro report suggested that small districts may need scaffolded supports to comply with elements such as double scoring and even task creation. Does the state have a plan to support teachers in small districts?

PACE puts a large burden on teachers, which could have unintended negative consequences if teachers experience burnout because of the additional workload to create and score tasks. This was noted in the Humrro report, but there was not a corresponding response by the state.

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

Humrro collected survey feedback from teachers about their views on the PACE system. Does the state have plans to collect similar feedback to monitor teachers' attitudes and satisfaction with the PACE system?

**Total Score(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement.**

**(e)(1) \_2\_\_**

**+(e)(2)\_3\_\_**

**\_\_5\_\_ of 15**

**Final Technical Review Form for the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority  
(IADA) Fiscal Year 2018**

Reviewer ID:6

Application "B" Applicant Name: New Hampshire

**Final Score Summary New Hampshire:**

<i>(a) Project narrative</i>	<b>38</b>	<b>of 40</b>
<i>(b) Prior experience, capacity, and stakeholder support</i>	<b>14</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<i>(c) Timeline and budget</i>	<b>12</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<i>(d) Supports for educators, students, and parents</i>	<b>16</b>	<b>of 25</b>
<i>(e) Evaluation and continuous improvement</i>	<b>5</b>	<b>of 15</b>
<b>Total:</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>of 110</b>