UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Michael Johnson
Commissioner
Alaska Department of Education and Early Development
PO Box 110500
Juneau, AK 99811

November 9, 2018

Dear Commissioner Johnson:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (the Department) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), which governed State assessments through the 2016-2017 school year (SY). The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), which governs State assessments beginning in the 2017-2018 SY, maintains the essential requirements from NCLB that each State annually administer high-quality assessments in at least reading/language arts, mathematics and science that meet nationally recognized professional and technical standards with a few additional requirements. I appreciate the efforts of the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (AK DEED) to prepare for the review, which occurred in February 2018.

State assessment systems provide essential information that States, districts, principals and teachers can use to identify the academic needs of students, target resources and supports toward students who need them most, evaluate school and program effectiveness and close achievement gaps among students. A high-quality assessment system also provides useful information to parents about their children's advancement against and achievement of grade-level standards. The Department's peer review of State assessment systems is designed to provide feedback to States to support the development and administration of high-quality assessments.

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated AK DEED's submission and found, based on the evidence received, that the components of your assessment system meet many, but not all, of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and the Department's analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics general assessments for grades 3-8 (PEAKS 3-8): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**
- R/LA and mathematics general assessments in high school (PEAKS HS): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**
- R/LA and mathematics alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for grades 3-8 and high school (DLM): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**

Substantially meets requirements means that these components meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required.

The specific list of items required for AK DEED to submit is enclosed with this letter. Within 30 days of receipt of this letter, AK DEED must provide to the Department a plan and timeline by which it will submit the additional documentation. I also understand that AK DEED is contemplating some re-design of the PEAKS R/LA assessment in grades 3-8 and high school. Please note that any significant changes may require a complete re-review of evidence pertaining to sections 2, 3, 4 and 6 of the peer review criteria following the first administration of the re-designed assessment.

Please note that the assessment requirements for ESEA, as amended by the NCLB, were in effect through the end of the 2016-2017 school year. The AK DEED peer review was conducted under the requirements of this statute. Beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, the assessment requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, will apply to State assessments. Given that this review began under the requirements of the ESEA as amended by the NCLB, it is important to indicate that while the AK DEED assessments meet many of the peer review guidance criteria under the NCLB, the State is still responsible to ensure that these assessments also comply with the requirements of the ESSA. Department staff has carefully reviewed AK DEED evidence and peer review recommendations in light of the updated requirements for State assessments under the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. As a result of this additional review, I have determined that AK DEED needs to meet one additional new ESSA requirement related to alternate academic achievement standards. This requirement is listed under critical element 6.3 along with the other evidence needed from the February 2018 peer review. Under the orderly transition authority in section 4(b) of the ESSA, I am granting AK DEED until December 15, 2020, to submit evidence of an AA-AAAS that meets this ESSA requirement.

The full peer review notes from the review are also enclosed. These recommendations to the Department formed the basis of our determination. Please note that the peers' recommendations may differ from the Department's feedback; we encourage you to read the full peer notes for additional suggestions and recommendations for improving your assessment system beyond what is noted in the Department's feedback. Department staff will reach out to your assessment director in the next few days to discuss the Department's determination and to answer any questions you may have.

Thank you for your ongoing commitment to improving educational outcomes for all students. I look forward to our continued partnership as we move ahead with this critical work. I appreciate the work you are doing to improve your schools and provide a high-quality education for your students. We have found it a pleasure working with your staff on this review. I wish you well in your continued efforts to improve student achievement in Alaska. If you have any questions, please contact Robert Salley of my staff at: OSS.Alaska@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/
Frank T. Brogan
Assistant Secretary
for Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Deborah Riddle, Division Operations Manager for Student Learning, CTE, Standards and Support

Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed to Meet the Requirements for Alaska's Assessment System

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed

2.1 – Test Design and Development	For PEAKS grades 3-8 and HS:
	• Evidence that the test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the depth and breadth of the State's academic content standards, and includes:
	  ○ Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the measurement of the depth and breadth of the of the State's grade-level academic content standards.
	  ○ Processes to ensure that each assessment reflects the appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills).

2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration	For all assessments: • Evidence that the policies and procedures for monitoring have been implemented during test administrations (e.g., a State-wide summary report of LEA-reported irregularities and/or observations; a summary of the percentage of LEA staff that received required training out of the total number of LEA staff who administered tests).
2.5 – Test Security	For PEAKS grades 3-8 and HS: • Evidence of procedures to prevent assessment irregularities (e.g., monitoring for item exposure as items are drawn from a national item bank; steps taken to mitigate risks involved with differing test windows between paper and computer administration). For all assessments: • Evidence of remediation following test security incidents/breaches.
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	For PEAKS grades 3-8 and HS: • Evidence that the revised assessments in R/LA demonstrate adequate validity regarding alignment between the assessments and the State's academic content standards.
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	For PEAKS grades 3-8 and HS R/LA assessments: • Evidence demonstrating that the assessments measure the cognitive processes indicated in the State's academic content standards.
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	For PEAKS grades 3-8 and HS: • Evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State's academic content standards (e.g., a confirmatory factor analysis or other analysis that supports the validity of the assessment's internal structure).

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	For PEAKS 3-8 and HS: • Evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables (e.g., analyses that demonstrate convergent relationships with the tests and measures other than test scores).

4.1 – Reliability	For PEAKS grades 3-8 and HS:
	• Evidence that the State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, specifically:
	  ○ An analysis of items demonstrating lower than desired item discrimination (e.g., point bi-serials) and plans to improve item discrimination.
	  ○ An analysis of lower-than-desired model fit in grades 3 and 4 R/LA and plans to improve model fit in these grades.

4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	For PEAKS grades 3-8 and HS: • Evidence that assessments provide an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including performance for high- and low-achieving students (e.g., more complete item type and content characteristics in data analysis results, plans for review of test items flagged for extreme difficulty and rationale for the limited number of test items classified at depth of knowledge (DOK) level 3 on the R/LA assessments). • Evidence that the revised assessments in R/LA demonstrate adequately precise estimates of student performance across the full performance continuum.
4.4 – Scoring	For PEAKS grades 3-8 and HS: • Evidence of standardized scoring procedures and protocols for assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results (e.g., a report of the follow-up analysis recommended by the technical advisory committee regarding extremely difficult items).
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	For PEAKS grades 3-8 and HS: • Evidence of a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments. • Evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results (e.g., additional comparability studies to determine if there are mode effects).
5.3 - Accommodations	For all assessments: • Evidence that accommodations do not alter the construct being measured and that they allow for meaningful interpretations of results and comparisons of scores for students who test with and without accommodations. • Documentation of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	For all assessments: • Evidence of State monitoring of the selection and administration of accommodations for students with disabilities and English learners.
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards (additional requirement under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA)	For the DLM: • Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that a student who meets these standards is on track to pursue post-secondary education or employment. The State educational agency should provide this evidence by December 15, 2020.
6.4 – Reporting	For all assessments: • Evidence that the State ensures LEAs provide alternative formats of score reports, upon request.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

February 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes

U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Note: Peer review notes provide the combined recommendations of the individual peers to the U.S. Department of Education (Department), based on the statute and regulations, the Department's peer review guidance, and the peers' professional judgement of the evidence submitted by the State. These assessment peer review notes, however, do not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for assessment peer review. Although the peer notes inform the Secretary's consideration of each State's assessment system, the Department makes the final decision regarding whether the assessment system meets the requirements in the statute and regulations. As a result, these peer notes may not completely align with the final determination made by the Department.

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS . 4
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students 4
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards 6
1.3 – Required Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 8
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 9
1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 11

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 12
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 13
2.2 – Item Development..... 15
2.3 – Test Administration 17
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)20
2.5 – Test Security 22
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 26

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 29
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 30
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 32
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 33
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables..... 34

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 35
4.1 – Reliability..... 35
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 36
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 37
4.4 – Scoring 38
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 39
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 41
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... 43

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 44
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 45
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 51
5.3 – Accommodations..... 54
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 59

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 62
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 63
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 66
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 67
6.4 – Reporting..... 69

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.	**Adoption of Challenging Academic Content Standards** • FILE 80 State of Alaska Regulations Excerpt, page 1, 4 AAC 04.140. • FILE 67 Alaska State Board of Education & Early Development June 7-8, 2012 Meeting Minutes • FILE 80 State of Alaska Regulations Excerpt, page 5, 4 AAC 06.737.	The evidence presented is sufficient for reading/language arts and mathematics. The state is currently reviewing their science standards and will need to submit evidence on progress and adoption of the science standards and assessments.
Section 1.1 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required .		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Alaska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards The State's academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.	• FILE 66 Alaska ELA and Mathematics Standards • FILE 69 Letter from UA President Confirming State Standards Preparation for College • FILE 110 CCSSO Review of Alaska ELA and Mathematics Standards • FILE 68 Alaska ELA and Math Standards Public Comment Submitted to the State Board of Education and Early Development • FILE 70 Stakeholders Involved in the Development of Alaska ELA and Math Standards	Alaska points to the standards documents themselves, as well as CCSSO review of those standards, as evidence that the content standards in ELA and mathematics are coherent within and across grade levels and are rigorous. Although there is no mention in the standards document (File 66) that Alaska's standards are closely modeled upon the Common Core State Standards, the CCSSO review (File 110) makes clear that this was the case. Specific comments in File 68 highlight many of the changes made leading to differences between the Alaska standards and Common Core; however, it might have been helpful to include a detailed "crosswalk" to make the differences between the final versions of each clear and complete. For example, one key issue raised in several comments dealt with the standards for literacy in history/social studies, science and technical subjects. Only in File 110 is it made clear that these were ultimately included. Alaska documents stakeholder involvement in the standards development process for ELA and mathematics. However, the documentation provided takes the form of an Excel file listing names and school districts of teachers who participated in standards review. This by itself does not demonstrate "broad stakeholder involvement" without detail on grade representation and other distinguishing characteristics. In addition, there is no evidence that stakeholders other than educators were consulted in the standards development, review, and approval process (e.g., no parents, members of the business community, etc.). This should be considered in any future submissions but is not regarded by the reviewers as a weakness requiring attention at this point.

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		The peers would also recommend for future submissions that the state remove personally identifiable information, particularly since racial characteristics are used (File 70).
Section 1.2 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required .		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
1.3 – Required Assessments The State's assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in: • Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).	NOTE TO PEERS DO NOT COMPLETE OR REVIEW-ED STAFF REVIEWS THIS EVIDENCE	NOTE TO PEERS DO NOT COMPLETE OR REVIEW-ED STAFF REVIEWS THIS EVIDENCE
Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
__ No additional evidence is required or ___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY

1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments
The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.
• For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;
• For English learners (EL):
  o Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment;
  o If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.
	NOTE TO PEERS DO NOT COMPLETE OR REVIEW-ED STAFF REVIEWS THIS EVIDENCE	NOTE TO PEERS DO NOT COMPLETE OR REVIEW-ED STAFF REVIEWS THIS EVIDENCE

Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
___ No additional evidence is required or		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Alaska

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
1.5 – Participation Data The State's participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State's assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.	NOTE TO PEERS DO NOT COMPLETE OR REVIEW-ED STAFF REVIEWS THIS EVIDENCE	NOTE TO PEERS DO NOT COMPLETE OR REVIEW-ED STAFF REVIEWS THIS EVIDENCE
Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
___ No additional evidence is required or ___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

2.1 – Test Design and Development
 	
The State's test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State's academic content standards, and includes:
• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;
• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State's grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;
• Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State's academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);
• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.
	Statement(s) of the purposes
	• FILE 80 State of Alaska Regulations Excerpt, page 3, 4 AAC 06.700
	• FILE 50 FAQs about Alaska's New Summative Assessments (website posting)
	• FILE 51 DEED video featuring Commissioner Johnson and staff titled Assessments: Why are They Important? (screenshot)
	• FILE 47 Educator Guide to 2017 Assessment Reports:
	  ○ page ii, letter from Commissioner Johnson
	  ○ page 1, Overview
	
	• FILE 47 Educator Guide to 2017 Assessment Reports, pages 13-14, "Educator Use of Information"
	• FILE 52 Parent Guide to Student Reports, Spring 2017 PEAKS Assessment
	
	Test blueprints
	
	• FILE 48 PEAKS Test Design 2017 (as posted on DEED website)
	• FILE 01 PEAKS Spring 2017 Technical Report
	  ○ Chapter 2, Test Design and Item Development, pages 2-34
	  ○ Appendix 1: Table of Test Specifications
	• FILE 06 PEAKS Third-Party Independent Alignment Study Report, pages 7-8.
	
	Tailored to knowledge and skills in the state's academic content standards
		Evidence for 2.1 is adequate.
		
		The state has provided explanations of the transition to the new assessment for both parents and teachers, which includes the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations.
		
		Blueprints have been provided that include sufficient information.
		
		Although alignment studies are the most critical evidence that any assessment measures the full range of a state's academic content standards, clarity and transparency regarding standards utilized in test design and development are important. Peers would have liked to have some background information (in evidence documents and/or the submission narrative) on the development of DRC's college and career readiness standards, including the resource(s) that informed those standards. This information would more fully demonstrate the relationship between DRC's standards and Alaska's standards. Peers recommend that at a minimum, this information be added to the technical manual. This concern applies as well to CE 2.2 and 3.1.
		
		Without inclusion of any constructed response items that require the production of text, peers question whether the assessment in fact measures the full range of the state's grade level academic content standards in English language arts.

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

	• FILE 07 DRC Item Development Manual:
	  ○ Pages 13-28
	  ○ Appendix A: Checklist for the Item Writer
	  ○ Appendix B: Checklist for Bias, Fairness, and Sensitivity
	  ○ Appendix C: Sample of an Item Writing Training PowerPoint Presentation
	• FILE 01 PEAKS Spring 2017 Technical Report:
	  ○ Chapter 2 (measures ELA and Math standards)
	  ○ FILE 06 PEAKS Third-Party Independent Alignment Study Report, pages 3-4, 30	

Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required .		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

2.2 – Item Development
 	
The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State's academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.
	• FILE 01 PEAKS Spring 2017 Technical Report:
	  ○ Chapter 2, Test Design and Item Development, pages 2-34
	  ○ Appendix 1: Table of Test Specifications, pages 90-226
	
	• FILE 07 DRC Item Development Manual, pages 6-29
	
	• FILE 08 Qualifications of DRC Item and Test Developers
	
	• FILE 60 DRC Process-Statement Letter to DEED
	
	• FILE 07 DRC Item Development Manual, pages 6-29
	
	• FILE 07 DRC Item Development Manual,
	  ○ pages 6-29
	  ○ Appendix C: Sample of an Item Writing Training PowerPoint Presentation
	:
	• FILE 06 PEAKS Third-Party Independent Alignment Study Report, pages 27-30
		There is evidence of an appropriate item development process. The evidence included an item development manual, qualifications of item developers, and documentation of item writer training.
		
		Also see comment about DRC college and career readiness standards in 2.1.

Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
__X__ No additional evidence is required .		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Alaska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.3 – Test Administration The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State: • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State's general and alternate assessments receive training on the State's established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.	**Establishment and communication of standard procedures for administration of assessments** • FILE 02 District Test Coordinator's Manual, Spring 2017 • FILE 03 Computer-Based Test Administration Directions, Spring 2017 • FILE 04 Paper-Based Test Administration Directions, Spring 2017 • FILE 05 Participation Guidelines for Alaska Students in State Assessments, December 2015 • FILE 10 Student Supports on the Computer-Based PEAKS Assessment, Spring 2017 • FILE 11 Student Supports on the Paper-Based PEAKS Assessment, Spring 2017 • FILE 12 Student Supports on the PEAKS Assessments • FILE 74 DTC Weekly Emails Sampler **Procedures to ensure training for administration of assessments** • FILE 13 District Test Coordinator Training Agenda, February 2017 • FILE 14 District Test Coordinator Training Presentation Slides, February 2017 • FILE 15 Test Administrator Training for PEAKS Computer-Based Slides, Spring 2017 • FILE 16 Test Administrator Training for PEAKS Paper-Based Slides, Spring 2017 **Technology based assessments requirements, administration procedures, and contingency**	**PEAKS** Peers recommend that File 5, Participation Guidelines be updated to reflect their current assessment. The state has provided an administration manual, separate directions for computer-based and paper-and-pencil administrations, training for district staff, and contingency plans as well as troubleshooting for computer-based administration. The peers commend the state for providing technology related training for the computer-based assessment to students. **AA-AAAS** In this critical element, instead of referring peer reviewers to the DLM submission, the state has provided adequate state-specific evidence this critical element. The peers recommend using a similar approach for the other elements.

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

	plans
	• FILE 17 Alaska DRC INSIGHT Readiness Webinar Slides, December 2016
	• FILE 18 Alaska Spring 2017 Technology Coordinator Training Slides, February 2017
	• FILE 19 DRC INSIGHT Supported System Requirements
	• FILE 20 Alaska INSIGHT Technology User Guide
	  ○ Volume I: Introduction to Online Testing
	  ○ Volume II: Testing Site Manager
	  ○ Volume III: Configuring Devices for Testing
	  ○ Volume IV: DRC INSIGHT
	  ○ Volume V: Troubleshooting
	• FILE 21 Alaska eDIRECT Training Slides, January 2017
	• FILE 22 DRC eDIRECT User Guide
	• FILE 13 District Test Coordinator Training Agenda, February 2017
	• FILE 14 District Test Coordinator Training Presentation Slides, February 2017
	• FILE 23 Quick Guide - Accessing Online Tools Training (OTT)
	• FILE 24 Quick Guide - Accessing PEAKS Student Tutorials
	• FILE 03 Computer-Based Test Administration Directions, Spring 2017, pages 7-8
	• FILE 25 Alaska Statewide Assessments Request for Information (RFI)
	  ○ page 6, 2nd paragraph
	  ○ page 8, item 7	

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	• FILE 26 DRC 2016-2017 Contract with Alaska Department of Education & Early Development, Appendix F-2 Test Security Plan, pages 108-111 **AA-AAAS** • FILE 113 Alternate Assessment Test Administration Information	
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
__X__ No additional evidence is required .		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.	NOTE TO PEERS DO NOT COMPLETE OR REVIEW-ED STAFF REVIEWS THIS EVIDENCE	NOTE TO PEERS DO NOT COMPLETE OR REVIEW-ED STAFF REVIEWS THIS EVIDENCE
Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
___ No additional evidence is required or ___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Alaska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

2.5 – Test Security
 	
The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:
• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;
• Detection of test irregularities;
• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State's assessments;
• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.
	Prevention of assessment irregularities and documentation of security procedures
	
	• FILE 80 State of Alaska Regulations Excerpt,
	  ○ page 8, 4 AAC 06.761
	  ○ page 9-10, 4 AAC 06.765
	• FILE 28 Test Security Agreement Guidance
	• FILE 29 Level 1-3 Test Security Agreement – District Test Coordinator, Lead Coordinators, and Building Test Coordinators
	• FILE 30 Level 4 Test Security Agreement – Test Administrators
	• FILE 31 Level 5 Test Security Agreement – Test Administration Support
	:
	• FILE 02 District Test Coordinator's Manual, Spring 2017
	  ○ Pages 38-43, Test Security Procedures
	  ○ Appendix D, Manual for Administration of Paper-Based Assessments
	• FILE 03 Computer-Based Test Administration Directions, Spring 2017 – Pages 19-22
	• FILE 04 Paper-Based Test Administration Directions, Spring 2017 – Pages 17-20
	• FILE 14 District Test Coordinator Training Presentation Slides, February 2017– Pages 14-16
	• FILE 32 District Test Coordinator and Building Test Coordinator Test Security Note-Taking Incident Guide
	• FILE 15 Test Administrator Training for
		PEAKS
		The state provides annual training and test security agreements.
		
		The peers also noted that the information to districts on conducting investigations would be useful to districts (File 2, p. 42-43).
		
		In terms of monitoring, although the state does include the data forensics (erasure, response time, school performance change), there is not sufficient information about checking for item exposure. As the items are from a national item bank and used on both the paper-and-pencil and computer-based forms, which have different testing windows, evidence of monitoring is needed.
		
		There is also a lack of information about remediation after a breach.
		
		AA-AAAS
		
		In supplementary communication, Alaska identified evidence documents that specifically address this CE for the alternate assessment. Various security agreements provided as evidence for PEAKS also apply to DLM (e.g., File 28, 29, 30). Others, while not explicitly addressing the DLM assessment, are identified by the state as doing so (e.g, File 76, 77, 78). The same concern expressed regarding the lack of information about remediation after a breach in administration of the general assessment applies to the alternate assessment.

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

	PEAKS Computer-Based Slides, Spring 2017 - Pages 13-14
	• FILE 16 Test Administrator Training for PEAKS Paper-Based Slide, Spring 2017 – Pages 11-12
	
	• FILE 33 Missing Materials Notification Example
	• FILE 34 Missing Materials Feedback Example
	
	• FILE 35 Final Missing Materials Report - All Districts
	
	Detection of test irregularities
	• FILE 02 District Test Coordinator's Manual, Spring 2017, FAQ, page 57
	• FILE 32 District Test Coordinator and Building Test Coordinator Test Security Note-Taking Incident Guide
	
	• FILE 26 DRC 2016-2017 Contract with Alaska Department of Education & Early Development
	  ○ Appendix D, Scope of Work, pages 43-44, system monitoring
	  ○ Appendix D, Scope of Work, page 48
	  ○ Appendix F-2, Test Security Plan, Section 5.8, page 119
	
	Remediation following any test security incidents
	
	• FILE 02 District Test Coordinator's Manual, Spring 2017
	• FILE 03 Computer-Based Test	

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Administration Directions, Spring 2017 • FILE 04 Paper-Based Test Administration Directions, Spring 2017 • FILE 14 District Test Coordinator Training Presentation Slides, February 2017 • FILE 32 District Test Coordinator and Building Test Coordinator Test Security Note-Taking Incident Guide • FILE 02 District Test Coordinator's Manual, Spring 2017, p. 37 • FILE 76 Example redacted letter to districts following test security incidents • FILE 77 Example redacted PTPC complaint • FILE 26 DRC 2016-2017 Contract with Alaska Department of Education & Early Development, Appendix F-2, Test Security Plan, Section 3.5 pages 12-13 **Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities** • FILE 02 District Test Coordinator's Manual, Spring 2017, page 42-43 • FILE 78 Example of redacted third-party investigation report	

Section 2.5 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Evidence of monitoring for item exposure as items are drawn from a national item bank and there are differing test windows between paper and computer administration.
- Evidence of remediation following test security incidents/breaches (applies to both PEAKS and DLM).

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Alaska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy
 	
The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable
 	
information, specifically:
• To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results;
• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;
• To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.
	Integrity of test materials and related data for test development, administration, storage, and use of results
	
	• FILE 36 DRC Confidentiality and Nondisclosure Agreement (signed by all item writers)
	• FILE 37 DRC Employee Intellectual Property Assignment Agreement (signed by all DRC employees with access to Alaska test and student information)
	
	• FILE 02 District Test Coordinator's Manual, Spring 2017, pages 38-43
	• FILE 33 Missing Materials Notification Example
	• FILE 34 Missing Materials Feedback Example
	• FILE 35 Final Missing Materials Report - All Districts
	
	• FILE 38 State of Alaska Information Security Policy (ISP-122): Privacy of Personally Identifiable Information
	• FILE 39 Alaska State Board of Education & Early Development June 2016 Meeting Packet (pages 74-102 for slides on student privacy and data confidentiality)
	• FILE 26 DRC 2016-2017 Contract with Alaska Department of Education & Early Development
	  ○ Appendix F-2, Test Security Plan, pages 95-122
	  ○ Appendix F-5, Alaska and DRC Data Sharing Agreement, pages 171-174
		PEAKS
		The state has provided adequate evidence to address this critical element.
		
		There is evidence about the confidentiality of the items (File 36), requiring the employees to not divulge trade secrets (File 37), information technology (File 26), and data sharing agreement (File 26, p. 172).
		
		The state conduct checks for missing materials (File 33 -35)
		
		The state statute also requires PII be safely/securely stored/transmitted (File 38) There are multiple secure portals (File 40, File 42, page 26-28) as well as information on storage information (File 39, p. 90) and suppression rules (see also Files 44-26).
		
		AA-AAAS
		In supplementary communication, Alaska identified evidence documents that specifically address this CE for the alternate assessment. Various documents provided as evidence of systems for protecting data integrity and privacy for PEAKS also apply to DLM (File 38, 39, 40, 42, 44), although this is not made explicit either in the documents themselves or in notes in the state's submission. Reviewers would have found it helpful for the state to make clear, when identifying evidence in the submission, if and when various documents apply to PEAKs, to DLM, or to both. Based on the state's clarification that the documents identified support both assessment systems, peers found the evidence for this CE to be adequate.

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

	Secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy
	• FILE 02 District Test Coordinator's Manual, Spring 2017, Test Security section
	• FILE 40 ZendTo Instructions to Transfer Personally Identifiable Information
	• FILE 41 State of Alaska Student Data Reporting Manual, pages 37-39 (for information on protections for student data)
	• FILE 42 2017 Participation Rate Data Handbook pages 26-28 (for details on using the State Report Manager to transfer demographic data securely)
	• FILE 26 DRC 2016-2017 Contract with Alaska Department of Education & Early Development
	  ○ page 34: secure data file delivery
	  ○ page 35: report delivery in eDIRECT
	  ○ pages 48-51 (Section 12): Data privacy & security
	• FILE 43 DRC Data Privacy Policy
	
	Protection for personally identifiable information
	• FILE 44 Alaska Department of Education & Early Development Four-Way Suppression Rules (provided to DRC for summary reports on 3/23/2017)
	• FILE 45 Reporting Protocol – 2 Levels of Achievement
	• FILE 46 Reporting Protocol – 4 Levels of Achievement
	• FILE 47 Educator Guide to 2017 Assessment Reports	

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 2.6 Summary Statement		
X __ No additional evidence is required .		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content
 	
The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State's validity evidence includes evidence that the State's assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State's academic content standards, including:
• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State's assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State's academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;
• If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State's academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.
	• FILE 06 PEAKS Third-Party Independent Alignment Study Report
	• FILE 73 Alaska Department of Education & Early Development Response to Alignment Study
	• FILE 48 PEAKS 2017 Test Design and Blueprint
	• FILE 01 PEAKS Spring 2017 Technical Report
	  o Chapter 2, Test Design and Item Development, pages 2-34
	  o Appendix 1: Table of Test Specifications
	
	AA-AAAS
	See DLM consortium evidence.
	
	• FILE 110 CCSSO Review of Alaska ELA and Mathematics Standards
		PEAKS
		See comment in 2.1 regarding alignment.
		
		The peers commend the state's response to the alignment study, particularly the decision to add an on-demand text dependent analysis writing essay questions for grades 4-9 for 2018.
		
		For 9th grade, the blueprint will change for 2018 (p. 11.) Given that there will likely be a substantial change to the assessment, the grade level will likely need to be resubmitted for peer review.
		
		AA-AAAS
		The DLM Essential Elements (EEs) are extended content standards that describe rigorous grade-level expectations for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities (SWSCDs). The Common Core State Standards were used as the primary reference for the development of these standards.
		
		Alaska offers as supplementary evidence File 110, the CCSSO Review of Alaska ELA and Mathematics standards, which indicates that the Alaska standards are sufficiently similar to the common standards used by DLM states to demonstrate adequate linkage of the DLM EEs to the Alaska ELA and Mathematics Standards.
		
		Although Alaska's academic content standards are evidently nearly identical to CCSS, further detail on the exceptions/differences between those two sets of standards may be necessary to confirm that the DLM EEs link fully/well to Alaska's academic content standards.

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required .		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes
 	
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State's academic content standards.
	• FILE 06 PEAKS Third Party Independent Alignment Study Report
	  ○ Depth-of-Knowledge Alignment Analysis of the Alaska Standards and PEAKS Assessments: English Language Arts, pages 34-40
	  ○ Depth-of-Knowledge Alignment Analysis of the Alaska Standards and PEAKS Assessments: Mathematics, pages 41-47
	• FILE 01 PEAKS Spring 2017 Technical Report
	  ○ Chapter 2, Test Design and Item Development, Subsection Pilot Tests, page 7
	  ○ Appendix 1: Table of Test Specifications, pages, 90-226
	  ○ Appendix 5: Operational Item Analysis, pages 538-584
	• FILE 07 DRC Item Development Manual
	• FILE 48 PEAKS 2017 Test Design and Blueprint
		Peer reviewers are concerned that there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the assessment adequately taps the intended cognitive processes.
		
		This is particularly an issue for writing. Details in the alignment study made clear that, at least for writing, there are some issues about alignment, particularly since the standards are collapsed to the anchor level. For reading, it does not appear that the assessment addresses some of the standards that would lend themselves to more cognitively demanding items. For example, both R.L.9 and R.I.9 at grades 3, 4, and 9 and for only one domain in grades 6 and 7. See File 02, Appendix 1.

Section 3.2 Summary Statement		
_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • Additional evidence to ensure that the cognitive processes indicated in the state's standards are adequately assessed on the state's assessment.		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure
 	
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State's academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.
	• FILE 48 PEAKS 2017 Test Design and Blueprint
	• FILE 01 PEAKS Spring 2017 Technical Report
	  ○ Chapter 2, Test Design and Item Development, pages 7
	  ○ Chapter 7, Field Test Item Data Summary, pages 54-62
	  ○ Chapter 8, Scale Scores and Proficiency Levels, pages 64-65
	  ○ Chapter 9, Test Validity and Reliability, page 81
	  ○ Appendix 1: Table of Test Specifications, pages, 90-226
	  ○ Appendix 12, Test Dimensionality, pages 920-1015
		The evidence provided for internal structure is difficult to interpret. The principal components from File 1, Appendix 12, pp. 920-1015 are lacking clear descriptions, and there are a number of negative factor loadings. It is also recommended that a confirmatory approach be used as there is already an assumption that the assessment is unidimensional, given the use of the Rasch model.

Section 3.3 Summary Statement		
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • Confirmatory factor analysis or other information about internal structure. The analysis that was provided is item-level and does not provide a sufficient explanation about the relationships.		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.	• FILE 49 PEAKS 2017 Grades 3-10 Standard Setting Technical Report, pages 3 and 38-43	To demonstrate adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables, Alaska uses NAEP 2015 data as an external reference during standard setting. PEAKs scores fell into a range that was similar to scores on NAEP in both ELA and mathematics. Alaska did not include reports of any analyses that demonstrate convergent relationships between PEAKS results and measures other than test scores (e.g., college enrollment rates, college credit bearing courses, academic characteristics of test-takers, teacher judgments regarding performance/student readiness). Inclusion of such information would have enhanced this section of the submission. At the least, it would be worthwhile for Alaska to include information on any intent to conduct such analyses in the future, particularly since they are mentioned in the guidance document.

Section 3.4 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- A plan for other research studies to examine the relationship with other variables.

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

4.1 – Reliability
 	
The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State's student population overall and each student group and, if the State's assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:
• Test reliability of the State's assessments estimated for its student population;
• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State's assessments;
• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;
• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student's achievement.
	Test reliability of the state's assessments for its student population:
	• FILE 01 PEAKS Spring 2017 Technical Report
	  ○ Chapter 9, Test Validity and Reliability, pages 78-87
	  ○ Appendix 15: Operational Test Reliability by Subpopulations, pages 1029-1045
	
	Overall and conditional standard error of measurement and standard error of estimate:
	• FILE 01 PEAKS Spring 2017 Technical Report
	  ○ Appendix 6: Form Statistics, pages 585-616
	  ○ Appendix 8: Raw to Scale Score Tables, pages 645-702
	• FILE 47 Educator Guide to 2017 Assessment Reports, Score Interpretation Section, pages 7 & 9
	
	Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for cut scores and achievement levels:
	• FILE 01 PEAKS Spring 2017 Technical Report
	  ○ Chapter 9, Test Validity and Reliability, pages 78-87
		The peers noted that there are items with low point-biserial correlations (File 01, p. 80, and p. 540). The evidence provided did not provide information other than item number and information such as standard or item type would have been useful to evaluate the correlations.
		
		The peers noted that ELA demonstrates lower fit at earlier grades (grades 3 and 4) and recommends that the state investigate the relatively low fit. (File 01, p. 80.)
		
		The SEM evidence was appropriate (File 01 p. 645 Appendix 8). The peers particularly appreciated the explanation of SEM to educators as part of reporting (File 47).
		
		The consistency analysis suggests that there is more support for the proficient/not proficient reporting categories than the 4 categories (File 01, p. 87) but still within acceptable range.

Section 4.1 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Additional evidence related to the point-biserial correlation to examine those with low correlations
- Plan to address the low fit of the early grades in ELA

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility
 	
The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.
	• FILE 01 PEAKS Spring 2017 Technical Report (documents application of principles of Universal Design)
	  o Chapter 2, Test Design & Item Development, Considerations of Test Fairness in Item Development, pages 4-5
	  o Chapter 2, Test Design & Item Development, Item Reviews, pages 7-8
	  o Chapter 7, Field Test Item Data Summary, pages 54-62 (evidenced
	
	• FILE 07 DRC Item Development Manual, adherence to universal design principles, pages 17-18
	• FILE 07 DRC Item Development Manual ()
	  o Bias/Sensitivity-Free Items, pages 16-17
	  o Appendix B: Checklist for Bias, Fairness, and Sensitivity, pages 41-42
	• FILE 53 DRC Fairness in Testing Manual
		Responsibility for ensuring the accessibility and fairness of the PEAKS assessment is identified primarily as the purview of their contractor, DRC. Thus, reviewers are referred to DRCs item and test development process (File 07) and Fairness in Testing Manual (File 53).
		
		DRC developed bias and sensitivity guidelines (relied upon in particular for item writing and review) to ensure that items are fair to all test takers regardless of disability status, ethnicity, gender, regional background, native language, race, religion, sexual orientation or socioeconomic status. DRC also convened an external bias and fairness review team that included experts who could provide diverse perspectives.
		
		It is of some concern to the reviewer that all responsibility appears to have been assigned to the contractor. The reviewers were unable to find any evidence that Alaska conducts any supplementary or parallel reviews for bias and sensitivity, particularly given that there may be some unique demands/expectations that are state-specific that might not be addressed in the creation of a multi-purpose item bank. The same concerns apply to passage selection/development (although passages undergo review for bias/sensitivity as well; File 01, p. 6).

Section 4.2 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Evidence that Alaska engages in a review of the items or test form to check for bias and fairness beyond what is done by the contractor.

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

4.3 – Full Performance Continuum
 	
The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.
	• FILE 01 PEAKS Spring 2017 Technical Report
	  ○ Chapter 6, Scaling and Equating, pages 52-53
	  ○ Chapter 8: Scale Scores and Proficiency Levels, pages 63-75
	  ○ Appendix 5: Operational Test Item Analysis, pages 538-584
	  ○ Appendix 6: Form Statistics, pages 585-616
	  ○ Appendix 7: Operational Test Item and Threshold Difficulty Maps, pages 617-644
	  ○ Appendix 8: Raw-to-Scale Score Tables, pages 645-702
	• FILE 47 Educator Guide to 2017 Assessment Reports, Score Interpretation Section, pages 7 & 9
		The peers recommend that more information be provided about the difficulty of the items, to determine the source of the difficulty (i.e., cognitive complexity vs. an issue with an item type [File 01, Appendix 5, p. 538]). It would be helpful in the Appendix tables if more information about the items could be provided such as type or reporting strand instead of the item number.
		
		Without inclusion of one or more writing samples, which are of greater cognitive demand than selected response items measuring aspects of writing, the reviewers question the adequacy of estimates of student performance in ELA across the full performance continuum. Reviewers were also concerned about the limited number of DOK 3 items for ELA (only a few available, fewer in 2017 form. Reviewers are unfamiliar with any DOK analysis that allows the assignment of hybrid DOK levels, such as the assignment of 2-3 rather than 3. The state's doing so may have obscured the extent to which the assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full continuum.
		
		There was sufficient evidence regarding the SEM across the performance continuum (File 1, Appendix 8, p. 645).

Section 4.3 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Evidence of plan to deal with items flagged for extreme difficulty such as examining item types and/or strands.
- Rationale for assigning hybrid DOK levels (2-3) to a particular item.

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.4 – Scoring The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State's academic achievement standards.	• FILE 54 Handscoring of Constructed Responses • FILE 01 PEAKS Spring 2017 Technical Report ○ Chapter 8: Scale Scores and Proficiency Levels, pages 63-75 • FILE 55 AK TAC Meeting Minutes, May 2017 • FILE 56 Alaska State Board of Education and Early Development June 2017 Meeting Packet, Agenda Items 5B and 7B, pages 3-4, 183-193, and 219-225 • FILE 56 Alaska State Board of Education and Early Development July 2017 Meeting Packet, Agenda Items 2A and 3A, pages 1-2 and 91-119 • FILE 57 Alaska State Board of Education and Early Development July 14, 2017 Meeting Minutes • FILE 49 PEAKS 2017 Grades 3-10 Standard Setting Technical Report • FILE 07 DRC Item Development Manual, page 36	The TAC notes (File 55, p. 9) discussed the number of items flagged for extreme difficulty and encouraged a review of those items by content experts and checking the keying. The peers recommend following the TAC's advice. There was adequate evidence of general scoring procedures. The peers noted that the detail in the blueprint appears to be contradicted by the statement in File 54 regarding handscoring.

Section 4.4 Summary Statement

__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Plan to review items flagged for extreme difficulty.

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms
 	
If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State's academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.
	• FILE 01 PEAKS Spring 2017 Technical Report
	  o Chapter 2, Test Design & Item Development, pages 4-5
	  o Chapter 5, Form Analysis & Item Calibration, pages 44-51
	
	• FILE 26 DRC 2016-2017 Contract with Alaska Department of Education & Early Development, page 54
	• FILE 112 Alaska TAC Meeting Agenda and Minutes, November 2017
		The peers noted that the same form is used for the different administrations with the computer form having a second scrambled form. The state provides evidence that the assessment is comparable across school years in accordance to the blueprint (File 01, p. 4-5).

Section 4.5 Summary Statement		
_X_ No additional evidence is required		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Alaska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State: • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.	**Design and development process** • FILE 01 PEAKS Spring 2017 Technical Report o Chapter 2, Test Design & Item Development, 2017 Operational Plan, pages 27-31 o Chapter 5, Form Analysis & Item Calibration, pages 44-51 **Comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results** • FILE 01 PEAKS Spring 2017 Technical Report o Chapter 7, Field Test Item Data Summary, pages 54-62 o Chapter 8, Scale Scores and Proficiency Levels, pages 64-65 o Chapter 9, Test Validity & Reliability, pages 78-87 o Appendix 5: Operational Test Item Analysis, pages 538-584 o Appendix 6: Form Statistics, pages 585-616 o Appendix 7: Operational Test Item And Threshold Difficulty Maps, pages 617-644 o Appendix 8: Raw-To-Scale Score Tables, pages 645-702 o Appendix 12: Test Dimensionality, pages 920-1015 o Appendix 14: Summary Of Primary Disability And Student Accommodations, pages 1024-1028 o Appendix 15: Operational Test Reliability By Subpopulations, pages 1029-1045	The peers noted potential comparability issues across modes. In File 1, p. 64, there are differences in the raw score cutpoints, particularly for the lower grade levels, for example, a 24 for below proficient for grade 3 online compared to 21 on paper. More evidence is needed to explain this issue as well as to demonstrate comparability across modes. The item statistics for ELA also suggest that there is not comparability across modes. For example, see the grade 3 ELA item statistics (File 01, p. 554 vs. 556). The peers noted a lack of evidence about how the technology-enhanced items were transformed for the paper-and-pencil form and how comparability was assessed.

Section 4.6 Summary Statement

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Alaska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • Additional comparability studies are needed to determine if there are mode effects.		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance
 	
The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).
	• FILE 111 Alaska Technical Advisory Committee Membership
	• FILE 55 Alaska TAC Meeting Agenda and Minutes, May 2017
	• FILE 112 Alaska TAC Meeting Agenda and Minutes, November 2017
	• FILE 01 PEAKS Spring 2017 Technical Report
	  ○ Chapter 5, Form Analysis & Item Calibration, pages 44-51
	  ○ Appendix 5: Operational Test Item Analysis, pages 538-584
	  ○ Appendix 12: Test Dimensionality, pages 920-1015
		The state has provided adequate evidence for element 4.7.
		
		The state has evidence of a TAC and has engaged in long-term planning for the assessment, including maintenance and incorporating TAC feedback.

Section 4.7 Summary Statement
_X__ No additional evidence is required .

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities
 	
The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State's assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:
• Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards;
• States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student's IEP Team based on each student's individual needs;
 	
• Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;
• Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;
• Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;
• Includes instructions that students eligible to be
	Explanations of differences between assessments based on grade-level standards and alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of taking an alternate assessment
	• FILE 80 State of Alaska Regulations Excerpt
	  ○ pages 11-12, 4 AAC 06.775(a), (b), (c), and (m)
	  ○ page 2, 4 AAC 06.078
	  ○ page 14, 4 AAC 06.790
	• FILE 05 Participation Guidelines for Alaska Students in State Assessments, December 2015, pages 1, 3, and 23
	• FILE 58 State of Alaska Department of Education & Early Development Guidance for Special Education Personnel, January 2017, p. 57
	• FILE 59 Handbook for Participation Guidelines, February 2016, p. 30
	• FILE 02 District Test Coordinator's Manual, Spring 2017, p. 13
	• FILE 03 Computer-Based Test Administration Directions, Spring 2017, p. 4
	• FILE 04 Paper-Based Test Administration Directions, Spring 2017, p. 4
	
	Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by IEP team
	• FILE 80 State of Alaska Regulations Excerpt, pages 11-12, 4 AAC 06.775(a), (b), and (c)
	• FILE 05 Participation Guidelines for Alaska Students in State Assessments, December 2015, page 24
	FILE 58 State of Alaska Department of Education & Early Development Guidance for Special Education Personnel, January 2017, p. 55-56 and p. 67 (Sample IEP)
	• FILE 59 Handbook for Participation Guidelines,
		PEAKS
		The state provides adequate evidence to provide clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate achievement standards.
		
		The state provides adequate evidence regarding IEP team involvement.
		
		The state provides adequate information about guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodations, the general assessment with accommodations, or an alternate assessment.
		
		The state provides accessibility tools, including embedded tools within the computer-based form.
		
		The state provides ample evidence on guidance related to the selection of accommodations (File 59).
		
		The peers would recommend more specific guidance to make clear that students eligible for the alternate assessment may come from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA.
		
		The peers also note that it would be useful to include examples of relevant parent documentation of the consequences of taking the alternative assessment.
		
		In a number of instances, for 5.1–5.3, the reviewers were unable to find the relevant evidence in the provided documents. The reviewers suggest providing only evidence that is directly relevant and

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;
• Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student's achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State's general assessments);
• The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.
	February 2016, p. 11
	• FILE 02 District Test Coordinator's Manual, Spring 2017, p. 13
	• FILE 03 Computer-Based Test Administration Directions, Spring 2017 p. 13
	• FILE 04 Paper-Based Test Administration Directions, Spring 2017, p. 11
	
	Guidelines for determining whether to assess on general assessment with or without accommodations or an alternate assessment
	• FILE 80 State of Alaska Regulations Excerpt (description of course requirements, alternate assessment, certificate of attendance or completion, and diploma track)
	  ○ pages 11-12, 4 AAC 06.775(a), (b), and (c)
	  ○ page 2, 4 AAC 06.078
	  ○ page 14, 4 AAC 06.790
	• FILE 05 Participation Guidelines for Alaska Students in State Assessments, December 2015, pages 24-25
	• FILE 58 State of Alaska Department of Education & Early Development Guidance for Special Education Personnel, January 2017, p. 57 (alternate assessment)
	• FILE 59 Handbook for Participation Guidelines, February 2016, pages 7-8 and 30
	• FILE 02 District Test Coordinator's Manual, Spring 2017, p. 13
	• FILE 03 Computer-Based Test Administration Directions, Spring 2017, p. 4
	• FILE 04 Paper-Based Test Administration Directions, Spring 2017, p. 4
	
	Information on accessibility tools, features, and
		with accurate page references.
		
		AA-AAAS
		Although the state has not specifically referenced DLM administration, the state has provided evidence about guidelines for alternate assessment participation.

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	accommodations available FILE 05 Participation Guidelines for Alaska Students in State Assessments, December 2015, pages 26-27 (alternate assessment) • FILE 09 Student Supports on the Performance Evaluation for Alaska's Schools (PEAKS) Assessment for Spring 2017 as Compared to Spring 2016 • FILE 10 Student Supports on the Computer-Based PEAKS Assessment for Spring 2017 • FILE 11 Student Supports on the Paper-Based PEAKS Assessment for Spring 2017 • FILE 12 Student Supports on the PEAKS Assessments for Spring 2017 • FILE 58 State of Alaska Department of Education & Early Development Guidance for Special Education Personnel, January 2017, pages 55-57 • FILE 59 Handbook for Participation Guidelines, February 2016, pages 32-36 (alternate) • FILE 02 District Test Coordinator's Manual, Spring 2017, pages 17-32 • FILE 03 Computer-Based Test Administration Directions, Spring 2017, pages 9-18, 56-57, and 68-70 • FILE 04 Paper-Based Test Administration Directions, Spring 2017, pages 9-16, 54-55, and 56-57 **Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations** • FILE 58 State of Alaska Department of Education & Early Development Guidance for Special Education Personnel, January 2017, pages 55-57 • FILE 59 Handbook for Participation Guidelines,	

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	February 2016, pages 11-14 (general) and 32-36 (alternate) o Appendix A: Annotated Table of Accommodations, pages 45-60 (references AMP rather than PEAKS, but general guidance still useful for educators, will be updated for PEAKS) o Appendix B: Tools for Educators, pages 61-76 • FILE 02 District Test Coordinator's Manual, Spring 2017, pages 17-32 • FILE 03 Computer-Based Test Administration Directions, Spring 2017, pages 9-18, 56-57, and 68-70 • FILE 04 Paper-Based Test Administration Directions, Spring 2017, pages 9-16, 54-55, and 56-57 **Eligibility for alternate assessment may be from any disability category listed in IDEA** • FILE 05 Participation Guidelines for Alaska Students in State Assessments, December 2015, page 30 **Parents of students with significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student's achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or state policy** • FILE 80 State of Alaska Regulations Excerpt, pages 11-12, 4 AAC 06.775(e) • FILE 05 Participation Guidelines for Alaska Students in State Assessments, December 2015, page 24 (aligned with standards)	

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

	• FILE 61 Participation Guidelines for Inclusion of Alaska Students in State Assessments, December 2017, page 19 (updated language for ESSA)
	
	Procedures to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.
	• FILE 80 State of Alaska Regulations Excerpt (description of course requirements, alternate assessment, certificate of attendance or completion, and diploma track)
	  ○ pages 11-12, 4 AAC 06.775(a), (b), (c), and (m)
	  ○ page 2, AAC 06.078
	  ○ page 14, 4 AAC 06.790
	• FILE 05 Participation Guidelines for Alaska Students in State Assessments, December 2015, page 23 (aligned with standards)
	• FILE 61 Participation Guidelines for Inclusion of Alaska Students in State Assessments, December 2017, page 19 (updated language for ESSA)
	• FILE 58 State of Alaska Department of Education & Early Development Guidance for Special Education Personnel, January 2017
	  ○ Alternate Assessment, page 57
	  ○ Secondary Transition Program Requirements, p.81
	• FILE 59 Handbook for Participation Guidelines, February 2016, page 7-8 and 30	

Section 5.1 Summary Statement

__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Evidence that students eligible for the alternate assessment may come from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA.

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Alaska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

5.2 – Procedures for including ELs
 	
The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State's assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:
• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);
• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;
• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.
	Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodations
	• FILE 02 District Test Coordinator's Manual, Spring 2017, page 14
	• FILE 05 Participation Guidelines for Alaska Students in State Assessments, December 2015, pages 20-21
	• FILE 59 Handbook for Participation Guidelines, February 2016, pages 23-26
	• FILE 62 Guidance for English Learners Identification, Assessment, and Data Reporting, page 10
	
	Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners
	• FILE 05 Participation Guidelines for Alaska Students in State Assessments, December 2015, pages 20-21
	• FILE 12 Student Supports on the PEAKS Assessments for Spring 2017, page 2
	• FILE 02 District Test Coordinator's Manual, Spring 2017, page 22 and 26
	• FILE 75 Accommodations for Students Identified as English Learners (updated version of Appendix B, Tool 10 from Handbook for Participation Guidelines)
	
	Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners
	• FILE 59 Handbook for the Participation Guidelines, February 2016
	  ○ Section 1: Five-Step Process for Selecting, Administering, and Evaluating Use of Student Supports, pages 5-26
	  ○ Appendix A: Annotated Table of
		PEAKS
		The state provided adequate information about the procedures for determining whether the English learner should be assessed with accommodations (File 75).
		
		The state provided sufficient information on accessibility tools and features.
		
		The state provided evidence for guidance for the selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. However, the peers noted that the guidance was not very clear and there was little specific detail on procedures to determine whether an English learner should be assessed with specific accommodations.
		
		The peers questioned the appropriateness of evidence drawn from the previous assessment without more information about the similarities and differences between the accommodations policies of the assessments.
		
		AA-AAAS
		Although the state has not specifically referenced DLM administration, the state has provided evidence about guidelines for alternate assessment participation.

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Accommodations, pages 45-60 (references AMP rather than PEAKS, but general guidance still useful for educators, will be updated for PEAKS) • FILE 75 Accommodations for Students Identified as English Learners (updated version of Appendix B, Tool 10 from Handbook for Participation Guidelines) • FILE 05 Participation Guidelines for Alaska Students in State Assessments, December 2015, pages 20-21 • FILE 12 Student Supports on the PEAKS Assessments for Spring 2017, page 2 • FILE 02 District Test Coordinator's Manual, Spring 2017, page 22 and 26	

Section 5.2 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Evidence for guidance and procedures for the selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Alaska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

5.3 – Accommodations
 	
The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:
• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;
• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);
• Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student's need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;
• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.
	Accommodations are available for students with disabilities under IDEA and students covered under Section 504 –
	• FILE 80 State of Alaska Regulations Excerpt
	  ○ pages 11-12, 4 AAC 06.775(a)
	  ○ page 13, 4 AAC 06.776(b)
	• FILE 05 Participation Guidelines for Alaska Students in State Assessments, December 2015
	• FILE 61 Participation Guidelines for Inclusion of Alaska Students in State Assessments, December 2017
	• FILE 09 Student Supports on the PEAKS Assessment for Spring 2017 as Compared to Spring 2016
	• FILE 10 Student Supports on the Computer-Based PEAKS Assessment for Spring 2017
	• FILE 11 Student Supports on the Paper-Based PEAKS Assessment for Spring 2017
	• FILE 12 Student Supports on the PEAKS Assessments for Spring 2017
	• FILE 58 State of Alaska Department of Education & Early Development Guidance for Special Education Personnel, January 2017, (pages 55-57)
	• FILE 63 Department of Education & Early Development Accommodations Webpage (screenshot)
	• FILE 59 Handbook for the Participation Guidelines, February 2016 (page 11 "Select and Document Accommodations for Instruction and Assessment")
	• FILE 02 District Test Coordinator's Manual Spring 2017, pages 22-25
	• FILE 14 District Test Coordinator Training Presentation Slides, February 2017, pages 17-19
	• FILE 15 Test Administrator Training for
		PEAKS
		Although the state identifies in detail the array of accommodations available to SWSCD and ELs, the reviewers were unable to locate any detail/evidence to describe policies and practices in place to ensure that appropriate accommodations are both identified and actually implemented during testing. Thus, it is difficult to confirm that the state "ensures" that appropriate accommodations are always available.
		
		For example, the Participation Guidelines for Inclusion of Alaska Students in State Assessments (File 61, p. 4) states, "Research shows that an unfamiliar test accommodation given to a student with a disability may negatively impact performance. Accordingly, an IEP or 504 team should be cautious about adding an accommodation shortly before an assessment. In general, a good practice is to make sure an accommodation has been used in the student's regular and/or special education classes for instruction and classroom assessments for at least three months or 90 days before testing. This will ensure that the student has experience with the accommodation and that the accommodation is appropriate for the student." It would seem advisable that the state have some means of monitoring compliance with this and other practices mentioned in File 61 and other evidence for this CE. This is addressed in the summary statement for CE 5.4.
		
		The reviewers were unable to find any evidence that the accommodations do not alter the construct being measured. This should be documented. The same applies to (iii) (i.e., allow meaningful interpretations of results).
		
		The peers noted that it was not well documented

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

	PEAKS Computer-Based Slides, Spring 2017
	• FILE 16 Test Administrator Training for PEAKS Paper-Based Slides, Spring 2017
	• FILE 03 Computer-Based Test Administration Directions,
	• Spring 2017, pages 10-18
	• FILE 04 Paper-Based Test Administration Directions, Spring 2017, pages 9-16
	• FILE 64 DRC Text-to-Speech (TTS) Production Methodology
	• FILE 65 DRC Braille Production Methodology
	• FILE 01 PEAKS Spring 2017 Technical Report
	  o Validity Evidence for Different Student populations, pages 81-82
	  o Appendix 13: Summary of Student Demographics
	  o Appendix 14: Summary of Primary Disability and Student Accommodations
	
	Accommodations are available for English learners –
	• FILE 05 Participation Guidelines for Alaska Students in State Assessments, December 2015, pages 20-22
	• FILE 11 Student Supports on the Paper-Based PEAKS Assessment for Spring 2017, page 2
	• FILE 02 District Test Coordinator's Manual Spring 2017
	  o (Eligibility and Participation Section, Table 8 Accommodations for ELs), page 26
	• FILE 14 District Test Coordinator Training Presentation Slides, February 2017
	• FILE 03 Computer-Based Test Administration Directions, Spring 2017, Table 10, page 16
	• FILE 04 Paper-Based Test Administration Directions, Spring 2017, Table 9, page 13
		whether there is a process for exceptional requests (see file 59, p. 15 and file 5, p. 6-7).
		
		AA-AAAS
		Although the state has not specifically referenced DLM administration, the state has provided evidence about guidelines for alternate assessment participation.

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Appropriate accommodations • **FILE 53 DRC Fairness in Testing Manual, pages 5-26** • FILE 08 Qualifications of DRC Item and Test Developers, pages 1-2 • FILE 61 Participation Guidelines for Inclusion of Alaska Students in State Assessments, December 2017, pages 8-9 • FILE 58 State of Alaska Department of Education & Early Development Guidance for Special Education Personnel, January 2017 (pages 55-56 "Annual Review of IEPs") • FILE 59 Handbook for the Participation Guidelines, February 2016 (page 19 "Evaluate and Improve Accommodations Use") **Process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed** • FILE 80 State of Alaska Regulations Excerpt, pages 11-12, 4 AAC 06.775(d) • FILE 05 Participation Guidelines for Alaska Students in State Assessments, December 2015, Determining if an Adaptation is a Modification or Accommodation, pages 6-7 • FILE 59 Handbook for the Participation Guidelines, February 2016, page 15, Planning for accommodations during assessment	

Section 5.3 Summary Statement

__X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Evidence that accommodations do not alter the construct being measured and that they allow for meaningful interpretations of results and comparisons of

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
scores for students who test with and without accommodations. • Documentation of a process for exceptional accommodations requests.		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Alaska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations
 	
The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:
• Consistent with the State's policies for accommodations;
• Appropriate for addressing a student's disability or language needs for each assessment administered;
• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;
• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student's IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;
• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.
	Guidance for selecting appropriate assessments for students:
	• FILE 80 State of Alaska Regulations Excerpt (description of course requirements, alternate assessment, certificate of attendance or completion, and diploma track)
	  ○ pages 11-12, 4 AAC 06.775(a), (c), and (m)
	  ○ page 2, 4 AAC 06.078
	  ○ page 14, 4 AAC 06.790
	• FILE 05 Participation Guidelines for Alaska Students in State Assessments, December 2015
	  ○ Participation section, paragraph 2, page 3
	  ○ General guidance for selecting appropriate assessments and accommodations, pages 4-5
	  ○ Overview of Alaska Alternate Assessment, page 23 and Checklist, page 25
	
	Consistent with the State's policies for accommodations
	• FILE 03 Computer-Based Test Administration Directions, Spring 2017 (Sections 2 and 3)
	• FILE 04 Paper-Based Test Administration Directions, Spring 2017 (Sections 2 and 3)
	
	Appropriate for addressing a student's disability or language needs for each assessment administered
	• FILE 01 PEAKS Spring 2017 Technical Report (evidence that state uses student level accommodation data for analysis and reporting
	  ○ Appendix 13: Summary of Student Demographics, page 1016-1023
	  ○ Appendix 14: Summary of Primary Disability and Student Accommodations, page 1024-1028
	  ○ Appendix 15: Operational Test Reliability
		PEAKS
		The peers note that although the state collects information about the type of disability and accommodation it is unclear what the state does with the information.
		
		As referenced in the peer review notes for 5.3, the peers recommend that the state have a monitoring plan in place to ensure that students with disabilities and English learners do, in fact, receive appropriate accommodations and that the accommodations are being administered consistently and appropriately.
		
		AA-AAAS
		In supplementary communication, Alaska identified evidence documents that specifically address this CE for the alternate assessment. File 05 (Participation Guidelines for Alaska Students in State Assessments) deals directly with alternate assessment, although it refers to the instrument used before DLM. File 58 (State of Alaska Department of Education and Early Development Guidance for Special Education Personnel) and File 59 (Handbook for the Participation Guidelines, February 2016) explicitly address administration of the DLM. The same recommendation made by the peer reviewers in regard to monitoring the test administration for special populations taking PEAKS applies to those taking DLM.

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

	by Subpopulations, pages 1029-1-45
	Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice
	• FILE 58 State of Alaska Department of Education & Early Development Guidance for Special Education Personnel, January 2017
	  o Pages 56-57, Accommodations section (indicates selection of familiar, not new, accommodations for assessment)
	  o Page 68, Sample IEP Plan (requires assurance that all accommodations used for assessment are in place in the classroom
	• FILE 59 Handbook for the Participation Guidelines, February 2016, Section I, pages 1-19 (Process for selecting, administering, and evaluating use of student supports)
	• FILE 03 Computer-Based Test Administration Directions, Spring 2017, p. 13
	• FILE 04 Paper-Based Test Administration Directions, Spring 2017, p. 11
	
	Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student's IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner
	• FILE 02 District Test Coordinator's Manual, Spring 2017, page 27 – process for documenting accommodations selected at individual student level in the test platform – data may be reviewed by school staff for alignment with IEP team decisions
	
	Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures
	• FILE 58 State of Alaska Department of Education & Early Development Guidance for Special Education Personnel, January 2017,	

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	○ Accommodations section, pages 56-57 Sample IEP, page 67 • FILE 14 District Test Coordinator Training Presentation Slides, February 2017, page 19 (administrator's responsibility to monitor accommodations) • FILE 15 Test Administrator Training for PEAKS Computer-Based Slides, Spring 2017, page 10 (administrator's responsibility to monitor accommodations) • FILE 16 Test Administrator Training for PEAKS Paper-Based Slides, Spring 2017, page 9 (administrator's responsibility to monitor accommodations) Evidence that school personnel must affirm that tests will be administered according to standard test procedures and consequences including possible loss of teaching certificate (includes sections on accommodations): • FILE 80 State of Alaska Regulations Excerpt ○ pages 11-12, 4 AAC 06.761(c) ○ pages 9-10, 4 AAC 06.765(e),(f), & (h) • FILE 28 Test Security Agreement Guidance • FILE 29 Level 1-3 Test Security Agreement – District Test Coordinator, Lead Coordinators, and Building Test Coordinators • FILE 30 Level 4 Test Security Agreement – Test Administrators ○ FILE 31 Level 5 Test Security Agreement – Test Administration Support	

Section 5.4 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Evidence of state monitoring of the selection and administration of accommodations for students with disabilities and English learners for both the general ELA/math and the AA-AAAS.

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students
 	
The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:
• The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;
• The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply;
• The State's academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.
	Academic achievement standards for PEAKS ELA and Mathematics
	• FILE 56 Alaska State Board of Education and Early Development June 2017 Meeting Packet, Agenda Items 5B and 7B, pages 3-4, 183-193, and 219-225
	• FILE 79 Alaska State Board of Education and Early Development July 2017 Meeting Packet, Agenda Items 2A and 3A, pages 1-2 and 91-119
	• FILE 57 State Board of Education and Early Development July 14, 2017 Meeting Minutes
	
	Academic achievement standards for alternate assessment:
	• FILE 80 State of Alaska Regulations Excerpt, page 11, 4 AAC 06.775(b)
	• FILE 108 Alaska State Board of Education and Early Development August 2015 Meeting Packet
	• FILE 81 Alaska State Board of Education and Early Development October 9, 2015 Meeting Packet
	• FILE 82 Alaska State Board of Education and Early Development October 9, 2015 Meeting Minutes
	
	Grade-level academic achievement standards applied to all public school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply;
	
	• FILE 80 State of Alaska Regulations Excerpt
	  ○ Page 5, 4 AAC 06.737
	  ○ Page 7, 4 AAC 06.739
	  ○ Pages 11-12, 4 AAC 06.775
		PEAKS
		
		The state provides adequate evidence of adoption for English language arts and mathematics.
		
		AA-AAAS
		The state provides adequate evidence of adoption for English language arts and mathematics for the alternate achievement standards.

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

	Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third for lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels
	
	• FILE 83 Development of Alaska Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs)
	• FILE 84 Recruitment for Alaska Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs) and Standard Setting
	
	• FILE 85 Alaska English Language Arts and Mathematics Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs)
	• FILE 47 Educator Guide to 2017 Assessment Reports
	  ○ Page 6, Score Interpretation
	  ○ Pages 47-66, Achievement and Proficiency Level Ranges and Achievement and Proficiency Level Summary Descriptors
	• FILE 52 Parent Guide to Student Reports, Spring 2017 PEAKS Assessment
	
	• FILE 49 PEAKS 2017 Grades 3-10 Standard Setting Technical Report, pages 40 and 43	

Section 6.1 Summary Statement

__X__ No additional evidence is required.

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting
 	
The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.
	• FILE 83 Development of Alaska Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs)
	
	• FILE 84 Recruitment for Alaska Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs) and Standard Setting
	• FILE 49 PEAKS 2017 Grades 3-10 Standard Setting Technical Report, Section 3, pages 4-13
	
	• FILE 49 PEAKS 2017 Grades 3-10 Standard Setting Technical Report (in entirety), also:
	  o Appendix C: Bookmark Training Presentation (ELA), pages 53-77
	  o Appendix D: Angoff Training Presentation (math), pages 78-97
	
	• FILE 55 AK TAC Meeting Minutes, May 2017
	• FILE 49 PEAKS 2017 Grades 3-10 Standard Setting Technical Report, Section 9 Administrative Review, pages 36-43
		The standard setting method was appropriate. The peers are concerned about the differences in proficiency levels across subjects and the differences across grades during the rounds of the standard setting (see file 49 around p. 27). Given the differences, peer reviewers are concerned that additional training for panelists may have been needed or that the ALDs were not sufficiently clear to guide the panelists during the standard setting process. The differences in proficiency levels across subject areas could result in difficulties in score interpretations, particularly for parents.
		
		It was unclear how the NAEP data was used (p. 43, file 49). Presenting other achievement data to the panel might have been beneficial.
		
		The state may wish to have another standard setting meeting to confirm or adjust results, particularly as there will be changes to the blueprints to add writing.

Section 6.2 Summary Statement
_X_ No additional evidence is required .

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards The State's academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State's academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce. If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State's grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.	• FILE 83 Development of Alaska Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs) • FILE 85 Alaska English Language Arts and Mathematics Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs) AA-AAAS • FILE 110 CCSSO Review of Alaska ELA and Mathematics Standards	The peers questioned why the achievement level descriptors include the production of complex texts, something that is not assessed in PEAKS. The peers noted that there were only 2 panelists per grade/subject area (file 83, p. 6 of pdf). This may contribute to the discrepancy in the standard setting process as the standard setting is based on the ALDs.

Section 6.3 Summary Statement

_X__ No additional evidence is required .

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Alaska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

6.4 – Reporting
The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:
• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;
• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;
• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:
  ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student's achievement;
  ○ Report the student's achievement in terms of the State's grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);
  ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;
  ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to
	Reporting of assessment results at each proficiency level and participation rate and each group
	• FILE 80 State of Alaska Regulations Excerpt,
	  ○ page 6, 4 AAC 06.738(b)-(d) Standards-based test results
	  ○ page 7, 4 AAC 06.739 Assessment achievement level scores
	  ○ page 11-12, 4 AAC 06.775 Alternate Assessment achievement level scores
	• FILE 86 DEED Releases PEAKS Results Press Release- 9/1/17
	• FILE 47 Educator Guide to 2017 Assessment Reports, pages 17-32
	
	Data provided on DEED website (sample webpages provided)
	• FILE 87 2017 PEAKS Statewide Results
	• FILE 88 Report Card to the Public
	• FILE 89 Accountability Indicators Reports
	• FILE 90 State of Alaska Report Card to the Public
	
	Reporting of assessment results with itemized score analysis to schools and districts in order to interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the state also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results
	
	Data provided on DEED Website
	• FILE 91 2017 PEAKS Districtwide Results
	• FILE 92 2017 PEAKS Schoolwide Results
	
	• FILE 52 Parent Guide to Student Reports-
		PEAKS
		The peers noted that although the state may delegate translation and alternative formats to the districts, the state still needs to monitor to ensure that districts are doing so. Additional monitoring evidence is needed by the state.
		
		The peers also noted that although participation rates are on the website (File 87), there is not explanatory text to caution interpretations when there is a low participation rate. The state may consider adding such explanatory text for future reporting.
		
		AA-AAAS
		
		In supplementary communication, Alaska identified evidence documents that specifically address this CE for the alternate assessment. Although the state cites File 26 for the timeline for the data release, peers note that File 26 appears to be specific to the PEAKS and was not clearly applicable to DLM. Similar to PEAKS, the state must provide evidence of monitoring to ensure that districts provide translations of score reports

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand; • The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.	Spring 2017 PEAKS Assessment • FILE 109 FAQs About 2017 PEAKS Reports • FILE 93 School Summary Down Arrow Explanation • FILE 47 Educator Guide to 2017 Assessment Reports, Score Interpretation section, pages 6-14 • FILE 94 PEAKS and Science Assessment Reports: PowerPoint for District or School Use • FILE 95 PEAKS and Science Assessment Reports: Superintendent Meeting July 7, 2017 Slides • FILE 85 Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs) • FILE 96 PEAKS Reports Survey Results Data • FILE 97 PEAKS Score Reports Design and Stakeholder Feedback Reports and data provided to districts/schools • FILE 98 AK-PEAKS-School Summary • FILE 99 AK-PEAKS-District Summary • FILE 100 AK-PEAKS-Roster • FILE 101 Student Data File Layout for Districts • FILE 102 Data Interaction for Alaska Student Assessment (DIASA) **Providing for the production and delivery of reports that:**	

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

	Provide valid and reliable information regarding student achievement
	• FILE 01 PEAKS Spring 2017 Technical Report, Chapter 9: Test Validity and Reliability, pages 78-87
	
	Report the student's achievement in terms of the state's grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors)
	• FILE 103 AK-PEAKS-ISR
	• FILE 100 AK-PEAKS-Roster
	• FILE 98 AK-PEAKS-School Summary
	• FILE 99 AK-PEAKS-District Summary
	
	Provide information to help parents and educators interpret the results and address specific academic needs of students
	• FILE 52 Parent Guide to Student Reports, Spring 2017 PEAKS Assessment
	• FILE 47 Educator Guide to 2017 Assessment Reports, pages 6-14
	• Sample Reports
	  ○ FILE 103 AK-PEAKS-ISR
	  ○ FILE 104 AK-PEAKS-ISR-DNA
	  ○ FILE 105 AK-PEAKS-ISR-INV
	  ○ FILE 98 AK-PEAKS-School Summary
	  ○ FILE 99 AK-PEAKS-District Summary)
	  ○ FILE 100 AK-PEAKS-Roster
	
	Available in alternate formats
	• The State does not provide reports in alternate formats. The districts may provide this upon request.
	
	Process and timeline for delivering individual student	

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

	reports
	• FILE 26 DRC 2016-2017 Contract with Alaska Department of Education & Early Development
	  ○ Report Generation and Quality Procedures page 32
	  ○ Final Data and Report Review page 33
	  ○ Report Deliverables page 33
	  ○ Report Distribution page 35
	  ○ Timeline for reports (Printed ISRs mailed to districts) page 65
	• FILE 80 State of Alaska Regulations Excerpt page 6, 4 AAC 06.738 (d) - districts have 20 days to distribute results to parents
	• FILE 106 Email to DTCs: Notification of reports available, August 3, 2017
	• FILE 107 Email to Superintendents: notification of reports available, August 2, 2017	

Section 6.4 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Evidence of monitoring translations/alternative formats for score reporting for both PEAK and DLM.
- Evidence of a timeline for DLM reporting.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

February 2018 State Assessment Combined Peer Review Notes for the DLM Year-End Assessment Consortium RESUBMISSION

U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Note: Peer review notes provide the combined recommendations of the individual peers to the U.S. Department of Education (Department), based on the statute and regulations and the Department's peer review guidance and the peer's professional judgement of the evidence submitted by the State. These assessment peer review notes, however, do not necessarily identify the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for assessment peer review. Although the peer notes inform the Secretary's consideration of each State's assessment system, the Department makes the final decision regarding whether the assessment system meets the requirements in the statute and regulations. As a result, these peer notes may not completely align with the final determination made by the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Contents

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 3
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 3

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 4
4.1 – Reliability..... 5
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 7
4.4 – Scoring 9

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.1 – Test Design and Development The State's test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State's academic content standards, and includes: • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State's grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State's academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.	YE 01 (Technical Manual Update YE 2015-16)	DLM provides a brief but adequate explanation for why speaking and listening standards (part of CCSS) were not included in the DLM ELA assessment, to the effect that partner states had not assessed these standards in their general assessments. For all students, therefore, including SWSCD, speaking and listening were to be taught and assessed at the local level (YE 01, pp. 9-10). It might have been useful (but not essential) to include participating state's waiver letters to support this statement. The supplementary submission evidence did not address part of the summary statement request for additional evidence—specifically, an explanation of why Language is not directly addressed. A brief explanation such as that offered for the question about Speaking and Listening would have been helpful—which the reviewers assume is that in their general assessments, all of the partner states assess Language in the context of Reading or Writing (e.g., as is the case with PARCC).
Section 2.1 Summary Statement (from August 2017 Peer Review)		
_X_ No additional evidence is required		

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (**Record document and page # for future reference**)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.1 – Reliability **(from 2016 peer review)** For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), WVDE must provide: • Evidence of monitoring and refinement of the diagnostic classification models from subsequent test administrations	YE 01, pp. 43-46; 48-62. YE 03, pp. 102.	Overall, Peer Reviewers are impressed with the DLM learning and assessment models. Peers are hopeful that the psychometric model, which is less mature, will eventually be refined to a similar level, to capitalize on the advantages of the learning and assessment models. DLM provided detail in the Technical Manual Update YE 2016-17 (YE 01) as evidence of monitoring and refinement of the diagnostic classification models from test administrations subsequent to the initial administration. Given recommendations below, Peer Reviewers would expect that technical manuals in subsequent years continue to address and update evidence of monitoring and refinement of Diagnostic Classification Models. The DLM's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) discussed and indicated support for maintaining the current scoring model for 2017-18 while additional research is conducted on different methods for being able to support cross-linkage level inferences (YE 03). On p. 45, there is mention of the fact that non-masters sometimes have a greater than chance likelihood of providing correct responses to items measuring the linkage level, which may indicate that items or LLs as a whole are "easily guessable." It would be useful to note what is being done to address that. Peer reviewers recommend checking this again with more operational data. If the issue remains, either model or items or both need to be changed. In reference to the issue of Model Fit, peers were satisfied with the methods being followed to ensure that the model fits the data. However, the Peers

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		suggest following the recommendations of the DLM Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to use a Bayesian estimation procedure to help address some of the methodological issues with the current approach to assessing model fit. Peers recommend that DLM continue to be guided by and to take into serious consideration the advice of the TAC in regards to refinement of the model and generation of data to demonstrate Model Fit.
•		
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
__x_ No additional evidence is required		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.	YE 01 (Technical Manual Update YE 2015-16), pp. 10-11, 13-14 Appendix A: ELA Text Photograph Guidelines	DLM provides an adequate explanation of the development and selection of reading passages, including steps taken to ensure passages are accessible to SWSCD. The peers found Table 5 (p. 11) very helpful in clarifying internal and external passage review criteria. While not essential to document attention to this CE factor, it would have been of interest to not only cite a source of more information on p. 10 of YE 01 ("For a complete summary of external review of ELA passages, see Results from External Review During the 2014–2015 Academic Year [Clark, Swinburne Romine, Bell, & Karvonen, 2016]"), but to have provided it among sources of evidence. The explanation of steps taken in the selection and/or creation of graphic components was clear and complete. The reviewers appreciated inclusion of the specific guidelines used in selecting photographs for ELA passages. No additional evidence was required regarding steps taken to ensure that assessments are fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.
Section 4.2 Summary Statement (2017 review)		
_X_ No additional evidence is required.		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (**Record document and page # for future reference**)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.4 – Scoring **(from 2016 review)** For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), WVDE must provide: • Evidence of monitoring procedures used for scoring DLM-YE writing items, including measures of inter-rater reliability.	Technical Manual Update YE 2016-17 (YE 01), pp. 106-113; 141-142	The sampling for the writing products seems to be small. Peer reviewers urge that an effort be made future studies to increase the number of samples and make sure that they represent the full range of abilities reflected in the underlying population. DLM describes the scoring of writing products by human raters (teachers) using a partially-crossed matric design (multiple, different raters across products). Agreement was determined to be good to excellent; but see below: To some extent, a conventional treatment of interrater reliability is not applicable to scoring of writing products in DLM because a "high-inference process common in large-scale assessment such as applying analytic or holistic rubrics" is not used (p. 107). Evaluation based on presence of text features requires little/no inference and thus one would expect raters to assign identical scores. Nevertheless, to address questions about interrater reliability, DLM conducted a study in spring 2017 using writing products from that administration. Teachers' original ratings from the operational administration were compared to the one additional rating or one randomly selected rating from the raters who participated in the study. While DLM points to agreement rates for intraclass correlation (ICC) as falling in the excellent range (≥ .75 and Fleiss's kappa in the good range (.60-.74), these ranges for comparable dichotomous decisions may be modest, but are certainly adequate (typically ICC should be > .80 to be considered "excellent"). It would be helpful to compare ranges applied to scoring of low inference items to those more typical

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		of direct assessment of writing. This might be addressed as part of the anticipated continuation of studies on writing score agreement. DLM indicates that they plan to conduct further study of interrater reliability of writing product scoring (p. 142), by expanding the collection and evaluation of written products. It might be useful for DLM to consider including as part of the study of rater agreement those scores assigned by teacher administrators for writing process items (which depend on administrator judgment). Such items were not included in the study in 2017. In addition, peer reviewers recommend some form of real time monitoring of teacher assigned scores by rescoring or second-scoring by a trained administrator of a small sample, rather than relying solely on post-hoc analyses. Raters' demographic may not be representative (YE01 Table 58, p. 110). It is hard to say, since state teacher demographics were not provided, but it seems that the raters in the study were overwhelmingly non-Hispanic white. Peer reviewers would urge that in subsequent studies, in so far as possible, a more diverse pool of raters be identified.
Section 4.4 Summary Statement		
_X_ No additional evidence is required		