



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Michael W. Kirst
President
California State Board of Education
1430 N Street, Suite 5111
Sacramento, CA 95814

January 18, 2017

The Honorable Tom Torlakson
Superintendent of Public Instruction
California Department of Education
1430 N Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear President Kirst and Superintendent Torlakson:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (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). The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) 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. Therefore, as you know, the Department reinstated peer review of State assessment systems so that each State receives feedback from external experts on the assessments it is currently administering. We appreciate the efforts required to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in June and August 2016. 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 child'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.

On October 6, 2016, the Department sent a letter to chief State school officers outlining the outcomes for States related to the assessment peer review. I am writing to provide you feedback on your State's recent submission of evidence. External peer reviewers and Department staff evaluated the California Department of Education's (CDE) 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 our own analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

400 MARYLAND AVE., SW, WASHINGTON, DC 20202
<http://www.ed.gov/>

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.

- Reading/ language arts (R/LA) and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (Smarter Balanced): **Substantially meets requirements**
- R/LA and mathematics general assessments in high school (Smarter Balanced): **Substantially meets requirements**

The components that **substantially meet** requirements meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The Department expects that CDE should be able to provide this additional information within one year.

The specific list of items required for CDE to submit is enclosed with this letter. The Department notes that CDE submitted a waiver request for assessing speaking that was approved on August 9, 2016, for the 2016–2017, 2017–2018, and 2018–2019 school years.

In addition, the full peer review notes from the review are enclosed. These recommendations to the Department formed the basis of the Department’s 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 peer notes and the Department’s determination and to answer any questions you 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. If you have any questions, please contact Tanesha Hembrey of my staff at: OSS.California@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Ann Whalen
Senior Advisor to the Secretary
Delegated the Duties of Assistant Secretary
for Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Michelle Center, Director, Assessment Development and Administration Division

Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed to Meet the Requirements for California’s Assessment System

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments	<p>For all assessments in grades 3-8 and high school, California Department of Education (CDE) must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services are included in the assessment system. • Clarification as to the circumstances under which a student may take the State’s optional standards-based test in Spanish (STS). (NOTE: if the STS is used to meet the requirements of Title I of the ESEA, it must be submitted for peer review).
1.5 – Participation Data	<p>For the general science general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school, CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment participation rate data on each required assessment. <p>For alternate assessments of alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) in all required subjects in grades 3-8 and high school, CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of assessment participation rate data on each required assessment.
2.1 – Test Design and Development	<p>For the reading\language arts (R/LA) and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification as to whether (and, if so, how) CDE has incorporated its supplemental content standards into the test design and development process for its assessments. • Evidence that the Smarter Balanced test design aligns the assessments to the full depth and breadth for all of the academic content standards in R/LA (including speaking) and mathematics at each grade level. [NOTE: California has received a speaking waiver; therefore, the U.S. Department of Education does not expect California to submit additional evidence regarding speaking during the period of the waiver.] • Evidence that the item selection procedures for the computer adaptive test (CAT) online assessment adequately deliver tests that meet test design requirements for the intended depth of knowledge (DOK) of the assessments (also applies to evidence requested for element 2.2). • Evidence that, for cases where an assessment includes off-grade level content, assessments produce grade level student achievement scores that are based only on grade-level content items. • Evidence that the item pools for all versions of the assessments (e.g., general, American Sign Language, Braille and Spanish) are sufficient to support the test design requirements.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
2.2 – Item Development	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See evidence regarding DOK and item pools in element 2.1 above.
2.3 – Test Administration	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence as noted for all item pools in element 2.1 above. • Evidence that Smarter Balanced assessments that include off-grade level content conform to the on-grade level blueprint for the assessment. • Evidence of alignment of sample test forms for grades 3, 4, 6 and 7 in R/LA and mathematics. • Evidence of improved alignment of the tests, based upon the findings of the independent alignment study.
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of estimated reliability for students receiving accommodations using operational data.
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See evidence regarding DOK and item pools in element 2.1 above.
4.4 – Scoring	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of procedures to ensure acceptable rates of to improve inter-rater agreement on human scored items. <p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Smarter Balanced has clear, unambiguous criteria, including minimum thresholds, to ensure and document inter-rater reliability for States that are conducting hand-scoring of Smarter Balanced performance items. • Evidence of procedures to ensure acceptable rates of inter-rater agreement for human scored test items.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the design and development of the item pools used to support multiple versions of the assessments, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Computer-adaptive in American Sign Language (R/LA listening only, Math) ○ Computer-adaptive in Braille (R/LA, math) ○ Computer-based fixed form in Braille (math) ○ Paper in Braille (R/LA, Math) ○ Computer-adaptive in Spanish (math) ○ Paper in Spanish (math) • Evidence that item pools for these additional computer adaptive versions can support the adaptive test design.
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of guidance regarding selection of the Spanish version of the Smarter Balanced assessments for English learners, and evidence of procedures for communication of this guidance to districts, schools, teachers and parents.
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that monitoring procedures addressed the appropriateness of accommodations for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Evidence that monitoring procedures addressed provision of accommodations consistent with those provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Evidence that monitoring procedures addressed provision of accommodations consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s individualized education program team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or by another process for English learners; • Evidence that monitoring procedures addressed the fidelity with which test administration procedures were carried out.
6.4 – Reporting	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement, including the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • Evidence that the State has a process and timeline for the timely production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments. • Evidence that student score reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille, large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.

U. S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

August 2016 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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR CALIFORNIA

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS . 3
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students 3
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards 5
1.3 – Required Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 7
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 9
1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 12

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 14
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 14
2.2 – Item Development..... 15
2.3 – Test Administration 16
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)18
2.5 – Test Security 21
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 22

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 23
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 23
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 24
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 25
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables 26

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 27
4.1 – Reliability..... 27
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 28
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 29
4.4 – Scoring 31
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 33
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 34
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 35

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 38
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 38
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 40
5.3 – Accommodations..... 43
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 45

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 48
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 48
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 49
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 50
6.4 – Reporting..... 51

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 CALIFORNIA

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
<p>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>On August 2, 2010, the State Board of Education, pursuant to Senate Bill X5 1, adopted the academic content standards, as proposed by the Commission, for ELA and mathematics; included in that adoption were the Common Core and specific additional standards that the Commission had deemed necessary to maintain the integrity and rigor of California’s already extremely high standards. Evidence 1: State Board of Education Minutes, August 2, 2010.</p> <p>The California Common Core State Standards for ELA/Literacy (CA CCSS for ELA/Literacy) and CA CCSS for Mathematics (CA CCSSM) were modified in early 2013. SBE adopt the modifications to the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics with California Additions (CCSSM) and the Model Courses for Higher Mathematics as presented in the Recommended Modifications to the Common Core State Standards with California Additions and Model Courses for Higher Mathematics including the amendment proposed in the Addendum Attachment 2. Evidence 4 and 4a, State Board of Education Minutes, January 16, 2013.</p> <p><u>California Common Core State Standards: English Language Arts & Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects</u> specifies that all elementary students are expected to learn the CA CCSS for reading (page 10), writing (page 20), listening and speaking (page 26), and language page 31). The same document specifies that all for secondary students are expected to learn the CA CCSS for reading (page 46), writing (page 55), speaking and listening (page 65) and language (page 70). Evidence 8.</p> <p><u>California Common Core State Standards: Mathematics</u> indicates that the standards are intended for all students. Evidence 9.</p>	<p>Requirement met.</p>

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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	California Department of Education Web page, <u>“What are the California Common Core Standards?”</u> explains that the SBE determines the content standards to be learned by all students in the State of California. Evidence 59	
Section 1.1 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or <input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide 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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</p> <p>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.</p>	<p><u>CCSS Initiative: Development Process</u> provides an overview and timeline of the development of the standards. Evidence 60.</p> <p><u>CCSS: Insight into Their Development and Purpose</u> provides an overview of the process used to develop and validate the standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rationale for the standards • An overview of how they were developed • A summary of the research base supporting them • Some of the evidence that the CCSS will prepare students for college and careers <p>Evidence 58.</p> <p>Senate Bill 1 from the fifth Extraordinary Session (SB X5 1) in 2010 established the California Academic Content Standards Commission (Commission) to evaluate the CCSS for ELA in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects for rigor and alignment with the California standards. The CCSS for mathematics were also evaluated by the Commission.</p> <p><u>Evidence 7b: Section 60605.8 of the California Education Code</u> established the commission and its charge. Evidence 2 provided the recommendations of the Commission which included input from stakeholders.</p> <p>In January and March 2014, the California additions to the standards were added. Evidence 4a and 4b.</p> <p>In March 2013, the SBE adopted the College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards to the CCSS for ELA in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects with California additions for all students in California and is internationally benchmarked. Evidence 4b SBE Minutes, March 2, 2013.</p>	<p>Evidence of stakeholder involvement, specifically with CA Commission, what are the qualifications of those appointed to commission? Did they get feedback from others?</p> <p>The SEA may wish to consider opportunities for more information on broad stakeholder involvement in the development of standards.</p>

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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>The final <u>CA CCSS—English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects and California Common Core State Standards Mathematics</u> provided documentation of the descriptions of to encourage the teaching of advanced skills with broad stakeholder input. Evidence 8 and 9.</p>	
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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 CALIFORNIA

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
<p>1.3 – Required Assessments</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). 	<p>Critical Element 1.3-Required Assessments demonstrates that California administers reading/language arts and mathematics assessments in Grades 3-8/11 (Smarter Balanced), and Science in Grades 5, 8, and 10 (Legacy Assessment, previously submitted for peer review, CST).</p> <p>The Smarter Balanced Online Test Administration Manual, page TAM 7, “The Smarter Balanced summative assessments are available in ELA and mathematics to students in grades three through eight and eleven.” Evidence 16</p> <p>CAASSP Online Test Administrator Manual 2015 confirms that Smarter Balanced was engaged to provide the CA assessments, and that those assessments are available in grades 3-8 and 11 for ELA and mathematics. Evidence 17, p. 7</p> <p>“Table 1 shows the assessments scheduled to be included in the CAASPP System for the 2014–15 school year, which will be the first school year of full implementation upon the SBE’s approval of the recommendations found in this report.” From page 3 of Evidence 10 (SSPI Implementation of Consortium Tech Enabled Summative Assessments Memo). The table on page 4 shows that smarter balanced ELA and math assessments will be required for grades 3-8 and 11, and the science testing will be required in grades 5, 8, 10.</p> <p>Evidence 68 details which students must take which tests</p> <p>Alternate assessments still under development, will</p>	<p>Requirement met.</p>

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 CALIFORNIA

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
	<p>submit for peer review at a later date. (CAA for ELA/Math: Field Test 2014-15 for Grades 3-8, 11, first operational assessment 2015-16; CAPA previously reviewed and under revision, CMA no longer administered after 15-16)</p> <p>Supported by State Statute, Evidence 74</p> <p>General note: “The remaining sections of this submission only cover the Smarter Balanced summative assessments, as the CAA ELA and mathematics alternate assessments, as well as the new science assessments, are currently under development. These assessments will undergo peer review in the year following the first operational administration of each assessment.”</p>	
Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [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 CALIFORNIA

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
<p>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</p> <p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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; ○ 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. 	<p>The state includes all students in its assessment system and communicates that to the public.</p> <p>Exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recently arrived EL students. (per evidence 74: CA education code title 2 division 4 part 33 chapter 5 article 4, section 60640 (f) (1) “From the funds available for that purpose, each local educational agency shall administer assessments to each of its pupils pursuant to subdivision (b). As allowable by federal statute, recently arrived English learner pupils are exempted from taking the assessment in English language arts.”) • Medical emergencies (per evidence 78: students with medical emergencies significant enough to be out from the first day of the testing window to the end of the testing window will be excluded from the denominator. • Parental request (per evidence 197, any parent/guardian can exempt any student from testing through written request. However, these students are included in the denominator in participation rate calculations) • Transfers (per evidence 79, a student that transfers out of California before testing begins is not counted in the participation rate denominator. Also, a student that transfers out of California after testing begins but before the end of the first two weeks of testing is not counted in the participation rate denominator. Also, a 	<p>California references a Standards-based Tests in Spanish (STS) for reading/language arts in grades two through eleven (voluntary for school districts to administer; state pays for reading/language arts) However, this is optional, and there is no evidence as to how this is included in the assessment system.</p>

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 CALIFORNIA

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
	<p>student that transfers in to California in the last two weeks of the school year is not counted in the participation rate denominator).</p> <p>Evidence of Communication:</p> <p>Evidence 77 “FAQ for 2015 Accountability” published on CDE website, information for the public. Qs 5, 6, and 7 deal with participation rate, counting enrolled students, how CDE calculates participation rate, and handling of transfer in/transfer out.</p> <p>Evidence 69, Smarter Balanced Online Test Administration Workshops (1/28/15) Slide 5, “Student Participation Q: Who will take the online Smarter Balanced summative assessments? A: All students in grades 3–8 and 11 are required to take the summative assessments.” Student Participation info continues on slides 6 and 7.</p> <p>Slide 7: “The only students exempt from participating in the Smarter Balanced summative assessments are: -Students participating in the California Alternate Assessments (CAA) in English language arts/literacy (ELA) and mathematics -English learners (ELs) who have been attending school in the United States for less than 12 months (for the ELA test only).” Slide 57, “All students in grades 3–8 and 11 are automatically enrolled in the online Smarter Balanced summative tests.”</p> <p>Question: Evidence 67</p>	

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 CALIFORNIA

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
	<p>“Standards-based Tests in Spanish (STS)” are the achievement tests and its test materials that are administered at the option of the LEA as the primary language test as provided in Education Code sections 60640(b) and (c) for pupils whose primary language is Spanish or to pupils enrolled in a dual immersion program that includes Spanish.</p>	
<p>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services are included in the assessment system • Evidence detailing the circumstances under which a student may take the Standards-based test in Spanish 		

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 CALIFORNIA

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
<p>1.5 – Participation Data</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>California provided participation rate data for ELA/mathematics for all students and all grades, disaggregated by student groups. (Critical Element 1.5 – Participation Data)</p> <p>The submitted document “Critical Element 1.5— Participation Data” contains Table 1 on page 2, titled “Students Tested, by Student Group in ELA/Literacy, 2015” which includes data on number of students tested and number of students enrolled in grades 3-8 and “HS”. The data is disaggregated, and shows numbers for the following categories: All students, economic disadvantaged, students with disabilities, English learners, migrant, female, male, American Indian, Asian, Black, Filipino, Hispanic, Multiracial, Pacific Islander, and White. The same document contains Table 2 on page 3, titled “Students Tested, by Student Group in Mathematics, 2015” which includes data in the same categories as detailed for ELA above. Table 3 shows participation rates with all grades aggregated.</p> <p>Table 3 indicates that for Students with Disabilities and American Indian/Alaska Native students, “Schools, LEAs, or student groups that did not meet the AYP 95 percent participation rate criteria using a one-year formula met the participation rate using a two-year formula.”</p>	<p>California did not provide participation data regarding science or the alternate assessments.</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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 CALIFORNIA

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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • California must provide participation rate data for science assessments • California must provide participation data for alternate assessments 		

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 CALIFORNIA

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>The CDE has indicated that it has adopted the Smarter Balanced assessments in Mathematics and English-language Arts/Literacy as the general population assessment. Please refer to the Smarter Balanced Consortium peer review submission, element 2.1, for evidence regarding this element.</p> <p>However, CA has indicated it has added standards believed to be important for CA students.</p>	<p>CDE has indicated it has added standards believed to be important for CA students.</p> <p>Is CA testing these standards? If they are included, there was no additional information provided on how this was addressed in the assessment. If they are not included, this may impact the alignment of the standards to the assessment.</p> <p>California confirmed it utilizes the Smarter Balanced test blueprint and exclusively pulls from the Smarter Balanced item pool.</p> <p>California uses an AIR proprietary application that meets the Smarter Balanced adaptive algorithm specification. AIR has provided evidence to California using the Smarter Balanced Implementation Readiness Packet that the algorithm correctly selects items based on the Smarter Balanced specification.</p> <p>CA did not address speaking which is part of the standards. CA should note that as part of SBAC, the Educator evaluation as NOT a listed purpose of this assessment.</p>
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p> <p>___ No additional evidence is required or ___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional information on how the CA standards impact the assessment • Is CA testing these standards? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If they are included, evidence should be provided for the relevant critical elements for the development, administration, scoring, reporting. ○ If they are not included, how does that impact the alignment of the standards to the 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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.2 – Item Development</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Items for the Smarter Balanced assessments also were developed by the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium. Refer to the Smarter Balanced peer review submission for Critical Element 2.2 for evidence pertaining to the item development process.</p>	<p>SBAC evidence is not sufficient to meet this critical element.</p>
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SBAC evidence is not sufficient to meet this critical element. 		

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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>CDE evidence submission indicated the administration of the Smarter Balanced Tests was the responsibility of ETS. Evidence for this section includes documents, training materials, and other resources produced by ETS and the CDE to ensure that the tests are administered with fidelity to established testing procedures.</p> <p>The California Department of Education (CDE), in partnership with Educational Testing Service (ETS), has developed a comprehensive set of resources in support of the administration of the program including manuals, user guides, in-person training, Webcasts, videos, and narrated PowerPoint presentations available on the CAASPP Training Videos and Resources Web page. In total, 11 tutorials were produced for the 2014–15 year.</p> <p>Testing Roles and Responsibilities Evidence 16 2014-15 CAASPP Online Test Administration Manual, pages 7–8. The manual includes checklists of example activities for each role in Appendixes I, J, and K.</p> <p>Evidence 22 LEA CAASPP Coordinator Checklist Evidence 23 CAASPP Test Site Coordinator Checklist Evidence 24 Test Administrator Checklist The test site coordinator is designated by the LEA CAASPP coordinator or LEA superintendent for each test site with designated responsibilities spelled out in <i>California Code of Regulations</i>, Title 5, Section 858[a]. Evidence 67. Instructions for Test Administration TOMS is a Web-based application through which LEA CAASPP coordinators set up administrations, add and manage users, submit online student test settings (i.e., designated supports, accommodations,</p>	<p>Ensuring that all students are familiar with the item format and online functionality including sample items before test administration. The amount of documentation and training for test administrators is certainly essential and suggest permitting students to have more opportunities for practice so the system is not a barrier to their performance.</p> <p>Evidence of contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration was not provided. While CA provided guidance regarding individual issues, there is no plan for widespread technology challenges.</p> <p>The peers recognize all of the many training resources provided for the schools. However, there seems to be a large number of administration/training manuals making it hard to navigate and perhaps CDE may want to investigate a streamlined approach. Even with the portal organization, there continues to be a concern about the amount of resources that test administrators must utilize.</p>

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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>and unlisted resources), and order paper-pencil tests. A separate manual is produced for each major function of TOMS: 2014–15 TOMS Test Administration Setup Guide and Local Manuals</p> <p>Evidence 38, 35, 36,21,18,19,25</p> <p>Evidence in selecting and providing accessibility supports to students through the online assessments is available with Evidence 28, 66, 27.</p> <p>The CDE has contracted with ETS to provide training. ETS provided 21 in-person workshops and 19 Webcasts for the 2014–15 administration of the Smarter Balanced assessments and set up the ETS California Technical Assistance Center (CalTAC). Evidence 42, ETS contract, pages 18–21. Evidence 46, pages 89–90.</p> <p>Training in the use of accessibility tools, use of the practice test to see the supports, and use of CAASPP Individualized Aid Request Form as needed for IEP and 504. Evidence 75</p> <p>Ongoing Communication with LEAs The CDE provides information to LEAs, schools, educators, and the general public through regular e-mail communications called the <i>CAASPP Update</i> and the <i>CAASPP Flash</i>. Evidence 43 and 198.</p>	
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a plan for widespread technology challenges. 		

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 CALIFORNIA

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
<p>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>California has contracted with ETS to monitor all CA tests for all grades.</p> <p>CDE contracted with ETS to provide monitoring services (contract is Evidence 42).</p> <p>From page 6 of Evidence 42: “ETS will manage the administration, scoring, and reporting activities and have overall responsibility for the constructed-response human scoring and artificial intelligence (AI) scoring. In addition, ETS will manage the logistics and coordination of all management meetings, along with the development of all relevant materials. ETS will also provide Help Desk services and psychometric support. ETS will provide item development for all state-specific assessments: the California Next Generation Science Standards (CA NGSS and CA NGSS Alternate) assessments, the primary language assessments, and the California Alternate Assessments (CAA) in English–language arts (ELA) and mathematics. ETS will host and provide support for the Test Operations Management System (TOMS).”</p> <p>ETS provided CDE with daily summaries during the testing window (sample from April 2, 2015 located at evidence 208).</p> <p>ETS also provided a daily report on the number of student testing records transferred to the TOMS (sample from May 17, 2015 located at evidence 209).</p>	<p>Requirements met.</p>

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 CALIFORNIA

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
	<p>Evidence 42 (ETS contract) page 53 states that ETS will report to CDE weekly on its test monitoring activities. Also in the contract: “ETS will conduct up to 100 on-site visits and up to 200 virtual site visits to LEAs to provide technology and test preparation support as needed.” (page 54)</p> <p>Page 54 of the contract also indicates that ETS will monitor social media to identify possible leaks, and the monitoring will happen between January when the first LEA receives testing materials and when the last LEA completes testing.</p> <p>In addition to on-site LEA assistance visits, ETS/In-Touch will conduct “up to 130 on-site test security site visits annually” (page 54). The visits will include audits of computer and paper/pencil test admin (25 pre-test, 60 during test, 15 post-test). (Page 55)</p> <p>Per page 56 of Evidence 42, ETS will also conduct an investigation of any confirmed security breach.</p> <p>Procedure for test auditing can be found in Evidence 55</p> <p>Some sample site visit histories are included in Evidence 41</p> <p>Evidence 20, the Test Administrator guide, outlines procedures for the LEA staff that actually give the test, who are the first line for monitoring. More guidance for those individuals is found in the Pretest workshops (Evidence 69), and the test security workshops (evidence 51)</p>	

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 CALIFORNIA

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
	<p>California had a series of forms, charts, logs and manuals for reporting test irregularities and carrying out appeals in the 2014-2015 school year. Summary data for appeals processed in 2015 appears on page 4 of the “Critical Element 2.4” document.</p> <p>After learning from the 2015 appeals, CA developed a new system for 2016 called STAIRS (Security and Test Administration Incident Reporting System) more details about this system can be found in Evidence 62.</p>	
Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>CDE Test security is a matter of concern for all the states in the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium. Some aspects of test security are built into the assessments. Refer to the Smarter Balanced peer review submission for Critical Element 2.5 for evidence regarding provisions for security built into the test development process.</p> <p>CDE provided procedures used to maintain test security, administrative responsibilities, and detection of test irregularities, remediation and investigation of security breaches.</p> <p>CAASPP Security and Test Administration Incident Reporting System (STAIRS). Evidence 62</p> <p>Policies and procedures for annual training, form must be read and signed annually and provided to CalTAC. Training covers the responsibilities of the test site coordinator, LEA CASSP coordinator, procedures for reporting, copies of forms, and audit procedures.</p> <p>Evidence 51 2_5 security training CAASPP.feb_18-slides.2015</p>	<p>Documentation that SBAC has in place security protocols and procedures to protect SBAC items and assessments.</p> <p>Does the state have a plan in place to address the various reported security incidents on the types of irregularities in order to monitor effectiveness of the remediation? Is there a way to summarize the log provided as a means of additional validity evidence? Has the CDE considered providing a summary of the incidents?</p> <p>While there were few incidents, it doesn’t impact the scores and feedback to the LEAs on the quality of their security processes.</p> <p>As part of the consequences for confirmed violations of test security, there didn’t appear any evidence provided as to the appeal rights of the test taker accused of cheating with an invalidated test. However, the consequences at the teacher or administrator level were not identified.</p> <p>What are the consequences for test security violations?</p>
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>Both the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium and California must protect the integrity and privacy of the data collected by the assessments. Assessment data are passed between the consortium and the CDE on a regular basis. The assessment contractor, ETS, produces students data files and transmits them to the CDE and to LEAs. For evidence of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium’s policies and procedures for protecting data integrity and privacy, refer the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium peer review submission for critical element 2.6.</p> <p>Student Data Access and Use Standards require annual mandatory training by the Education Data Office and consequences for breaches. Evidence 213. Policies and procedures for annual training, form must be read and signed annually and provided the Center. Evidence 51 2_5 security training CAASPP.feb_18-slides.2015.</p> <p>Evidence 22, 23, 24 Responsibilities, including security, of LEA Coordinator, Site Coordinator, and Test Administration 2.6.2 Evidence 54 Information Security Plan Evidence 213 Student Data Access and Use Standards Evidence 42 ETS Contract p.50-53 Evidence 84 UCLA Compliance Agreement 2.6.3</p>	<p>SBAC evidence provided is not sufficient to meet this critical element.</p> <p>SBAC needs to provide evidence that they are monitoring test item exposure and drift to ensure integrity on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>CA listed minimum n as fewer than 10 on the reports. In order to protect student privacy, an asterisk (*) will be displayed instead of a number on Internet test results where 10 or fewer students had valid test scores</p>
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or <input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		

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 CALIFORNIA

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>California adopted the Smarter Balanced assessments for Mathematics and English language Arts/Literacy as the general population assessments for these content areas. California has worked with the Smarter Balanced Consortium to support investigation of the validity of the Smarter Balanced Assessments. The Smarter Balanced peer review for section 3 will serve as the evidence for elements 3.1 through 3.4.</p>	<p>SBAC evidence provided is not sufficient to meet this critical element.</p>
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See SBAC 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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>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.</p>		<p>SBAC evidence provided is not sufficient to meet this critical element.</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See SBAC 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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <p>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.</p>		<p>SBAC evidence provided is not sufficient to meet this critical element.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See SBAC 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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>		<p>SBAC evidence provided is not sufficient to meet this critical element.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See SBAC 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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR CALIFORNIA

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) contractor, Educational Testing Service (ETS) and Smarter Balanced Consortium produced evidence for this section.</p> <p>The California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) contractor, Educational Testing Service (ETS), conducted reliability analyses.</p> <p>Technical Report: Evidence 46. Table 8.2. Summary Statistics for Scale and Theta Scores, Reliability and SEMs. Page 235 Table 8.3. Overall Conditional Standard Errors of Measurement for the Performance-level Cut Points. Page 236-237</p> <p>Appendix 8.D: Reliability Analyses. Page 337- 364</p> <p>Appendix E: Scale Score CSEM Distribution by scale score for each subject and grade. Pages 365-378</p> <p>Appendix F: Analyses of Classification, presents decision accuracy and decision consistency by subject and grade in Tables 8.F.1 to 8.F.14. Pages 386- 392.</p> <p>TAC discussion of additional analyses Evidence 113 CAASPP TAG Agenda 10-15-15.</p>	<p>SBAC evidence is not sufficient for this critical element.</p> <p>4.1.1 Claim level reliabilities are low, especially ELA Claims 3 & 4 and math Claims 2 & 3</p> <p>4.1.2 CSEMs relatively large at low end, especially at higher grades and in math</p>
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SBAC evidence is not sufficient for this critical element. 		

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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>CDE documented the supports and accommodations were appropriately implemented as outlined in the specifications by the Smarter Balanced Online Summative Assessment and paper and pencil versions of the assessment.</p> <p><i>CAASPP Smarter Balanced Technical Report</i>, Evidence 46. Summary of tools available from SBAC. Page 13</p> <p>Appendix 2.B, “Special Services Summaries,” counts and percentages of students with designated supports, accommodations, or unlisted resources for each subject and grade. Page 45.</p> <p>Section 5 of this submission provides extensive evidence on procedures for including students with disabilities and English learners. This section provides as evidence manuals, tools, trainings, and other resources provided by the state to local educational agencies to ensure fairness and accessibility for all students.</p> <p>Testing times for each administration expected response processes underlying the tasks presented to students. Variability in testing time can be investigated to determine whether a student’s testing time should be viewed as unusual or irregular. Pages 245-246.</p>	<p>SBAC evidence is not sufficient for this critical element.</p> <p>CDE tracked and reported use rates which the peers noted as an important component of the system.</p> <p>CDE indicated that variability in testing time can be investigated to determine whether a student’s testing time should be viewed as unusual or irregular, but data was not provided.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SBAC evidence is not sufficient for this critical element. 		

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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Evidence provided includes distributions of student scores by grade and subject, conditional standard errors of measurement by grade and subject, Item Response Theory (IRT) parameter estimates for items and item exposure data.</p> <p><i>CAASPP Smarter Balanced Technical Report</i> Evidence46.</p> <p>Item Difficulties and discrimination power. Appendix 8.A. Page 255-313</p> <p>Tables 8.A.1 through 8.A.28 contain descriptive statistics for IRT a-values and b-values by claim area for each subject and grade.</p> <p>Tables 8.A.29 through 8.A.35 present the distribution of IRT a-values conditional on ability for English language arts (ELA) non-performance task (Non-PT) (computer adaptive test [CAT] and paper and pencil) items.</p> <p>Page 262, Distribution of IRT a-values Conditional on Ability for Mathematics Non-PT items Tables 8.A.36 to 8.A.42</p> <p>Page 264, Distribution of IRT b-values Conditional on Ability for ELA Non-PT Items: Tables 8.A.43 to 8.A.49</p> <p>Page 268, Distribution of IRT b-values Conditional on Ability for Mathematics Non-PT Items: Tables 8.A.50 to 8.A.56</p> <p>Page 271, Distribution of IRT a-values Conditional on Ability for ELA PT items: Tables 8.A.57 to 8.A.63</p> <p>Page 273, Distribution of IRT a-values Conditional on Ability for Mathematics PT items: Tables 8.A.64 to 8.A.70</p> <p>Page 276, Distribution of IRT b-values Conditional</p>	<p>Documentation that Smarter Balanced has enriched the item bank such that the assessments can provide a more precise estimate of student performance for low-achieving students.</p> <p>See SBAC notes for this critical element.</p> <p>CSEMs suggest imprecision at low ability levels</p> <p>In the narrative, CDE cited off-grade level testing. Are off-grade level items used in scoring?</p>

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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>on Ability for ELA PT Items: Tables 8.A.71 to 8.A.77</p> <p>Page 279, Distribution of IRT b-values Conditional on Ability for Mathematics PT Items: Tables 8.A.78 to 8.A.84</p> <p>Item statistics for each item used in the performance tasks (PTs) are presented by subject and grade in Tables 8.A.85 to 8.A.98 (pages 283–313). categories).</p> <p>Appendix 8. B. Omission and Completion Analyses for each portion of the test (PT and CAT) for each grade and subject. The omit rates are presented in Tables 8.B.1 and 8.B.2.</p> <p>Table 8.B.3 item completion rates for ELA and mathematics by grade</p> <p>Appendix 8.C. Conditional Exposure by Difficulty for each subject and grade in Tables 8.C.3 to 8.C.16</p> <p>CSEMs obtained from the 2015 administration by subject and grade graphically in figures 8.E.1 to 8.E.14 (pages 366–386) demonstrating stable across grades and that the assessments are very accurate across most of the scale score range for each grade.</p> <p>Chapter 7.4.1.3 Ability estimates for students at different performance/achievement levels. Pages 117–118.</p> <p>Table 7.6 shows the performance level cutoff scores based on students’ abilities (theta scores), and Table 7.7 shows the performance level cutoff scores based on scale score.</p>	
Section 4.3 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See SBAC notes for this critical element. 		

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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Smarter Balanced Online Summative Assessment specifications for scoring for both the computer adaptive and the performance task components of the assessments were developed by SBAC and in its submission.</p> <p>CDE, through ETS and its subcontractors, engage in a scoring certification process demonstrating their capacity to accurately and reliably score the assessments with its documentation of procedures used for scoring of the computer adaptive and performance task components of the assessment with quality control of scoring and rater training procedures.</p> <p>California Assessment of Student Performance Progress (CAASPP) Smarter Balanced Technical Report, 2014–15 Administration. Evidence 46. Section 7.1 (page 100) describes the overall scoring process, the certification of the scoring system. Section 7.2 (pages 102–105) describes quality control procedures used for human and artificial intelligence scoring. It specifically addresses quality control in the scoring process for human scoring, rater qualification, and monitoring of raters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 9.4, Quality Control of Psychometric Processes, page 451 • Section 9.5, Quality Control of Constructed Response Scoring, page 452 • Section 9.6, Quality Control of Paper Pencil Scoring, page 453 <p>Section 7.3: Rater Training (pages 105–112) documents the procedures used to train and qualify raters as well as supplemental training for scoring supervisors.</p> <p>Sections 8.6.4.7, Inter-rater Reliability (page 248), and 8.6.4.8, Inter-rater Agreement (page 248).</p>	<p>See SBAC notes for this critical element.</p> <p>Documentation of reliable and accurate scoring for alternate test forms (i.e. paper and pencil, paper braille).</p> <p>Exact agreement rates as low as 51% for items with 2 score points. Table 8.G.7. Grade 11 short answer. Exact + adjacent agreement rates as low as 85% (p.408-409).</p> <p>Exact agreement rates for ELA extended response items in lower grades and grade 11 are generally low (mid 40% to low 60%).</p> <p>AI exact agreement rates for math are good, but more variable (by item) for ELA with some values quite low.</p> <p>Exact agreement for human scoring for several items is too low. One option for consideration by CDE is to invest time and resources into the improvement of human scoring, with training, calibration work, and monitoring, as well as to consider administering fewer items that require human scoring while not changing the blueprint. Some items had acceptable values and CDE may consider using quality vs quantity of items in the pool, such as focus on fewer high quality items, review item replacement at the item development stage.</p> <p>Clarify the process used to address scorer drift.</p> <p>Did CDE do anything to improve this scoring process as a result of these results in 14-15? Is there a plan to address improvement?</p>

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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Tables 8.G. presents the results for inter-rater reliability for the 2015 administration of the Smarter Balanced assessments with agreement statistics between AI and human scoring of constructed response items by grade for mathematics and English language arts (ELA). Pages 394–432.</p> <p>Section 5.2.10. Rules for invalidating test results when necessary (e.g., non-attempt, cheating, unauthorized accommodation or modification) and appropriate procedures for implementing these rules. Page 85</p> <p>Instructions to test coordinators and test administrators on how to report test security breaches, cheating, and other testing irregularities.</p> <p>2014-15 Online Test Administration Manual (Chapters 3–5 and Appendix C) Evidence16.</p>	
Section 4.4 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the steps implemented to improve scoring and/or item pool since the 2014-15 results. • Provide evidence of the human scoring results for 15-16 (Appendix 8G) 		

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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Multiple assessment forms are not used by California for the Smarter Balanced assessments.</p> <p>Administrations Evidence 46.</p> <p>Chapter 2, presents an overview of the processes including item development (page 10), item specifications (page10), test assembly (page 11), item selection (page 11), procedures used to maintain standardization, (page 12), and calibration and scaling (pages 14–16).</p> <p>Chapter 4 (pages 75–77) describes the test assembly process, including the application of the item selection algorithm by ETS and the American Institutes for Research test delivery system (Section 4.1, page 75) and the use of simulation studies (Section 4.2, page 76) to demonstrate blueprint coverage, target coverage, item exposure rates, and rates of selection of off grade items.</p> <p>Appendix 8.C. Actual item exposure rates for English language arts and mathematics, including conditional exposure by difficulty (pages 320–336).</p> <p>Chapter 5 (pages 79–91) provides an overview of the Smarter Balanced test administrations and includes measures to ensure test security, maintain standardization, and implement test supports and accommodations.</p> <p>Section 5.1.1.1. CAT administration is described in (page 79), and performance task (PT) administration is described in Section 5.1.1.2 (page 80). Appendix 5.B, “Item Distributions” (pages 96-97), provides data on the item distributions resulting from the 2015 administration (Tables 5.B.1-5.B.3) and the percent of students meeting blueprint by claim and grade (Table 5.B.4).</p>	<p>Documentation that the assessment system always produces blueprint conforming forms for all students who took an operational form or test event, regardless of format or accommodation.</p> <p>See SBAC notes for this critical element.</p> <p>ELA Grade 4 roughly 94%, why? Explanation of why all tests don’t meet blueprint. What was the challenge?</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See SBAC notes for this critical element. 		

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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>The majority of California schools (over 99%) administered the Smarter Balanced online summative assessments; a small number of schools used the paper and pencil versions. Comparability of the Smarter Balanced online and paper/pencil versions provided by Smarter Balanced peer review submission for element 4.6.</p> <p>CAASPP Smarter Balanced Technical Report, Appendix 10, pages. 459–646. Results of the paper and pencil assessments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data are reported on the provision of supports and accommodations in Evidence 46; Appendix 10A (pages 466–493). Scale score and achievement level distributions and claim score distributions are presented for all students and all demographic groups in Evidence 46, Appendices 10.B, 10.C, and 10.D. (pages 494–595). IRT parameter vales are presented in Evidence 46; Appendix 10.E (pages 596–606). Reliabilities of Claims and Intercorrelations of claims by subject, grade, and demographic subgroup are presented in Evidence 46, Appendix 10.F (pages 607–634). <p>Appendix 10.G. Scale score conditional standard error of measurement distributions are presented in (pages 635–646).</p>	<p>See SBAC notes for this critical element.</p> <p>The peers acknowledged the high number of online test administrations</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See SBAC notes for this critical element. 		

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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>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).</p>	<p>Evidence for this element is primarily located in the Smarter Balanced Peer Review Submission. For California’s part, evidence presented includes information about post-test surveys and evaluation activities conducted as part of the CAASPP program.</p> <p>California contracted with Educational Testing Service (ETS) for development and administration of the assessments comprising the CAASPP assessment system. ETS Contract lists and describes the analyses enumerated by the California Department of Education (CDE) in its request for submissions. Section 8.2, Analysis of Test Results (pages 122–127) outlines the analyses specified for the various tests. Expectations for the contents of the technical reports are given in section 9.5, Technical Reports (pages 140–142). Discussion of other analyses to be conducted in order to ensure continuous improvement of the system is presented in section 9.6 (page 142). Evidence 42.</p> <p>The CAASPP contract includes provisions for site visits, surveys, and focus group interviews designed to provide feedback and information for the continuous improvement of the CAASPP System.</p> <p>2015 California Assessment for Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) Site Visit History by County/School District for the CDE. Evidence 41.</p> <p>CAASPP Pre- and Post-Test Focus Group Survey Results. Evidence 88</p> <p>State Board of Education Memorandum, August 19, 2015. A second post-test study conducted on behalf of the CDE by the San Joaquin County Office of</p>	<p>See SBAC notes for this critical element.</p> <p>CDE initiated an independent evaluation of the CAASPP system to as part of monitoring and improving the quality of its assessment system.</p>

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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Education following the 2015 spring CAASPP administration of the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments. Findings relevant to accessibility supports included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher feedback on the process used to identify designated supports and accommodations (pages 5–6) • Student feedback on the use of accessibility supports (pages 9–10) <p>Evidence 45</p> <p>California <i>Education Code</i> Section 60649(a) calls for an independent evaluation of the CAASPP system to include “a variety of internal and external studies such as validity studies, alignment studies and studies evaluating test fairness, testing accommodations, testing policies, and reporting procedures, and consequential validity studies specific to pupil populations such as English learners and pupils with disabilities.” Evidence 74.</p> <p>State Board of Education Approved CAASPP Independent Evaluation Plan with the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) to develop and conduct a three-year evaluation of the CAASPP system. The evaluation plan was developed in collaboration with the CAASPP Technical Advisory Group and was approved by the State Board of Education in September 2015. Evidence 112.</p> <p>Five principal areas of study were identified in the plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access to designated support and accommodations during assessments for subgroups, such as English learners and students with disabilities, during the Smarter Balanced and California Alternate Assessments 	

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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	2. Implementation of the Smarter Balanced Interim Assessments by districts, including the various ways the assessments are delivered and which approaches are effective 3. Efficacy of quality control processes for human scoring and the consistency of resulting scores for the Smarter Balanced Interim and Summative Assessments 4. Ease of interpretation and use of Smarter Balanced Summative and Interim Assessments results by teachers and by students, parents, and guardians 5. Quality of the new science assessment items and the assessments' level of alignment with the California Next Generation Science Standards.	
Section 4.7 Summary Statement <input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See SBAC notes for this critical element. 		

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 CALIFORNIA

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
<p>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; 	<p>CDE cited the California Education Code (EC) Section 60604 to demonstrate that rules are in place to ensure the inclusion of students with disabilities are included in the state assessment system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Section 60640(k)</u> of the law assures compliance with Title 20 of the United States Code, ensuring that individuals with exceptional needs shall be included in the testing requirement, with appropriate accommodations in administration and that those unable to participate in the regular tests, even with accommodations, shall be given an alternate assessment. <p>Evidence 73 and 74.</p> <p>Section 851 of the regulations states the requirements for pupil testing, including the requirement to test all students and defines eligible pupils.</p> <p>Section 853(a) requires that the test administration manual and other instructions for administering the test include instructions for administering the test with universal tools, designated supports, accommodations, unlisted resources or instructional supports, where appropriate.</p> <p>Section 853.5 of the regulations defines which universal tools, designated supports, and accommodations are available to all students, and which need to be specified in the student’s IEP or 504 plans in order for them to be made available to students with disabilities.</p> <p>Evidence 67</p> <p>Instructions and guidance IEP teams on decisions on determining whether to assess the students in specific assessment, selection of accommodations, accessibility tools are provided in policy letters, training sessions, and</p> <p>Impact of Assembly Bill 484 on IEPs, to the field to</p>	<p>It would be helpful if CDE provided a sample IEP form with the directions for completion which addressed the procedures for including students with disabilities in state assessment. There didn’t seem to be any special education procedures provided so the peers could review specific evidence of the implementation?</p> <p>CDE provided narrative on the critical elements and provided the state laws, but did not always provide the practices and implementation evidence to support each of the components within the critical elements</p> <p>The evidence provided such as, the Impact of Assembly Bill 484 on Individualized Education Programs in 2013–14 and the SBAC Usability-Accessibility-and-Accommodations-Implementation-Guide certainly supported the legal and SBAC references but did not provide information as to how the CDE implemented this section or provide resources for the LEAs in its implementation.</p> <p>CDE may consider customizing the SBAC Usability-Accessibility-and-Accommodations-Implementation-Guide for IEP team use based on practices within CA.</p> <p>In the first bullet, State laws were provided as evidence and generally, State laws aren’t cited to the public as references of “clear explanations.”</p>

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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes instructions that students eligible to be 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. 	<p>inform local educational agencies (LEAs) of the impact of California Assembly Bill (AB) 484 on the students’ IEPs in the year of 2013–14. Evidence 76.</p> <p>Symposia were conducted for special education professionals on the development of IEPs consistent with the CCSS and the accessibility supports provided by the Smarter Balanced assessments and archived on the CDE Web site. Evidence 92-96.</p> <p>CDE resources for CAASPP coordinators and test administrators regarding the provision and appropriate use of the universal tools, designated supports, and accommodations that are permitted in the CAASPP online and paper and pencil assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence 28 CAASPP Matrix One • Evidence 66 Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines • Evidence 27 Smarter Balanced Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Implementation Guide • Evidence 71 Using the CAASPP ISAAP Tool to provide in-depth instruction on how to provide access to the Smarter Balanced assessments for SWDs. • Evidence 36 2014–15 TOMS Online Student Test Settings User Guide, <i>Appendix A</i>: Online Student Test Settings File Specifications. • Evidence 69 Smarter Balanced Online Test Workshops (January—February 2015) <p>The alternate assessment for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities is not part of this review.</p>	
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or <input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide 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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>California Education Code (EC) sections 60640–60649 enumerates the general and programmatic provisions for assessment as well as establishes the CAASPP System. California <i>Education Code</i> and Regulations on Access to Assessments for ELs. Evidence 74</p> <p><i>EC</i> Section 60604.5 requires that the reauthorization of the statewide pupil assessment system include conformity to the assessment requirements of any reauthorization of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act or any other federal law that effectively replaces that act.</p> <p>EC Section 60604.5(b) (6) mandates that the new CAASPP system include assessments that are valid, reliable, and fair measures of achievement for all students, inclusive of SWDs and ELs. Evidence 73</p> <p>The general provision for testing all students is enumerated in Evidence 74 <i>EC</i> sections 60640–60649, specifically Evidence 74 <i>EC</i> Section 60641(a)(1).</p> <p>California Code of Regulations, Title 5, 850–868 CAASPP System, specifies the requirements for administering the CAASPP system. Evidence 67</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 851 includes the requirement to test all students and defines eligible pupils. • Section 853(a) requires that the test administration manual and other instructions for administering the test include instructions for administering the test with universal tools, designated supports, accommodations, unlisted resources or instructional supports, where appropriate. <p>CDE presentations and web resources to explain the</p>	

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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed using universal tools and designated supports, described the tools and supports available, and provided guidance on the selection of appropriate supports and/or accommodations for ELs. Evidence 100.</p> <p>Use of Senior Assessment Fellows to provide a training and support to LEAs to successfully implement CAASPP. Evidence 75.</p> <p>Matrix One: Universal Tools, Designated Supports, and Accommodations for the CAASPP System. Evidence 28</p> <p>Usability-Accessibility-Accommodations-Guidelines Evidence 67 California Code of Regulations, Title 5, sections 850 through 868 of the emergency regulations, to determine the use of resources for individual students.</p> <p>Smarter Balanced Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Implementation Guide This manual provides suggestions for implementation of these supports. Evidence 27.</p> <p>Evidence 101 Smarter Balanced Resources and Practices-Comparison-Crosswalk, (pages 4–5). Items 13–19 are specific to the needs of ELs.</p> <p>The <i>2014–15 TOMS Online Student Test Settings User Guide</i>, Appendix A, “Online Student Test Settings File Specifications,” provides a listing of all the universal tools, supports, and accommodations available for use with the Smarter Balanced Assessments. Note that stacked translations of test items are only available for mathematics as a designated support. Stacked translations were only available in Spanish in 2015.</p>	

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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>The CAASPP Web site provides educators, parents and students information about the Smarter Balanced assessments in general as well as information on accessibility and accommodations. Information specific to the needs of ELs can be found in the following documents:</p> <p>Evidence 102 English Spanish Education and Assessment Glossary developed by the CDE, provides guidelines for preferred translations to use when communicating about education and assessment.</p> <p>Evidence 103 Smarter Balanced Spanish Web page provides an overview of the Smarter Balanced assessments and provides downloadable fact sheets for teachers, parents, and students.</p> <p>Evidence 104 Smarter Balance Accessibility and Accommodations Web page directs users to Evidence 66 Smarter Balanced Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines Evidence 98 Effective Use of Designated Supports Evidence 105 Instructions for Using Embedded Glossaries and Evidence 106 Read Aloud Guidelines in Spanish from Smarter Balanced provide instructions for educators who are providing these supports to ELs.</p> <p>Archived Webcast, Evidence 107 Accessibility and Accommodations for CAASPP 2014–15: An Overview PowerPoint (October 2014, slides 7-8 and 15-25) This video provides information on accessibility tools and features available to all students, including procedures for determining whether students, including ELs, should be assessed with accommodations and/or other accessibility tools.</p>	
Section 5.2 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>CDE provides use of Universal Tools, Designated Supports, and Accommodations. Matrix One: Universal Tools, Designated Supports, and Accommodations for the CAASPP System. Evidence 28.</p> <p>Smarter Balanced Consortium: Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines and the regulations, Evidence 27.</p> <p>California Code of Regulations, Final Regulations (Sections 850–868), to determine the use of resources for individual students. The appropriate use of universal tools, designated supports, and/or accommodations on CAASPP tests is restricted to only those identified in Matrix One. Evidence 67.</p> <p>Title 5, Chapter 2, Subchapter 3.75 CAASPP Article 1 California Code of Regulations, Final Regulations (Sections 850–868) defines accommodations and expresses California commitment to providing accommodations to students with disabilities. The regulations provided a list of the universal tools, designated supports, and accommodations to be made available to SWDs and ELs in California. The regulations set up a process to individually review and request supports or accommodations beyond those routinely allowed (individualized aids or unlisted resources). Evidence 67.</p> <p>Smarter Balanced Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines provides a complete list and a general description of the various tools, supports and accommodations, and guidelines for selection. Evidence 66.</p>	<p>See SBAC notes for this critical element.</p> <p>It is not clear at what rate the requests are approved for exceptional requests? Does the state track the exceptional requests? Does the state monitor the rate of requests by the school/district? If so, how does the state monitor the rate of requests by the school/district?</p>

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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>These guidelines are intended to provide information on Smarter Balanced policy regarding universal tools, designated supports, and accommodations. Smarter Balanced Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Implementation Guide provides suggestions for implementation of these supports. Evidence 27.</p> <p><i>CAASPP TOMS Online Student Test Settings User Guide.</i> Evidence 36.</p> <p>The DIF studies conducted during the field test revealed no meaningful differences between IEP and non-IEP groups, limited English proficient (LEP) and non-LEP groups, and Title 1 and non-Title 1 groups. This suggests that the results of accommodated and non-accommodated tests can be directly compared. Smarter Balanced Peer Review Submission, Section 5.3.</p> <p>CDE CAASPP Web site provided access to test administration manuals, Webcasts, training slides, and videos designed to inform LEAs of their responsibilities regarding the assessments of SWDs and ELS and of the recommended procedures for selecting universal tools, supports and accommodations. Evidence 92-97.</p>	
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: See SBAC notes for this critical element.</p>		

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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>California <i>Education Code (EC)</i> Section 60640(k) The Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium’s Evidence 74</p> <p><i>Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines.</i> Evidence 66</p> <p>CDE’s Matrix One are intended for use by school-level personnel and IEP and Section 504 plan decision-making teams to select and administer the appropriate universal tools, designated supports, and accommodations as deemed necessary for individual students. Evidence 28</p> <p>Smarter Balanced Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Implementation Guide, provides suggestions for implementation of these supports. Evidence 27</p> <p>If a student’s IEP or Section 504 plan team identifies and designates a resource not identified in Matrix one, the LEA CAASPP coordinator or CAASPP test site coordinator submits a request for an unlisted resource to be approved by the CDE. Evidence</p> <p>ETS must work proactively with the CDE and LEA CAASPP Coordinators to improve the administration of the assessments and ensure that SWDs and ELs receive the accessibility supports they need. Evidence 42 ETS Contract section 4.2 (pages 53-56)</p> <p>The Test Delivery System (TDS) by which the statewide online assessments are delivered to students includes a Web browser-based application that allows test administrators to activate student tests and monitor student testing. Evidence 46</p> <p>CAASPP Smarter Balanced Technical Report 2014-</p>	<p>Evidence 41 is general assessment security and does not include accommodations. Since there is monitoring conducted at specific sites across the state, it would be beneficial to include implementation of appropriate accommodations as part of this monitoring.</p> <p>The evidence provided in 121 and 122 did not provide detail as to how the monitoring occurred, specifics on how and who completed the survey, how the results were reviewed and reported, and what type of follow-up occurred.</p>

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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>15, page 6. The system displays each student’s progress through the test.</p> <p>2015 California Assessment for Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) Site Visit History by County/School District for the CDE. Evidence 41. SBE Approved CAASPP Independent Evaluation Plan. The results of this study will help the CDE to better understand how supports and accommodations are used in instruction and assessment. Evidence 112.</p> <p>CalTAC Reports and weekly minutes provide examples of requests addressed for specialized assistance. Evidence 116, 117, 118, 119, 120.</p> <p>Review and Compliance Test_ SECMS. Special education monitoring and review plans were developed based on data provided by the California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS). California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS) Technical Assistance Guide Evidence 121.</p> <p>2015 Special Education Compliance Monitoring Survey, Compliance Monitoring Survey (SECMS) Assessment Questions) included the following questions pertaining to assessment Evidence 122.</p> <p>Summary of Post-Test Survey and Focus Group Results and Analyses of the 2015 CAASPP Smarter Balanced Online Assessments Administration includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An Executive Summary of the results (pages 1–5) • An overview of the purpose of the survey (pages 6–10) • Data gathering methodologies (pages 11–20) 	

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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of Responses (pages 21–49) • Results and Recommendations (pages 53–56) Evidence 215. Pages 55–56 <p>State Board of Education Memorandum, August 19, 2015 Findings relevant to accessibility supports included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher feedback on the process used to identify designated supports and accommodations (pages 5–6) • Student feedback on the use of accessibility supports (pages 9–10). Evidence 45 	

Section 5.4 Summary Statement

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Provide evidence for the following:
 - 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

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 CALIFORNIA

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
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>The state formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards for reading/language arts, mathematics and science for all students with State Board of Education action.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Board of Education, March 2015 Meeting Minutes, the California State Board of Education (SBE) adopted the Smarter Balanced assessment student report, which included the achievement standards for each subject. Evidence 130. • State Board of Education, November 2014 Meeting Minutes, the SBE voted to implement the Smarter Balanced assessments beginning in the 2014–15 school year. Evidence 131. • State Board of Education, January 2015 Meeting Minutes. California and other member states of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium voted in November 2014 to implement the assessments arts/literacy and mathematics assessments that were administered as part of the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress System. Consistent with Evidence 214 <i>Education Code Section</i> 60602.5, the SBE was not required to act on the achievement standards/performance standards: “Exclusive of those assessments established by a multistate consortium, produce performance standards to be adopted by the state board.” Evidence 132. 	
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Evidence for this element is solely the responsibility of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium.</p>	
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Evidence for this element is solely the responsibility of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium.</p>	
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 	<p>CAASPP Smarter Balanced Technical Report, Section 7.6, page 125. The four major purposes of the system are described, as well as the various online reporting systems, and the criteria for reporting scores. Also presented is a listing of the types of reports provided to Students, Schools and LEAs. Evidence 46.</p> <p>Test Operations Management System (TOMS), the Online Reporting System (ORS), and the California Department of Education public reporting Web site (i.e., http://caaspp.cde.ca.gov). The public reporting Web site consists of an interactive search engine and reporting application. Evidence 150</p> <p>The reporting schedule was widely communicated to the field through the pre-test workshops and through the CAASPP 101 workshops. Evidence 196, slide 44.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual student scores were posted to the ORS System less than four weeks after the student completed the online assessment in ELA or mathematics. <p>Four weeks after the close of the LEA test administration window, LEAs were able to download the final student data file for their LEA from TOMS.</p> <p>Beginning in July of 2015, ETS began shipping paper student score reports to LEAs. LEAs are required to deliver paper student score reports to parents and guardians within 20 days of receiving the reports when school is in session.</p> <p>2015 Post-Test Workshop: Reporting Summative Assessment Results. Evidence 150.</p> <p>Understanding the CAASPP Student Score Reports provides interpretive information regarding the</p>	<p>6.4.1 Percentage of students not tested was not reported.</p> <p>6.4.4 What is the reason/explanation for why paper reports weren’t shipped until the summer? How were those reports distributed given that school was not in session?</p> <p>CDE did not indicate if there are any parent guides in alternate accessible formats, such as braille and large print.</p> <p>CDE did not indicate if there are any parent guides in alternate accessible formats, such as braille and large print.</p>

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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>online reports with basic information on student scores and includes the Smarter Balanced Reporting Achievement Level Descriptors and Smarter Balanced Area (claim) Achievement Level Descriptors. Evidence 191.</p> <p>All data presented in ORS is considered preliminary until the testing window closes and all appeals have been closed. In July of 2015, Summative Assessment Results Letter was sent to LEAs informing them about the online reporting system and other resources available prior to the statewide release. Evidence 195.</p> <p>ORS District Reports provide school-level information by content area and grade, including testing status, number of students who completed testing, average scale scores, and percentages of students in each achievement level.</p> <p>ORS School Reports provide information by content area and grade including average scale score, percentage of students at the each achievement level and the percentage of students in each claim achievement category.</p> <p>ORS Roster Reports provide information on user defined groups of students. This can be any grouping of students such as a classroom or by participation in a particular program. In addition to providing average scale score, achievement level, and claim reports, roster reports can present information on group performance with respect to select assessment targets defined in Evidence 135 Smarter Balanced Test Blueprints.</p> <p>The procedures used by ETS to produce the target reports are documented in two memoranda, the first outlining the basic procedure and reporting, Evidence</p>	

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 CALIFORNIA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>136 Educational Testing Service (ETS) Memorandum, June 22, 2015. The second documenting restriction of target reporting based on number of items present in the Smarter Balanced item pool, Evidence 137 ETS Memorandum, January 19, 2016.</p> <p>Target Score Reporting FAQs. This document explained the purpose of the target reports, reporting categories, how to access the reports, and cautions for the use of the reports. Evidence 138. Assessment Target Reports Quick Start Guide, provided step by step information on how to produce the target reports. Evidence 139</p> <p>2015 CAASPP Post-Test Guide is the primary document explaining the available score information. The Post-Test Guide provides interpretive guidance that addresses appropriate uses and limitations of the data. It includes a listing of all the reports available with examples of individual student score reports, and explanatory notes on each report. Evidence 149. Workshops and webcasts were conducted to review the posttest guide. Evidence 151 and 152.</p> <p>2015 CAASPP Smarter Balanced Score Reports differed for grades 5 and 8 because science scores are also reported in these grades. Two separate interpretive guides were developed, one for grades 3, 4, 6, 7, and 11, and one for grades 5 and 8. These guides are also provided in Spanish and in the other nine most commonly used languages in California: Grades 3, 4, 6, 7, and 11</p>	

Section 6.4 Summary Statement

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Percentage of students not tested was not reported.
- Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language.

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 CALIFORNIA

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.

U. S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

June, 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes Smarter Balanced Consortium Evidence



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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Contents

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	3
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	3
2.2 – Item Development.....	9
2.3 – Test Administration	11
2.5 – Test Security	14
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	16
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....	18
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	18
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	21
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	22
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	24
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	25
4.1 – Reliability.....	25
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	27
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	28
4.4 – Scoring	29
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	30
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	31
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance.....	33
SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS	34
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	34
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	37
5.3 – Accommodations.....	38
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	40
SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .	41
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	41
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	42
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	43
6.4 – Reporting.....	44

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Index p. 2 7 pp. 24-25</p> <p>15a 15b 17 29</p>	<p>Statements of purpose exist and are stated.</p> <p>One purpose statement relates to growth. Is there or will there be evidence to support that the SBAC summative test measures growth?</p> <p>Of note: There is no statement pertaining to the use of the SBAC test for teacher evaluation.</p> <p>The 5th purpose statement of the summative test is to gauge “how instruction can be improved...” Assessment results do not clearly indicate actions to improve instruction. Recommend either restating or deleting this purpose statement.</p> <p>In several places of Evidence 15a and 15b, the range of total items by claim on the test blueprints does not match the range implied by the sums of minimum and maximum numbers of items, respectively, by assessment targets. It is not clear if the range by claim is intended to be a tally of items or an additional constraint.</p> <p>Speaking is not included in the assessments for ELA.</p> <p>Re “measure the full range”: In Evidence 17 p. 31, what makes for sufficiently good alignment is unclear. Evaluation of alignment study results is exacerbated</p>

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>by the statement “low percentages of fully aligned and mostly aligned ratings do not necessarily reflect poor alignment.”</p> <p>The peers recommend including a clear discussion and supporting tables demonstrating the SBAC summative assessments cover the full range of the CCSS standards. The evidence should display the full range of the CCSS standards and indicate which are covered by the SBAC summative assessments. Those standards not assessed should be noted with the reason for their exclusion stated.</p> <p>Although off grade level tests may be administered via the CAT system, the conditions under which off grade level items may be given is not clear. It is not clear to what extent students receiving a test event with off grade level items are receiving and/or being scored on a grade-level test event that complies with the blueprints.</p> <p>It is claimed that off grade level items are realigned to the on grade blueprint, but how this alignment was done and evaluated are not included among the evidence documents.</p> <p>The peers’ understanding is that the decision of proficiency vs. non-proficiency is based only on on-grade level testing. The determination of other measures (levels I and IV, or student growth) may be impacted by the use of off grade level items and states must take this into account when using the assessments for accountability purposes.</p>

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>Guidance p. 14 15a 15b 28 § 2.1-2.2</p> <p>Guidance Index 8 15a 15b 27 28 29 p. 8 30</p>	<p>The relative scarcity of DOK 3+ items in the assessments makes it difficult to conclude that they reflect “appropriate inclusion of challenging content” and requires “complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills)”</p> <p>There are notes specifying a minimum number of DOK 3+ items in the blueprints. However, from Evidence 28, it is unclear how DOK requirements are being implemented.</p> <p>The discussion of custom item pools in sections Evidence 28, § 2.1 and 2.2 suggests that some students will receive a test with a different blueprint from other students. The current documentation lends itself to the interpretation that this might occur even for students not receiving accommodations.</p> <p>Evidence 29 page 8 identifies the inadequacy of the item pools in providing assessments to the full range of students. This issue needs to be addressed.</p> <p>In Evidence 27, the number of ELA items developed are short of the order, although the Index claims that deliveries exceeded orders. The rationale for the</p>

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>orders listed in Evidence 27 is not explained. Specifically, how was the pool size and item demand determined?</p> <p>The ELA shortfalls in Evidence 27 are not explained in terms of impact on standards coverage. There needs to be an identification of the DOK of these orders and the shortfalls.</p> <p>Evidence 29 states that not all assessments follow blueprint constraints. Please provide the remediation and the assurance that this is not happening in operation with actual students.</p> <p>Appendix B of Evidence 29 demonstrates that many students taking the Spanish language and Braille versions of the SBAC assessments may be receiving assessments not aligned to the blueprints.</p> <p>It is unclear from Evidence 29 if the algorithm used in the simulation would accurately reflect (or accurately reflected) that used in operational testing.</p> <p>Evidence 30 demonstrates issues meeting constraints for the performance tasks. This needs to be addressed – specifically, how the misalignment was resolved.</p> <p>Evidence 8, p. 6 states that states may use their own delivery engines. The peers agree that states will need to provide evidence either that they are using the SBAC engine or that their chosen delivery engine functions the same as the SBAC engine and conforms to the SBAC blueprints for tests being delivered. If a non-SBAC engine does not conform, then it is incumbent upon the state using it to provide all evidence beyond item development for their program. That is, the program will need to be treated as an assessment other than SBAC (although using the</p>

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		SBAC pool).
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Further justification for Purpose 4. Purpose 4 is related to measuring student growth. Where appropriate (e.g., in § 3), evidence should be provided supporting (1) growth interpretations of assessment results, and (2) specific uses of growth estimates. b. Further justification for Purpose 5. Purpose 5 indicates that the assessment results will provide information about how instruction can be improved. This may be beyond the scope of a summative assessment system, since assessment results do not clearly indicate actions to improve instruction. Peers believe that this purpose should be restated or deleted. Alternatively, evidence can be provided where appropriate to support this interpretation / use of assessment results. <p>2.1.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Clarification concerning whether the range of total items by claim identified in the test blueprints is intended to be a tally across assessment targets, or an additional constraint. b. Documentation concerning the basis for exclusion of speaking in the ELA assessments. c. Documentation concerning the Consortium’s criterion for “sufficient alignment” (see Evidence 17 p. 31) and an explanation of how the results of the alignment study cited meets this definition. If sufficient alignment cannot be demonstrated, a remediation plan to achieve sufficient alignment. d. A clear discussion and supporting tables demonstrating the SBAC summative assessments cover the full range of the CCSS standards. The evidence should display the full range of the CCSS standards and indicate which are covered by the SBAC summative assessments. Those standards not assessed should be noted with the reason for their exclusion stated. e. Documentation supporting adherence to the grade level blueprint of assessments administered to students that include off grade level items. f. Documentation that a suitable methodology was implemented for realigning off grade level items to on grade level content for use in administration of off grade level content. <p>2.1.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Documentation supporting the claim that the DOK range of each assessment reflect “appropriate inclusion of challenging content” and requires “complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills)” b. Clarification regarding how DOK requirements are being implemented, for both CAT and fixed forms. <p>2.1.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Explanation of how the implementation of custom item pools described in § 2.1 and 2.2 of Evidence 28 cannot result in test events that are inconsistent with the test blueprints. If they can result in such test events, then a plan for how this will be remedied. b. Documentation with plan addressing the inadequacy of the item pools in providing assessments to the full range of students, identified on p. 8 of Evidence 29. c. An explanation of how DOK requirements are being implemented in the test delivery algorithm. d. An explanation of the basis for the item counts in the orders listed in Evidence 27. e. An explanation of the impact, if any, that the ELA shortfalls in Evidence 27 had / have on standards coverage. f. Documentation that all assessments in operation now conform to blueprints. g. Documentation regarding remediation of the issue that many students taking the Spanish language and Braille versions of the SBAC assessments may be 		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>receiving forms or test events that do not conform to the blueprints.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> h. Documentation regarding remediation of the issue in meeting constraints for the performance tasks. i. Documentation that SBAC is appropriately guiding and supporting states in using the appropriate algorithm. Clarification that a state using a different algorithm cannot rely on evidence gathered through the SBAC algorithm. 	
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>2.1.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A waiver to use SBAC due to the exclusion of speaking in the assessment. <p>States should note: Educator evaluation is not a listed purpose of this assessment.</p>		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.2 – Item Development</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>7 15a 15b 53</p>	<p>The documentation states revision based on the results of the cognitive labs, but does not specify what revisions were done or what changes were made to address issues identified (i.e. use of equation editor).</p> <p>There does not appear to be a specific statement about the mode of delivery for review of items. Since this is an electronic assessment, the items should have been reviewed on screen. The Consortium needs to specify the review mode in addition to the thorough documentation already provided.</p> <p>Page 3 of evidence 53 states that the ethnic make-up of the reviews reflects the diversity of the governing states, however the make-up of those states is not listed and the make-up of the math review panel is different from the ELA. While the peers are sensitive to the issues of recruitment, increased transparency would be helpful and support the positive outcome of the review. For example, listing the targets for ethnic make-up of panels and the efforts to recruit. If there were no targets for diversity, instead of claiming the panels matched the diversity of the governing states, simply state that this is the make-up based on the recruitment.</p> <p>The blueprints have a scarcity of items at DOK 3+. This leads the reviewers to question the level of inclusion of higher order skills.</p>

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>2.2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Documentation regarding how usability issues discovered during the cognitive labs (e.g., student difficulties using the equation editor) have been addressed. b. Documentation showing that the mode of delivery during item review was the same as that for test administration – in other words, that reviewers reviewed items exactly as they would have been seen by students. c. Documentation regarding the targets for ethnic make-up of panels and the efforts to recruit panels consistent with those targets or, if there were no targets for diversity, a statement to the effect. d. Documentation as per Summary Statement 2.1.3.a. 		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>None.</p>		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>11a p. 4 11b 65a 66 67 p. 24 68 pp. 36-41 69b 69c 69d 69e 77a 77b 76</p>	<p>The graphic on p. 4 of Evidence 11a is extremely helpful.</p> <p>Evidence 65a contains links that are important, however many are dead (the link to the collaboration site is not available to the reviewers).</p> <p>Since many documents are supplied as templates, the state will need to provide evidence that they are communicating clearly, effectively and accurately to its educators. These should include state-specific communications on the following issues: usability and accessibility guidelines, on-line test administration procedures, assessment technology requirements, test administrator manuals, and state specific procedures. These should include the content from the SBAC manuals as listed: on-line test administrator manual 67, usability accessibility and accommodations guide 68, UAA guidelines 11a 11b, state procedures manual 65a, test administrator users guide 66, paper pencil TAM 77a 77b, iPad guidelines 76, technology requirements training 69b, student interface training 69c, TA interface training modules 69d, ART training module 69e</p> <p>Evidence 67 p. 24: the thirty-minute timer mentioned in the first paragraph discussing the timeout, disagrees with the twenty-minute timer in the second paragraph. Please clarify.</p> <p>The definition of activity for the inactivity timer may be problematic since students can be clicking on the</p>

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>States need to provide evidence that test administrators have procedures and access to helpdesk/troubleshooting support.</p> <p>States need to provide evidence that they have determined that schools meet the readiness guidelines prior to operational utilization.</p>
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>2.3.1</p> <p>a. A clarification to reconcile the disagreement, in Evidence 67 p. 24, between (1) the thirty-minute timer mentioned in the first paragraph discussing the timeout, and (2) the twenty-minute timer referenced in the second paragraph. Provision of the clarification to states.</p> <p>2.3.2</p> <p>a. Documentation of the communication plan (to states) when modifications are made to the SBAC systems.</p> <p>2.3.3</p> <p>a. Contingency plans addressing a broad range of technology challenges, providing more details and clearer guidance on issues such as how to resume test administration in case of lost internet connectivity.</p> <p>b. Documentation that the Implementation Readiness Package has been fully developed and released, together with the release date.</p> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>2.3.3</p> <p>a. A contingency plan detailed for their state, and in alignment with SBAC’s guidelines.</p> <p>b. Documentation that test administrators have technology failure contingency procedures in place and access to helpdesk/troubleshooting support.</p> <p>c. Documentation of school readiness for operational administration of technology-based assessments.</p>		

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
<p>2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p>65a 65b 66 78</p>	<p>The documents appear to defer much of the test security and irregularity detection to the states. However, peers felt that this critical element implied that SBAC should have its own programs of post hoc assessment for irregularities (data forensics) and ongoing test security monitoring including social media monitoring.</p> <p>Information in 65b should be communicated to states</p> <p>SBAC should maintain a security log overall to ensure security of the summative assessment system itself.</p> <p>States need to provide evidence of their security policies and procedures in accordance with the investigation and remediation procedures for SBAC.</p>
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>2.5.1</p> <p>a. Documentation that SBAC has in place security protocols and procedures to protect SBAC items and assessments.</p> <p>2.5.2</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>a. Documentation that information in 65b is communicated to states.</p> <p>2.5.4</p>	<p>Documentation of the implementation of the security logging and the remediation plan for incidents that may impact the validity of the assessment (including communications).</p>	<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p>
<p>2.5</p>	<p>Documentation of state’s security policies and procedures and the relationship of the state’s policies and procedures to those of SBAC. In other words, a state’s security policies and procedures should reference SBAC’s policies and procedures and demonstrate coherence with these. It should be clear from all available documentation (regardless of source – SBAC or state) that all aspects of critical element 2.5 are addressed.</p>	

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p>65a 66 134</p> <p>133</p>	<p>SBAC needs to provide evidence that they are monitoring test item exposure and drift to ensure integrity on an ongoing basis. States must provide evidence of this item with respect to administration and use.</p> <p>Please detail what is the low risk item stated in Evidence 133 and explain what is being done about this issue or why the issue is not being addressed.</p> <p>States must provide evidence of this item.</p> <p>For reporting outside the SBAC system, states need to provide evidence of compliance with this item.</p>
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		
<p>2.6.1</p>		
<p>a. Documentation of monitoring of test item exposure and drift done by SBAC to ensure integrity of the assessment system.</p>		
<p>2.6.2</p>		
<p>a. Further explanation of the low risk item in Evidence 133, including any actions being taken to address it or a reason why it is not being addressed.</p>		
<hr/> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p>		
<p>2.6.1</p>		
<p>a. Documentation of compliance with this item with respect to “administration” and “use of test results.”</p>		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.6.2 a. All. 2.6.3		
For states reporting outside of the SBAC system, documentation of compliance with this 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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Guidance 7 17 104 105 124 pp. 86-89 131</p>	<p>Evidence 104 and 105 are the most direct evidence.</p> <p>How have the low ratings from 104 and 105 been addressed if at all?</p> <p>Evidence 124 achievement level feedback on pp. 86-89 suggests panels not understanding the standard setting process. How has this been addressed?</p> <p>The ELA shortfalls in evidence 27 are not explained in terms of impact on standards coverage. There needs to be an identification of the DOK of these orders and the shortfalls.</p> <p>Evidences 104 and 105 are the only alignment between standards and test items, however these studies do not encompass each grade level. Please provide evidence of alignment between operational tests at each grade level and the CCSS.</p> <p>Since the system allows student tests to include off grade level items, SBAC needs to report the rate at which it occurs and the impact on student scores as well as describe the implications for match to blueprints since presumably the blueprints were developed for on grade level test forms / events.</p>

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 		<p>SBAC needs to demonstrate adherence to the guidance regarding off grade level testing condition #2 on page 14. (Some reviewers felt the guidance means off grade level items cannot be used for any score purpose while others felt the guidance means off grade level items can be used in determining scores but not proficiency) Only on grade level items are used for score production and the on grade level items used cover the full range of the standards at that grade level.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence demonstrating the CAT forms students are scored upon match the blueprints submitted as evidence. Please submit this evidence for operational tests instead of simulations with the plan for monitoring this process.</p> <p>To maintain a valid item bank, SBAC needs to monitor item exposure and run post hoc analyses to ensure the system has the same characteristics as designed and approved.</p> <p>N/A: State responsibility.</p>
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: 3.1.1 a. Documentation regarding how issues of low ratings in Evidence 104 have been addressed. Examples: Evidence 104, p. 18 shows SBAC has a low rating on</p>		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>“high quality items and variety of item types.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Documentation regarding how the low ratings on panelist comprehension of the standard setting process (Evidence 124, pp. 86-89), was addressed. c. Documentation regarding the ELA item shortfalls in Evidence 27 affected the item pool and how those shortfalls were addressed. d. Evidence of alignment between operational tests and the CCSS for those grade levels not covered in Evidence 104 and Evidence 105. (There must be evidence of alignment for every grade level.) e. Documentation regarding the rate at which off grade level testing occurs, the impact of off grade level testing on student scores, and the implications of off grade level testing for blueprint satisfaction of test events. f. Documentation demonstrating adherence to the Guidance regarding off grade level testing condition #2 on p. 14. (Some reviewers felt the Guidance means off grade level items cannot be used for any score purpose while others felt the Guidance means off grade level items can be used in determining scores but not proficiency.) g. Documentation that the operational CAT test event that students are scored on match the blueprints submitted as evidence. A plan for monitoring the process of evaluating match to blueprint for all test events administered. h. Documentation of plan for monitoring item exposure and conducting post hoc analyses to ensure the system has the same characteristics as designed and approved. 	
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>3.1.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. All. 		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>7 25 130b</p>	<p>Cognitive labs are compelling and good evidence for this critical element.</p> <p>Documentation states that revisions were made based on the results of the cognitive labs, but does not specify what revisions were done or what changes were made to address issues identified (i.e. use of equation editor).</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>x The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: 3.2 a. Documentation as per 2.2.a</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states: None.</p>		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>7 61 130b 130c</p>	<p>The summary of evidence in Evidence 130b p. 8 is not compelling for meeting this critical element.</p> <p>DIF and biserial correlations calculated and used...good.</p> <p>Evidence 61 does not discriminate between interim and summative items. Please provide confirmation that this applies only to the summative items.</p> <p>Evidence 7 p. 166: Good evidence for unidimensionality but again not specific to summative vs other tests - please specify.</p> <p>Evidence 130c p. 5: Bias estimates are unacceptable for 3rd grade in ELA and some other grades. Also for Math claims 2 and 4. Please provide evidence the claim level classifications that are reported are not negatively impacted by the bias.</p> <p>Please provide model fit information based on operational assessment data instead of just pilot data.</p> <p>Please provide clarification that items removed from the dimensionality analysis were removed from the bank as well and not merely removed from the analysis.</p> <p>The item vector dimensionality study could have bene stronger if it included the possibility of more than two dimensions.</p> <p>Not clear if scaling at the claim level was considered.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Confirmation that Evidence 61 and Evidence 7 p. 166 apply to the summative items. b. Documentation that claim level classifications are not negatively impacted by large bias estimates in 3rd grade ELA, and for Math Claims 2 and 4. c. Model fit information based on operational assessment data. d. Confirmation that items removed from the dimensionality analysis were retired from further operational use. 	
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>3.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen. 		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>7 p. 443 137 139 156</p>	<p>In Evidence 7 there is no clear explanation of how SBAC lines up with PISA or NAEP even though they used embedded items. The purpose appeared to be to ground the standard setting but how they actually helped to inform the process isn’t clear. It isn’t clear how inclusion of these items helped to show that “assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.”</p> <p>Evidence 7 p. 443: Not clear how the ACT benchmarks were projected on to the SBAC scale. Please clarify how this occurred and how this was used to provide the validity evidence relevant to this critical element.</p> <p>Evidence 139: The high pass rate for students who are failing the course does support this critical element.</p> <p>Evidence 137: Peers are not sure this is relevant to this critical element. The importance of the results was not presented.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>3.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Clarification of how inclusion of PISA and NAEP items in the standard setting, and how projection of ACT benchmarks onto the SBAC scale, helped to show that “assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.” b. Discussion of the high pass rates on the Smarter Balanced assessments for students failing the course in the Washington: Linking Course Grades to Smarter Balanced Cut Scores report, with respect to meeting this critical element. <hr/> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>3.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen. 		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>7 p. 472 130c pp. 14, 17, 22-34, 36-41</p>	<p>There needs to be additional information concerning which states were included in the calculations of reliability and categorical classification decisions. The calculations should include data from all states included in that round. Per follow-up communication, CT, MI, and NH were not included in these calculations.</p> <p>Per ED, this critical element implies a requirement for state-specific reliabilities. These state-specific reliabilities should be either in the submissions of the Consortium or the State.</p> <p>130c: Total score reliabilities are acceptable. Claim reliabilities are low, but impact is likely marginal. Total score reliabilities are low in Decile 1 for grades 7 and 11 in mathematics (p. 14) and 11th grade LEP and IDEA (p. 17).</p> <p>130c: CSEMs high for the low end (pp. 36-41), especially in relation to typical ranges for achievement levels (007: p. 472). Frequently the CSEM is about a 1/3rd of a typical range. This could impact achievement level accuracy for students and may limit the utility of the assessments for measuring student growth.</p> <p>130c: Classification accuracy for distinguishing between level 2 and 3 is low for ELA grades 3-5 (pp. 22-34). Since level 3 is proficient, this has an impact on proficiency designations.</p>

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 		<p>Consistency estimates are not provided or addressed. The submission should include a statement or rationale for claiming that test procedure produces test forms meeting this requirement, especially in light of potential differences in results for different algorithms.</p> <p>There needs to be evidence that all of the data included in computing the reliability-related estimates are based on the same implementation of the same algorithm.</p>
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A statement responding to areas of low reliability and low accuracy (Either SBAC or the relevant state) Test reliability of the assessments estimated for each state separately and each subgroup within state (these estimates will also need to meet adequacy criteria) Estimates of consistency of classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results (these estimates will also need to meet adequacy criteria) 		
<hr/> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (Either SBAC or the relevant state) Test reliability of the assessments estimated for each state separately and each subgroup within state (these estimates will also need to meet adequacy criteria) If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen. 		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>11a 30 126</p>	<p>The evidence supports attention in design and development to ensure fairness and accessibility.</p> <p>Only simulation or field test data, showing no DIF or low DIF on the assessment.</p> <p>Peers agreed there should be ongoing tracking of DIF items that have been left in the pool.</p> <p>Accommodations are not tested; there are only lit reviews in Evidence 126.</p> <p>See notes on low IEP and LEP reliabilities.</p> <p>Evidence 11a is not prescriptive and does not provide data validating the use of the accommodations for certain students.</p> <p>Would like to see reliability estimates for students using accommodations, based on operational data.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Documentation supporting ongoing tracking of DIF items left in the operational pool, to ensure that any negative impact they have on fairness and accessibility remains minimal. b. Estimated reliability for students using accommodations, based on operational data. 		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen. 		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Index pp. 76-77 104 130c pp. 33-35</p>	<p>It is not clear how Evidence 104 addresses this critical element.</p> <p>Evidence 130c: The reported SEMs are large and CSEMs are especially high for certain deciles and grades.</p> <p>The bin analysis in Evidence #130c pp. 33-35 demonstrates a need for more representation at the low end of the scales. The need is very pronounced for mathematics.</p> <p>Comments on earlier critical elements addressing representation across the scale are relevant here as well.</p> <p>Index pp. 76-78 calls attention to lack of items at the low end, impacting the test’s ability to test those students. SBAC should follow through on stated plans to enrich the item bank at the low end.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.3 Documentation that Smarter Balanced has enriched the item bank such that the assessments can provide a more precise estimate of student performance for low-achieving students.</p> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.3</p> <p> a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.</p>		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>70</p>	<p>Evidence 70: The scoring module was not ready, per this document. We would like evidence that the implementation readiness package was made available and the dates on which each module was released, especially the scoring module.</p> <p>We would like additional evidence of standardized scoring procedures and protocols, specifically with respect to the use of the same CAT algorithm across states. (Scoring and item selection for test forms are interdependent for CATs.)</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.4 Evidence of established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Documentation that the implementation readiness package was made available and the dates on which each module was released, especially the scoring module. A plan to ensure timely future delivery of materials and modules necessary for third party administration vendors. b. Documentation of reliable and accurate scoring for alternate test forms (i.e. paper and pencil, paper braille). <hr/> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen. 		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>Simulation studies provided evidence regarding adherence to blueprint (and those simulations did not always produce conforming forms).</p> <p>Need evidence that operational forms always produce conforming forms for all students.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>a. Documentation that the assessment system always produces blueprint conforming forms for all students who took an operational form or test event, regardless of format or accommodation.</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.</p>		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>42 49a 49b 50 51 70 130d 143 145 169</p>	<p>This critical element is largely redundant with the prior one, because of CAT. However, it is relevant to the paper-pencil version, Spanish version, ASL, and Braille versions.</p> <p>Noted systematic reviews for Spanish translations. Expected evidence of analogous reviews for ASL and Braille.</p> <p>We found no empirical evidence of this. For example, there was no analysis comparing descriptive statistics on students taking different versions, and discussion of results to address comparability. Some comparisons, for example adaptive Braille versus paper Braille versus CAT, are especially relevant.</p> <p>(We would expect to see this for operational data, now that it is available.)</p> <p>Has SBAC attended to comparability across devices empirically? Can it? (Is device information collected for test events?)</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.6</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation that the Consortium followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments (i.e. evidence of systemic checking the ASL and Braille versions of items.) Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results (i.e. evidence of comparability between standard Smarter Balanced assessments, ASL, Braille, Spanish, and other versions of the assessment using operational data). Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results (i.e. evidence of comparability across the different devices allowed for standard Smarter Balanced assessments.) <hr/> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.6</p>		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>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).</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Index 155</p>	<p>Useful to have advisory groups for different student populations.</p> <p>Evidence 155: Many of the proposed analyses seem standard for a tech report.</p> <p>Index (pp. 97-98): Outline of the review cycle.</p> <p>Unclear to the Peers whether a complete 2014-2015 Technical Report exists. We would like a complete technical report for 2014-2015 or an explanation for why it is still in process.</p> <p>For States using SBAC: 4.7 is covered by the SBAC submission.</p>
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: 4.7</p> <p>a. To support that the Consortium has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, a complete technical report for the operational administration of the Smarter Balanced assessments in 2014-15.</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states: None.</p>		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

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
<p>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS</p> <p>11a 11b 97 98 128</p>	<p>11a: SBAC should provide guidance when use of the SBAC test is not appropriate. This is not provided. (States also need to provide their specific guidance on this critical element for alternate assessment.)</p> <p>This critical element should be provided in the state-specific submission.</p> <p>126: This is met with respect to accommodations. See first bullet above.</p> <p>97 and 98: Evidence of this is provided. (States need to provide evidence that they have given appropriate guidance to their IEP teams.)</p>

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>students with disabilities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; • Includes instructions that students eligible to be 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. 		<p>128: Evidence of this is provided. (States need to provide evidence that they have given appropriate guidance to their IEP teams.) This is provided.</p> <p>Evidence of these last three critical elements should come from the state-specific or alternative assessment submissions.</p>
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u> </u>X_ No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>5.1.1</p> <p> a. States need to provide specific guidance associated with their AA-AAS.</p> <p>5.1.2</p> <p> a. All.</p> <p>5.1.3</p>		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.1.4	a. States need to provide specific guidance associated with their AA-AAS.	
	a. States need to provide evidence of specific guidance provided to IEP teams.	
5.1.5	a. Documentation that the state adheres to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines, or state-specific evidence to address this part of the critical element.	
5.1.6	a. All.	
5.1.7	a. All.	
5.1.8	a. All.	

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS</p> <p>11a 11b 97 98 126 128</p>	<p>Evidence 97: Guidance unclear and not helpful. Steps 3 and 4 do not help schools determine whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodations, and if so, which accommodations are appropriate.</p> <p>Evidence 128: Provided as evidence, but does not pertain to ELs</p> <p>Evidence 126: Provides a framework, but needs operationalization to meet this critical element</p>
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>a. Documentation regarding how schools determine whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodations, and if so, which accommodations are appropriate.</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>a. Documentation that the state adheres to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines, or state-specific evidence to address this part of the critical element.</p>		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p> <p>11a 11b 65a 97 98 100a 100b 126 129</p>	<p>If a state excludes some accommodation tools, then the State needs to provide a rationale that it is still meeting this critical element.</p> <p>Points (i) and (ii) are not shown. Claim (iii) is not made or stated. There is no comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations. (And a discussion relevant to comparability in light of findings.)</p> <p>Suggestion: Meeting with the appropriate advisory group with information relevant to this critical element and soliciting their advice re need for follow-up investigation.</p> <p>65a: Consortium has a process, p. 15, which depends on the State having a process. The State needs to provide their process for requesting and reviewing.</p>
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: 5.3.3</p>		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Documentation that the Consortium 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. b. Documentation that the Consortium has determined that the accommodations it provides 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 (e.g., a comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations, and a discussion relevant to comparability in light of findings). 		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p>		
5.3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If the State does not adhere to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines, state-specific evidence to address this critical element. If a state excludes some accommodation tools, then the State needs to provide a rationale that it is still meeting this critical element. 	
5.3.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If the State does not adhere to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines, state-specific evidence to address this critical element. If a state excludes some accommodation tools, then the State needs to provide a rationale that it is still meeting this critical element. 	
5.3.4		
All.		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p> <p>96 97 98 99 126</p>	<p>Monitoring compliance with accommodation policies and procedures: State responsibility</p> <p>Monitoring appropriateness of accommodation (that they are continuing to function as intended): Consortium responsibility</p>
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>5.4</p> <p>a. Documentation of all aspects of this critical element as it relates to monitoring compliance with accommodation policies and procedures</p>		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

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
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>49 86 95</p>	<p>States are responsible for first two critical elements.</p> <p>Evidence 86: This critical element is met for SBAC.</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>6.1.1 a. All.</p> <p>6.1.2</p>		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
a. All.		
Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>Evidence of a technically sound procedure has been provided.</p> <p>Please provide information re what the Consortium was targeting w/r/t panelist ethnicity distribution.</p>
Section 6.2 Summary Statement		
<p><u> x </u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>6.2.</p> <p>a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.</p>		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</p> <p>(1) 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.</p> <p>(2) 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.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>86 106 107</p>	<p>The Consortium provided the evidence that could reasonably be expected of them at this early stage in the program. This critical element should be addressed more fully as the program develops – for example, through additional validity studies.</p> <p>This critical element is not relevant at the SBAC Consortium level. However, this needs to be addressed by states in their state-specific submission or through the submission of the alternate assessment consortium.</p>
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>6.3.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen. 		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 the extent practicable, in a native language 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>Responsibility for meeting this critical element lies principally with the State.</p> <p>There is evidence that SBAC had a plan to develop a tool (with Amplify) for reporting. States need to produce evidence to meet this critical element.</p> <p>The SBAC reporting system appears to meet sub-bullets 1 and 2. However, the states not using the SBAC reporting tools need to provide evidence to meet sub-bullets 1 and 2.</p> <p>All states need to provide evidence showing that sub-bullets 3 and 4 are being met.</p> <p>In regards to sub-bullet 4, the SBAC system provides Spanish and Vietnamese reports upon request.</p> <p>All states need to provide evidence of report delivery.</p>

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 		<p>States must provide evidence for this critical element.</p>
<p>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p>		
<hr/> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>6.4.1 a. All.</p> <p>6.4.2 b. All.</p> <p>6.4.3 a. All documentation under this bullet and sub-bullets as it pertains to delivery of reports.</p> <p>6.4.3.1 a. All, if the state is not using the Smarter Balanced-hosted reporting system and the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium reporting system user guide.</p> <p>6.4.3.2 a. All, if the state is not using the Smarter Balanced-hosted reporting system and the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium reporting system user guide.</p> <p>6.4.3.3 a. All.</p> <p>6.4.3.4 a. All.</p> <p>6.4.4 a. All.</p>		

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.