



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

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

August 30, 2018

Dear President Kirst and Superintendent Torlakson:

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

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

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated CDE's submission, which included several assessments. Peer reviewers and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the components of CDE's assessment system meet most, 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:

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

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.

- R/LA and mathematics general assessments in high school (Smarter Balanced): **Substantially meets requirements**
- R/LA and mathematics alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for grades 3-8 and high school (CAA): **Substantially meets requirements**

In saying that these assessments **substantially meet the requirements** of the ESEA, the Department means that these assessments meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The Department expects that CDE may 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. Within 30 days of the receipt of this letter, CDE must provide to the Department a plan and timeline by which it will submit the additional documentation. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action.

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

Please note that the assessment requirements for ESEA, as amended by the NCLB, were in effect through the end of the 2016-2017 school year. The CDE peer review was conducted under the requirements of this statute. Beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, the assessment requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, apply to State assessments. Given that this review began under the requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB, it is important to indicate that while the CAA substantially meets most of the peer review guidance criteria under the NCLB, the State is still responsible to ensure that these assessments also comply with the requirements of the ESSA. Department staff carefully reviewed CDE's evidence and peer review recommendations in light of the updated requirements for State assessments under the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. As a result of this additional review, I have determined that the CDE administration of the CAAs need to meet one additional requirement related to alternate academic achievement standards to fully meet ESSA requirements. This requirement is listed under critical element 6.3 in the enclosed list of items.

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 Nkemjika Ofodile-Carruthers of my staff at: OSS.California@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank Brogan
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
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy	For the CAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of protecting the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development.
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	For the CAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a study of dimensionality to aid in reporting and interpretation to document adequate validity.
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility	For the CAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development, and analysis of its assessments.
4.4 – Scoring	For the CAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for the hand-scored items.
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	For the CAA: Evidence that ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations.
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	For the CAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system.
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	For all assessments: <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 IEP team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or by another process for English learners; and • Evidence that monitoring procedures addressed the fidelity with which test administration procedures were carried out.
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	For the CAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. CDE should provide this evidence by December 15, 2020

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
6.4 – Reporting	For all assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence that student score reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or 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

February 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR California

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS .	4
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students	4
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards	5
1.3 – Required Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only).....	6
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only).....	8
1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only).....	10
SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	11
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	12
2.2 – Item Development.....	15
2.3 – Test Administration	18
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only).....	21
2.5 – Test Security	24
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	26
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....	27
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	27
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	29
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	31
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	32
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	33
4.1 – Reliability.....	33
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	35
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	38
4.4 – Scoring	41
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	43
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	44
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	46
SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS	48
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	49
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
5.3 – Accommodations.....	52
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	55
SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .	57
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	58
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	60
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	61
6.4 – Reporting.....	63

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.

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>The CA CCSS for ELA and mathematics were adopted by the SBE on August 2, 2010. See CA State Board of Education Meeting, August 2010, Minutes, Item 3 Evidence 12</p> <p>On July 9, 2015, the California SBE adopted the CCCs as the basis for the CAAs in ELA and mathematics. See CA State Board of Education Meeting, July 2015 Agenda, Item 4 and CA State Board of Education Meeting, July 2015 Minutes. Evidence 14-18.</p>	
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for the CAA.</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>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>For students with severe cognitive disabilities, California has adopted the Core Content Connectors (CCCs) for ELA and mathematics developed by the National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) under a U.S. Department of Education awarded NCSC a General Supervision Enhancement Grant but supplemented after CA educator teams reviewed and provide recommendations.</p> <p>The CCCs identify the most salient grade-level, core academic content in ELA and mathematics found in both the CA CCSS for ELA and mathematics, and the LPF. The CCCs are less complex than the CA CCSS, focusing on the main academic content in each subject and grade and identify priorities in each content area to guide the instruction for students in this population and for the alternate assessment</p> <p>The process used is reviewed in the July 2015 Agenda, Item 4 while the July 2015 Minutes is the Board action for approval of the ELA and Math blueprints for the Alternate Assessment.</p> <p>Evidence 14 and 15.</p> <p>https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/altassessment.asp</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Content Connectors, Prioritized English Language Arts: Reading • Core Content Connectors, Prioritized English Language Arts: Writing • Core Content Connectors, Prioritized Mathematics <p>Evidence 16,17,18.</p>	<p>Broad stakeholder involvement was not addressed. However, as part of the USDE grant and multiple states, broad stakeholder involvement is evident.</p>
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required for the CAA.</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>California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) includes annual general and alternate assessments and includes the required content and grade levels</p>	<p>requirement met</p>
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> </u>x No additional evidence is required.</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
---	--	---

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 align="center">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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • California Education Code, selected sections, Section 60604.5 • California Education Code, selected sections, • California Education Code, selected sections, • CAASPP Matrix One CAASPP Individual Student Assessment Accessibility Profile (ISAAP) Tool CAA Test Administration Manual 2015–16 CAA Parent-Guardian's Guide CAA Guidance for IEP Teams 	<p>documentation provided supports requirements for this critical element, except there appears to be no explicit provision for 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</p>
<p>stemming from 2016 peer review: For all assessments in grades 3-8 and high school, California Department of Education (CDE) must provide:</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"> 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. 		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</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. 		

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 align="center">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>There was not an updated document that included evidence of assessment participation rate data on each required assessment.</p>	<p>The results for the CAA will not be included in the initial 2016 Accountability Transition Report because the data are not yet available. However, the CAA will be used in reporting the participation rate when the 2016 Accountability Transition Report is updated in 2017. This is noted to have been done in February 2017, and should reflect the incorporation of 2015-16 CAA into the participation rate calculations. This report is the latest version provided by the state and must be updated with the participation rate data on each required assessment.</p>
<p>stemming from 2016 peer review: 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> <p>Evidence of assessment participation rate data on each required assessment Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDE must update the Accountability Transition Report and include the 2015-2016 CAA into the participation rate calculations. The state should then submit this 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 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

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

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

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 align="center">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 CAAs are aligned with alternate achievement standards, the Core Content Connectors (CCCs) that are linked to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). All items developed and used are appropriate for the grade level, aligned with the CCSS, and based on the clarifications and guidelines from the CCCs derived from the CCSS.</p> <p>Purpose CAA Technical Report, 2015–16, Evidence 61 Interpretations 8.7.1.1, page 216 Four purposes page 217</p> <p>The CAAs for ELA and mathematics are delivered online and through adaptive multistage testing (MST). The CAAs have two stages. A student’s final score is calculated by combining the student’s performance on items from both stages.</p> <p>(CAA Technical Report, 2015–16 , page 12 :Evidence 61 CAA Technical Report, 2015–16, pages 46–47</p> <p>Figure 4.1 and Figure 4.2 graphically display the two-stage test designs for ELA and mathematics.</p> <p>Appendix 4.A Test Blueprints Alignment by California Alternate Assessment (CAA) Form</p> <p>There is no vertical linking or scaling for the CAAs. However, the grade-appropriate CCSS, CCCs, and EUs were part of the test development process. See section 4.1 Test Content Specification and Test Blueprints for additional information CAA Technical Report, 2015–16, page 42. Chapter 3 of the CAA Technical Report, 2015–16 (starting on page 35) Evidence 61.</p>	<p>Purposes and intended interpretations The purposes of the CAA are outlined in Evidence 61 on pages 216 and 217.</p> <p>Test Designs and Blueprints Based on NCSC, proportional to CCSS Tech Report p. 46 & 47 have test design structure for MST</p> <p>While the required information for the blueprint is located in several places, it is difficult to understand the system in a coherent fashion. It may be beneficial for stakeholders to have an organized display and explanation in order to understand the system.</p> <p>Connections to standards and challenging content Tiered items Blueprints show link between CCSS and CCC</p> <p>Item Descriptions for ELA and Mathematics Tech Manual p. 43-47</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
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required for the CAA.		

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
------------------	--	--

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 align="center">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>The item development process included the participation of teachers, CDE staff and professional item writing staff at ETS. Item specifications, technical documentations, and item writer training materials document the procedures.</p> <p>CAA item development is described in the CAA Technical Report, 2015–16, Chapter 3: Item Development and Review, page 34. Evidence 61</p> <p>The CAA Technical Report for 2014–15 documents the procedures followed in conducting field testing during the 2014-15 SY. Tables that contain the Item Development Plan for the ELA and mathematics assessments are included in Appendix A. Evidence 60</p> <p>The CAA Technical Report for 2014–15 Chapter 2. Evidence 60 Item specifications: CAA ELA Item Specifications Grades 3–11, and CAA Math Item Specifications Grades 3–11. Evidence 42, 43, 49,50</p> <p>The CAA guidelines for bias and sensitivity, accessibility and accommodations, and style helped item developers and reviewers ensure consistency and fairness across the item development process. CAA General Style Guide Evidence 45 CAA Graphics Style Guide Evidence 46</p> <p>Selection of personnel and item writing workshops Example Item Writer Training Agenda. Evidence 114 CAA 2015 ELA Item Writing Training Slides Evidence CAA 2015 Math Item Writing Training Slides Evidence 29 CAA ELA Item Writing Guide Evidence 43 CAA ELA Guiding Questions for Item Writing</p>	<p>The evidence provided by the State is an outline of steps in the item development, item specifications, style guide, item writing style guide, sample item writing templates, and item review process</p> <p>An overview of the cognitive complexity training is provided in Evidence 109.</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
	Evidence 41 CAA Math Item Writing Guide Evidence 50 Depth of Knowledge for Item Writing Workshops . Evidence109 Sample CAA Item Template Evidence 127 Item Review Process and Guidelines.	
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required for the CAA.		

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
-------------------------	--	---

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 align="center">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>The central repository for all information <u>about the CAA testing procedures is the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) Portal Web site, maintained by ETS.</u></p> <p><u>Operation of the ETS California Technical Assistance Center (CaTAC) is described in ETS CAASPP Contract, 2015</u>, pages 19–22. Evidence 112</p> <p>Regular e-mail communications called the <i>CAASPP Update</i> and the <i>CAASPP Flash</i>. Evidence 89,90,91,92,93</p> <p>The <u>CAA Test Administration Manual 2015–16</u> explains all of the steps in conducting a CAA administration. Evidence 62</p> <p>CAA Test Examiner Tutorial 2015-16.pdf. Evidence 63</p> <p>CAA Training Test. Evidence 65</p> <p>The <u>Directions for CAA Administration</u> are the actual instructions to be read to the student and which are a vital component of the standardization of the assessments. Evidence 108</p> <p>The <u>CAASPP System Requirements Manual 2016</u> outlines the hardware and software requirements for administering the assessments. Evidence 84</p> <p>The <u>CAASPP Test Operations Management System (TOMS): Online Student Test Settings User Guide 2015–16</u> Evidence 88</p> <p><u>CAASPP Matrix One</u>, which lists and describes the universal tools, designated supports, and accommodations (embedded and non-embedded) allowed as part of the CAASPP System for 2015–16. Evidence 74.</p> <p><u>Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Implementation Guide</u> Evidence 146</p>	<p>Establish and communicate standardized procedures Directions for Administration The documentation is provided for teachers in the administration; however, CDE may wish to consider a more user friendly format.</p> <p>Training The CDE identified a number of available trainings, but it is not evident how monitoring of the training was conducted.</p> <p>Technology requirements, procedures, and contingency plans</p> <p>Defined technology requirements System Requirements</p> <p>CDE Information Security Program Plan, The Disaster Recovery Plan, page 26, Evidence 105</p> <p>Contingency plan was not 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 California

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>ETS created a template for uploading of student test settings using an Excel file.</p> <p><i>Individual Student Assessment Accessibility Profile (ISAAP)</i> Tool to assign supports to students. Evidence 94.</p> <p>Using the 2015–16 ISAAP Tool to demonstrate the use of the tool to test administrators. Evidence 147.</p> <p>The CAASPP Security Incidents and Appeals Procedure Guide explains the use of the Security and Test Administration Incident Reporting System. Evidence 78,79</p> <p>CAASP Security Plan, 2015016 docx. Evidence 80</p> <p>The CAASPP Online Reporting System (ORS) User Guide, Winter–Spring 2015 explains how to use the online reporting system to retrieve student results and score reports. Evidence 76, 117,123,124,125</p> <p>Secure sections of the testing CAASPP Portal provide access to all of the systems involved in administering the CAA, including the Operations Management System (TOMS) Evidence 88,</p> <p>The Test Administration Interface (TAI) Evidence, CAASPP Security and Test Administration Incident Reporting System (STAIRS) Evidence 83.</p>	
<p>stemming from 2016 peer review:</p> <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. <p>No evidence found either in SB submission or CA submission.</p> <p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for the CAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of an established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration: 		

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
---	---	---

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 align="center">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>ETS CAASPP Contract, 2015, Section 4.2, pages 53–55</p> <p>CAASPP Security Plan, 2015–16, pages 12-20</p> <p>CAASPP Security Plan, 2015–16, pages 17–23</p> <p>ETS CAASPP Contract, 2015, pages 19-22</p> <p>CAA Test Administration Manual 2015–16, pages 28–30</p> <p>CAASPP Security Incidents and Appeals Procedures Guide, 2015–16</p> <p>CAA Technical Report 2015–16 Pages 65-66</p>	<p>CDE noted that the state monitors the administration of the CAA to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. The state noted that this is done by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - requiring regular reports from the testing contractor, ETS, on the status of the assessment system, including regular reports on the status of systems for downloading student data and on the number of assessments started and completed each day. - using the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) LEA coordinators, test site coordinators, test administrators, and test examiners. ETS provided educators with extensive training on the CAA administration of the assessments to ensure proper monitoring at the school site level. - tracking of requests for assistance and reports of CAASPP testing issues and problems. - collecting data after testing is completed from test examiners using an online survey and through a series of focus groups.
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for the CAA:</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"> All of the documents that CDE has listed as sources are not active on the website or are obsolete. For example, the CAASPP Security Incidents and Appeals Procedure Guide is written as published for 15-16, however, the most recent version is for 17-18 and is not shown on the document. CDE should update the documents to reflect the most recent monitoring information. 	

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
------------------	--	--

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 align="center">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>The system incorporates security checks before, during, and after testing to protect the integrity of the CAASPP System. ETS CAASPP Contract, 2015, section 4.2, pages 50–53 section 3.2.B.3, pages 41–42, Evidence 112</p> <p>A general overview of test security and data confidentiality is also contained in the CAA Technical Report, 2015–16, section 5.2, page 61. Evidence 61 CAASPP Security Plan, 2015–16 Evidence 80</p> <p>The CAASPP Security Incidents and Appeals Procedure Guide explains the use of the Security and Test Administration Incident Reporting System. Evidence 78,79</p> <p>The CAASPP Test Operations Management System (TOMS): Online Student Test Settings User Guide 2015–16 Evidence 88</p> <p>The CAASPP Online Reporting System (ORS) User Guide, Winter–Spring 2015 Evidence 76, 117,123,124,125</p> <p>Secure sections of the testing CAASPP Portal provide access to all of the systems involved in administering the CAA, including the Operations Management System (TOMS) Evidence 88, CAASPP Security and Test Administration Incident Reporting System (STAIRS) Evidence 83. STAIRS Applicable Testing Issues, Evidence 129 STAIRS- Appeals Reconciliation Report. Evidence 130 Example OTI Investigation Report Evidence 115 The 2015–16 CAASPP Test Security Guidelines Evidence 1 The 2015–16 CAASPP Pretest Administration Workshop Slides, slide 137, Evidence 4 2015–16 CAA Test Administration Workshop Slides,</p>	<p>Prevention of assessment irregularities CDE provides documentation concerning the prevention of any assessment irregularities.</p> <p>Detection of irregularities No evidence is provided for detection beyond audits across assessment. It is not clear how the CAA was incorporated into the CAASP system for detecting irregularities.</p> <p>Remediation of testing irregularities and security incidents Evidence 62, page 28- 29</p> <p>Investigations of irregularities Investigation instructions by the State of potential irregularities are described in Evidence 62, page 29.</p> <p>In all descriptions, there was no evidence of any CAA issues addressed in the detection, remediation, and investigations of irregularities.</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
	slide 102 ,Evidence 3	
Section 2.5 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale related to only the alternate assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities 		

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>The CAA Test Administration Manual, 2015–16 (TAM), page 28 Evidence 62</p> <p>2015–16 CAA Test Administration Workshop Slides, Slides 51– 53, 104 Evidence 3</p> <p>ETS CAASPP Contract, 2015, page 17; section 4.2, pages 50–53, Evidence 112</p> <p>2015–16 CAASPP Pretest Administration Workshop Slides Evidence 4</p> <p>2015–16 Archived CAASPP Videos and Resources Web page, separate test security workshop produced by ETS, Evidence 2</p> <p>CDE Information Security Program Plan Evidence 101</p> <p>Student Data Access and Use Standards Evidence 132</p> <p>CAASPP Test Security Plan 2016 Evidence 87</p> <p>CDE and UCLA FERPA Compliance Agreement Evidence 100</p> <p>CAA Technical Report, 2015–16, Section 7.2.2, Group Scores, Table 7.6, page 87. Evidence 61</p>	<p>Protect the integrity of its test materials and related data The state had policies and procedures in place for protecting test materials and data.</p> <p>Secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality Security in test development was not evident.</p> <p>Protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting Evidence 61, Page 87 Table 7.6 provides definitions of the demographic subgroups. To protect student privacy, when the number of students in a subgroup is 10 or fewer, the summary statistics are not reported and are presented as hyphens. Page 87</p>
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>X___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for the CAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of protecting the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development 		

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>The CDE and ETS conducted numerous stakeholder meetings with special education consultants, teachers, and parents in 2014.</p> <p>ETS CAASPP Contract, 2015. linear test form to be administered in 2015–16 to be followed by an adaptive test in 2016–17 with assessment design process following the principles for Universal Design for accessibility, and that the assessments be developed using the Evidence Centered approach, page 63. Evidence 112</p> <p>CAASPP Technical Advisory Group, 2015–16 Evidence 86</p> <p>CAA Technical Report, 2015–16. The English Language Arts/Literacy Test Design is addressed in section 4.2.2 (pages 45–46) and the Mathematics Test Design is in section 4.2.3 (pages. 46–47) Evidence 61</p> <p>Core Content Connectors, Prioritized English Language Arts: Reading; Evidence 103</p> <p>Core Content Connectors, Prioritized English Language Arts: Writing; Evidence 104</p> <p>Core Content Connectors, Prioritized Mathematics. Evidence 106</p> <p>(CAA Blueprint for English Language Arts, September 2015; Evidence 38</p> <p>CAA Blueprint for Mathematics, November 2016 Evidence 39</p> <p>CAA Technical Report, 2015–16, Evidence 61 <i>Chapter 4: Test Assembly</i>, starting on page 2; and in Appendix 4A beginning on page 52 of the report. section 8.7 in chapter 8 pages 215–222</p> <p>CAA Alignment Study, Evidence 149</p>	<p>Adequate overall validity The HumRRO study was provided to document alignment and identified areas for review.</p> <p>Documentation of Alignment- Adequate Linkage Alignment study by HumRRO indicated acceptable documentation with some areas for improvement.</p> <p>What will the impact of the alignment study moving forward? This evidence was not located in the materials.</p> <p>A plan to address the areas identified in the HumRRO study will support the validity claim.</p>
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for the CAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A plan to address the areas identified in the HumRRO study to support the validity claim 		

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.

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>CAA Technical Report, 2014–15 Evidence 60 Chapter 2 presents the assessment design, item types, and item development specifications that were used. Tables that contain the Item Development Plan for the ELA and mathematics assessments are included in Appendix A. Chapter 3 summarizes the results of the 2014–15 test administration. It includes qualitative observations and the results of quantitative analyses. Tables that provide more detailed information in support of the analyses in Chapter 3 are included in appendixes B through G at the end of the document. Chapter 4 highlights the findings and implications for future administrations Appendix B, pages 49 and 50 qualitative observation reports Appendix C on pages 51 to 56 and page 7-10, LCI Appendix D on pages 57 and 58, results of SRC A summary of findings and a discussion of the implications for development of the 2016 CAA assessments, pages 22 to 25</p> <p>CAA Technical Report, 2015–16, Evidence 61 Results of SSC analyses are presented in Appendix 8.G (starting from page 391 to page 418) Appendix 8.F page 383 displays total testing time by pathway and quartile. Table 8.F.5 through Table 8.F.11 display content correlations for subgroups, Table 8.10 (page 221) presents the content correlations for all students.</p> <p>CAASPP 2016 Focus Group Report, page 13. Evidence 67</p>	<p>2014-15 Pilot administrations included observations and surveys Observations in 3 locations per subject area Discovered issues with Directions and adherence with them</p> <p>Post test focus groups focused on support and processes for test administration and not on student.</p> <p>Much of what was cited was the experience of the examiner instead of the student. This evidence did report on issues that teachers reported in training, and providing accommodations as well as areas educators cited which negatively impacted student performance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rigor of the question sets is too difficult, • Question formats are challenging and inconsistent with those in the classroom, • Greater student familiarity with supports and accommodations is needed, • Increased student computer literacy skills <p>Page 21, 22 Focus Group Report</p> <p>Since the Focus Group Report was cited, it may provide a starting point to address the cognitive processes.</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for the CAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s 		

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
academic content standards for the CAA.		

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>Core Content Connectors, Prioritized English Language Arts: Reading; Evidence 103 Core Content Connectors, Prioritized English Language Arts: Writing; Evidence 104 Core Content Connectors, Prioritized Mathematics. Evidence 106</p> <p>CAA Technical Report, 2015–16 Evidence 61 Chapter 7 Scoring and Reporting, page 80 Chapter 3 Item Development and Review, page 35 Chapter 8, Analyses include classical item and item response theory statistics, page 196. Pages 208–209, flagging criteria for dichotomous items Page 209, flagging criteria for polytomous items Appendix 8.D, page 314, DIF Page 212, reliabilities Page 328, reliabilities and SEMs on the theta scores for the various subgroups. Appendix 8.E page 379, contingency tables for both accuracy and consistency of the various achievement-level classifications. Error! Reference source not found. Page 221, correlations between scores on the ELA and mathematics tests. Appendix 8.F page 387, content area test score correlations by gender, ethnicity, English-language fluency, economic status, and migrant status.</p>	<p>Reliability estimates CAA 2015-16 Tech Manual p.212 ELA = 0.83-0.89 Math = 0.74-0.81</p> <p>Decision consistency and accuracy CAA 2015-16 Tech Manual p. 379-382, 0.68-0.81</p> <p>CA 2015-16 Tech Manual p.256-270 range of item difficulties by tier levels.</p> <p>There was no factor analysis or study of dimensionality to aid in reporting and interpretation.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for the CAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a study of dimensionality to aid in reporting and interpretation to document adequate validity. 		

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 align="center">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>CAA Technical Report, 2015–16, Evidence 61 Appendix 8.G, page 391, SSC analyses. Table 8.10 on pages 220–221, In general, students’ ELA scores correlated moderately with their mathematics scores. They are correlated more highly among students in lower grades than students in higher grades.</p> <p>Table 8.F.5 through Table 8.F.11, page 387 in Appendix 8.F, content area test score correlations by gender, ethnicity, English-language fluency, economic status, and migrant status.</p>	<p>CA 2015-16 Tech Manual p. 391 study regarding Survey of Student Characteristics</p> <p>Correlations between ELA and Math scores = 0.51-0.65</p> <p>CDE may wish to explore opportunities to conduct additional studies concerning the assessment scores and its relationship with other variables.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required for the CAA.</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

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 style="text-align: center;">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>Reliabilities, standard errors of measurement, decision classification analysis and other reliability analyses conducted by ETS.</p> <p>CAA Technical Report, 2015–16, Evidence 61</p> <p>-reliability estimates for the state’s student population overall and for each student group, page 210</p> <p>-Item analyses for each item in each grade and subject are presented in Appendix 8.A, page 226</p> <p>-Overall reliability estimates and standard errors of measurement for each subject and grade, Table 8.8</p> <p>-Summary Statistics for Scale Scores, Theta Scores, and Reliability, page 212</p> <p>-Scale Score Conditional Standard Errors of Measurement (CSEM) for the Achievement-level thresholds are presented in Table 8.9, page 212</p> <p>Appendix 8.E: Reliability, page 328–382, contains the following analyses for each subject and grade:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tables 8.E.1 to 8.E.14, Reliabilities and SEMs by subgroup, page 328–336. • Tables 8.E.15 to 8.E.56, Scale Score Conversion Tables with CSEMs by subject, grade, and pathway, page 337–378. • Tables 8.E.57 to 8.E.70 present decision accuracy and decision consistency by subject and grade, page 379. 	<p>Reliability on student population CA 2015-16 Tech Report p.210 ELA = 0.83-0.89 Math = 0.74-0.81 By student groups p. 329-336</p> <p>Overall and conditional standard error of measurement CA 2015-16 Tech Report, Tables 8.E.15-8.E.56</p> <p>Consistency at cut scores and achievement levels CA 2015-16 Tech Report, p.379-386</p> <p>Computer adaptive- produce forms with adequate estimates Accurate estimates from routing</p>
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required for the CAA.</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
------------------	--	--

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>CAA Technical Report, 2015–16, Evidence 61 data on the universal tools, designated supports, and accommodations employed, page 15 Appendix 2.C presents counts and percentages of CAA test takers afforded designated supports, accommodations, or unlisted resources for each subject and grade, as well as the numbers and percentages of students designated supports, accommodations, or unlisted resources, page 30 Note: universal tools are available to all students in the test delivery system, the use is not tracked. Subsection 8.5. Differential Item Functioning (DIF), page 207 Appendix 8.D, DIF analysis results page 314 Subsection 8.7.3.1. Analysis of Testing Time, pages 209–220 CAASPP Matrix One. Evidence 74 Embedded universal tools, designated supports, and accommodations listed in Parts 1 and 2 Non-embedded universal tools, designated supports, accommodations, and unlisted resources determined by IEP teams, Including an inventory of unlisted resources that have already been identified and are preapproved (CDE, 2016d)part 3. CAA Test Administration Manual, 2015–16, Evidence 62 Individual Student Assessment Accessibility Profile (ISAAP) Tool, Evidence 94 Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium’s Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Implementation Guide, 2015–16 Evidence 146</p>	<p>Design, Development and Analysis</p> <p>CA 2015-16 Tech Manual p. 30-33 includes data on the use of various supports Universal design strategies employed Usability Guide provides guidance on implementation DIF analyses</p> <p>Accessibility by test mode seemed to be an issue as reported by teachers. Teachers assessed students having difficulty using the computer, item formats, time limits, and reports of students being overwhelmed. Page 21 Focus Group. Evidence 67.</p>
<p>stemming from 2016 peer review:</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>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. <p>See SB Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for the CAA: Ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its 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.

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
------------------	--	--

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>CAA Technical Report, 2015–16, Evidence 61</p> <p>Section 4.2.1, two-stage MST design for the CAAs for English language arts (ELA) and mathematics based on performance on Stage 1, students are routed to one of three alternative modules at Stage 2 (easy, moderate, and hard) that is appropriate for their abilities, page 43</p> <p>Section 4.2.1.1 describes the characteristics of each tier, page 43</p> <p>Section 4.2.1.2 description of the test modules, page 43</p> <p>Section 4.2.1.3 description of the 8 pathways, page 44</p> <p>Section 4.2.4 routing rules, page 47</p> <p>Appendix 8E, Tables 8E-15 through table 8E-56, range of difficulty and conditional standard errors of measurement including raw score, theta, theta conditional standard error of measurement (CSEM), scale score, and scale score CSEM for each raw score point in each pathway, pages 337-378</p> <p>Appendix 8.G, Survey of Student Characteristics (SSC), pages 314–327.</p> <p>Tables 8.B.1 through Table 8.B.14 in Appendix – 8.B, the item difficulties for each item across grades for ELA and Math ,pages 256–270.</p> <p>Tables 8.B.15 through 8.B.16, Item Response Theory (IRT) Item Difficulty Summary by the Content Complexity (Tier) by subject, pages 271–272.</p> <p>Table 8.B.17 through Table 8.B.30, distribution of IRT Item Difficulty by Stage and Tier Set, pages 273–286.</p>	<p>The eight possible pathways can be regarded as multiple forms of a linear test.</p> <p>3 tiers of complexity of items to help capture full range</p> <p>Routing minimizes testing burden</p> <p>CA 2015-16 Tech Manual p.256-270 range of item difficulties by tier level.</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>Appendix 8.C, <u>pages 287-305</u>. Omission and Completion Analyses for each item by grade and subject.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tables 8.C.1 through 8.C.14, omit rate. • Tables 8.C.15 and 8.C.16, Average Number of Item Omits for Each Test Stage for ELA and Math by grade. 	
Section 4.3 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required for the CAA.		

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
------------------	--	--

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 style="text-align: center;">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>CAA Technical Report, 2015–16, Evidence 61 Derivation and treatment of student scores pages, 17–18.</p> <p>Rubric-based scoring/rating was done by the test examiner during the test administration, page 67. Section 7.1 Student Scores, scoring algorithm and procedures, pages 80–84. Rules for incomplete tests, page 82</p> <p>Section 8.3. IRT Analyses, pages 203–206.</p> <p>Section 5.2.9, testing irregularities pages 65–66,</p> <p>CAASPP 2016 Reporting Specifications, three critical steps in the reporting process which identify special condition codes, determine attemptedness/completeness status, and set include indicators. Evidence 70</p>	<p>ETS developed two parallel scoring systems to produce and verify students’ scores: the eSKM scoring system, which receives the individual students’ item scores and item responses from AIR and computes individual student scores for the ETS reporting system; and the work of the Statistical Analysis Team, which also computes individual student scores based on the same data files. The scores from the two systems are then compared for the purpose of internal quality control. Any differences in the total raw scores are discussed and resolved.</p> <p>Some rubric scoring is completed by the examiner but there is very little evidence provided for the quality of the scoring by the examiner.</p> <p>Are there any checks on the scoring or tryouts of the rubrics? Are there any plans to incorporate double scoring for a percentage or any other type of verification process.</p> <p>Machine scoring done by AIR, additional scoring and checking done by ETS CA 2015-16 Tech Manual p.80-84 – concurrent calibration, 1PL and GPCM</p>
<p>stemming from 2016 peer review (may be addressed by smarter balanced 2nd review notes)</p> <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 to ensure and document inter-rater reliability for States that are conducting hand-scoring of Smarter Balanced performance items. These criteria should include minimum thresholds for all States. • Evidence of procedures to ensure acceptable rates of inter-rater agreement for human scored test items. 		

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
		SB provided additional guidance and acceptable scoring rates. CA did not provide evidence of reliability human scoring.
Section 4.4 Summary Statement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for the CAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for the hand scored items. 		

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 style="text-align: center;">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>CAA Technical Report, 2015–16, Evidence 61 Chapter 4, test assembly process, page 42 Section 4.2 Test Design, pages 43–48 Table 4.1, total of eight possible forms each for ELA and mathematics, page 44 Figure 4.1 and Figure 4.2 graphically display the two-stage test designs for ELA and mathematics, pages 46–47.</p> <p>Chapter 4, meeting blueprint, page 42 and Table 4.A.1 through Table 4.A.14, pages 52–56.</p> <p>Appendix 4.B Routing Thresholds, pages 57–58.</p> <p>Table 8.B.15 and 8.B.16, Item Response Theory (IRT) item difficulty summaries by tier, pages 271–272].</p> <p>Table 8.B.17 through 8.B.30, distributions of IRT item difficulty by stage and tier, pages 273–286.</p> <p>Chapter 5, Test Administration, overview of administration processes with measures to ensure test security and maintain standardization. pages 59–73.</p>	<p>Design of the CAA assessments results in 8 different forms for each grade and subject- student’s final score is calculated by combining the student’s performance on items from both stages</p> <p>MST yields 8 possible forms per grade/subject area CA 2015-16 Tech Manual p.52-56 show content distribution across 8 forms, each form does not meet blueprint exactly, in some cases off by 19% (ELA, G6, R1ABE)</p> <p>Within a grade/subject area, it appears the form blueprints vary.</p> <p>Variability in the blueprints by form needs to be addressed. For example, ELA, G6, R1ABE. Peers understand that with the CAA test design, students receive varying numbers of items which impact exact adherence to the blueprints, however, rationale for deviations should be provided. Does the state have a policy to address variation from the blueprint?</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for the CAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations. 		

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 align="center">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>CAA Technical Report, 2015–16. Evidence 61 Guidelines for using the Print on Demand accommodation, page 27</p> <p>Appendix 2.C, Print on Demand is listed as a non-embedded resource in page 31.</p> <p>2015–16 CAASPP Pretest Administration Workshop Slides, Evidence 4</p> <p>Printers were also listed as a hardware requirement, Slide 43.</p>	<p>Administered one on one using a computer interface to present items and record responses, questions may be printed out for students to respond to but all responses are entered via computer</p> <p>List Print on Demand as the only other version. Not provided by the state but made possible based on student needs.</p> <p>Is the state tracking the number of print on demand tests and how does this impact overall test administration.</p> <p>No evidence provided of comparability</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u> X <u> </u> No additional evidence is required for the CAA.</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
------------------	--	--

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 style="text-align: center;">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>The ETS CAASPP Contract, 2015, Evidence 112 Section 2.3, process for “data driven improvement, page 17 ETS customer contact tracking system, page 22.</p> <p>Section 8.2, Analysis of Test Results, pages 122–127. Section 9.5, Technical Reports, expectations for the contents of the technical reports, pages 140–142. Section 9.6 Discussion of other analyses to be conducted in order to ensure continuous improvement of the system, page 142.</p> <p>CAA Technical Report, 2015–16, Evidence 61 Item Response Theory (IRT) Analyses, Appendix 8.B, page 256 Omission and Completion Analyses, Appendix 8.C, page 287 Reliability Analyses, Appendices 8.E, results of analyses on the reliability of performance classifications are presented in Table 8.E.57 through Table 8.E.70, pages 328-382. Table 8.8, reliability analyses on theta scores and scale scores for each test, page 211. Table 8.F.1 and Table 8.F.2, Testing time for each test pathway, pages 382-384. Table 8.F.3 and Table 8.F.4 total testing time and percentile information at each student performance quartile level, pages 385-386.</p> <p>Assessment Related Special Education Monitoring Data, Evidence 9</p> <p>CAASPP Technical Advisory Group, 2015–16 Evidence 86</p> <p>CAASPP TAG Agenda 10-15-15, Evidence 85</p>	<p>The CDE Special Education Division’s Complaint Resolution Unit. CDE stated that data was gathered related to those cases where state standardized assessment was the focal point of the complaint.</p> <p>Analysis of the results of the monitoring visits would provide information for ongoing maintenance. However, it was not clear to peers if or how this was implemented.</p> <p>ETS contract requires 100 site visits. CA 2015-16 Tech Manual includes several types of analyses: IRT, omission and completion rates, reliability analyses, test time. Information about what was done with the analyses or if it was used to implement any changes.</p> <p>TAG meets at least 3 times annually.</p> <p>It wasn’t evident on how these pieces of information are coherently applied for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system. How is the state using the information from the studies to improve the quality of the system. For example, will the results of the focus group be used to redesign the training for teachers.</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>CAA standard setting and routing thresholds CAASPP CDE Weekly Meeting Agenda 10132015, Evidence 71 ETS provides the CDE with detailed information on issues and issue resolution, page 5.</p> <p>CAASPP 2016 Independent Evaluation Report, Evidence 68. Pages 84-102 and pages 120-128 CAASPP 2016 Focus Group Report Evidence 67</p> <p>CAASPP 2016 Post-Test Survey and Focus Group Report, Evidence 69 summarizes responses related to technology as well as test examiner and student experiences, pages 38–42</p>	

Section 4.7 Summary Statement

 X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for the CAA:

- Evidence of a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system.

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
------------------	--	--

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 style="text-align: center;">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; • Includes instructions that students eligible to be 	<p>California <i>Education Code (EC)</i> sections and regulations, which specify the requirements for including students with disabilities (SWDs) in the CAA assessments. Test administration manuals, test coordinator manuals, training materials, instructions to individualized education program (IEP) teams, and communications to the field regarding the inclusion of SWDs.</p> <p>CAA Web page, Evidence 66.</p> <p>resources for IEP teams to use in making and documenting this decision, describes the CAA and its administration, criteria for participation CAA Guidance for IEP Teams, Evidence 47.</p> <p>2015–16 CAA Test Administration Workshop Slides. Evidence 3</p> <p>CAA Test Administration Manual, 20015–16, page 2. Evidence 62</p> <p>CAA Participation Decision Worksheet Evidence 52</p> <p>CAA Fact Sheet for ELA and Math Evidence 44</p> <p>CAA Parent-Guardian’s Guide Evidence 51.</p> <p>CAA Technical Report, 2015–16 Evidence 61 Appendix 2.B. Data are sorted by demographic group for each grade/content area, page 22.</p> <p>California <i>Education Code (EC)</i> 60604 defines provisions for the design and implementation of the statewide pupil assessment system. Evidence 96,97,98</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>EC Section 60604.5</i> • EC Section 60640 established the CAASPP system • EC sections 60641–60649 established 	<p>The following information was available as guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams:</p> <p>Differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic CAA Guidance for IEP Teams, Evidence 47. CAA Participation Decision Worksheet Evidence 52</p> <p>Decisions about how to assess and determining which assessment CAA Participation Decision Worksheet Evidence 52</p> <p>Information on Accessibility Tools and selection of appropriate accommodations and general curriculum CAA Test Administration Manual, 20015–16, page 2. Evidence 62</p> <p>CAA Guidance for IEP Teams, Evidence 47 page 1</p> <p>Parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed of possible consequences in the IEP guidance for teams but no verification that parents receive this information. CAA Guidance for IEP Teams, Evidence 47 page 1</p> <p>CAA Parent-Guardian’s Guide Evidence 51. Does not address consequences.</p> <p>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</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>assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>requirements for various aspects of the system</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EC Section 60640(k) compliance with Title 20 of the United States Code, ensuring that individual with exceptional needs shall be included in the testing requirement, with appropriate accommodations in administration and that those unable to participate in the regular test, even with accommodations, shall be given an alternate assessment. EC Section 60641(a)(1) general provision for testing all students. EC Section 60649(a) independent evaluation of the CAASPP system, including the CAAs, to include a studies specific to pupil populations, such as pupils with disabilities 	<p>content area on the State’s general assessments” was not provided for parents.</p>
<p>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for the CAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence 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). 		

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
------------------	--	--

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 align="center">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>Title 5, Chapter 2, Subchapter 3.75 CAASPP Article 1 of the California Code of Regulations, Title 5 (5 CCR), Education, section 850-868, defines accommodations and expresses California commitment to providing accommodations to students with disabilities and Els. Evidence 96.</p> <p>CAA Test Administration Manual, 2015–16, Evidence 62, page 15</p> <p>CAASPP Matrix One Evidence 74.</p> <p>Matrix One: Universal Tools, Designated Supports, and Accommodations for the CAASPP System</p> <p>A LEA CAASPP coordinator, a CAASPP test site coordinator, or the test examiner may submit a request using forms available in TOMS to request unlisted supports. The support must be specified in the eligible student’s IEP and only may be assigned with the CDE’s approval, page 8</p> <p>Directions for CAA Administration, Evidence 105</p>	<p>Every pretest workshop included information about the provision of supports and accommodations for SWDs including ELs</p> <p>Directions for CAA Administration outline universal tools available (both embedded and non-embedded)</p> <p>CAASPP Eye Gaze Guidance</p> <p>Selection and assignment of accommodations and supports:</p> <p>CAA Test Administration Manual</p> <p>Usability Guide</p> <p>Resources and Practices Comparison Crosswalk</p> <p>Archived webcasts</p> <p>Process to individually review exceptional requests CAA Test Administration Manual, 2015–16, Evidence 62, page 15, 20</p> <p>Unlisted resources, previously called <i>individualized aids</i>, must be requested in the TOMS.</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>CAA Technical Report, 2015–16, Evidence 61</p> <p>Appendix 2.C, numbers and percentages of students page 30</p> <p>CAASPP TOMS Online Student Test Settings, 2015–16. Evidence 88, Instructions, on page 26. Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Implementation Guide Evidence 146.</p> <p>The Resources-and-Practices-Comparison-Crosswalk Evidence 126</p> <p>CAASPP Eye Gaze Guidance, Evidence 72 2015–16 Archived CAASPP Videos and Resources). Evidence 2. Demonstration of the ISAAP tool</p>	
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required on the CAA.		

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
------------------	--	--

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 align="center">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>CAASPP 2016 Independent Evaluation Report Evidence 68 Access to Designated Supports and Accommodations Study conducted in 2015–16 pages 84-102 and pages 120-128</p> <p>CAASPP TOMS Online Student Test Settings, 2015–16 Evidence 88 CAASPP Instructions and Manuals Web page.</p> <p>ETS CAASPP Contract, 2015 Evidence 112. Section 4.2 (pages 53-56) ELs</p> <p>CAA Technical Report 2015-16, Evidence 61 Sections 1.9.1 and 1.9.2, students progress through test, pages 6 and 7.</p> <p>CAASPP Site Visit Report 2016. Evidence 81. Monitoring</p> <p>CAASPP Update, Issue 96 Evidence 92, discusses the upcoming administration of the CAA assessments CAASPP Update, Issue 104 Evidence 90, notifies testing window closing with over 6,000 tests not completed with only 10 days left.</p> <p>CAASPP 2016 Post-Test Survey and Focus Group Results Evidence 69 includes information about administration of the CAA assessments Pages 38 to 42</p> <p>Assessment Related Special Education Monitoring Data Evidence 9, cases where state assessments were the focal point of the complaint.</p> <p>CASEMIS Technical Assistance Guide Evidence 99. Relays information about assessment requirements</p>	<p>The CAASPP assessment delivery contractor, Educational Testing Service (ETS), is required to conduct monitoring visits to at least 100 LEAs to ensure that tests are administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</p> <p>The Special Education Compliance Monitoring Survey for 2016 (currently unavailable) included questions pertaining to assessment, but no document was provided to verify the application of the survey.</p> <p>CAASPP Site Visit Report 2016 – Provides outcome of each visit at a high level. No detail about what or how was done or any reference to the CAA monitoring. Most of the responses reflect irregularities in test security and do not relate to accommodations for SWD.</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
	to special education administrators Appendix C, page 137.	

stemming from 2016 peer review
 For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), CDE must provide:

- 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.

Section 5.4 Summary Statement

 X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for the CAA:
 Evidence that the State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations that are:

- Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;
- Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;
- Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;
- Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;
- Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures

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
------------------	--	--

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>6.1 – 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>California <i>Education Code (EC)</i> Section 60648 states, “... the state board shall adopt, performance standards on the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress summative tests administered pursuant to this article. The performance levels shall identify and establish the minimum performance required for meeting a particular achievement level expectation.”</p> <p>CA State Board of Education, April 2016 Information Memorandum</p> <p>The April 2016 SBE Information Memorandum outlines the process used to develop the content-specific PLDs. Evidence 27</p> <p>CA State Board of Education Meeting, May 2016 Agenda, Item 7, Evidence 20</p> <p>CA State Board of Education Meeting, May 2016 Minutes, page 10. Evidence 21</p> <p>California State Board of Education (SBE) adopted the California Alternate Assessment performance level descriptors for ELA and mathematics as well as the CAA student score reports.</p> <p>CAA PLD Web site detailed description of performance level descriptors (PLDs)</p> <p>http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/caapld.asp.</p>	<p>The adopted performance level descriptors were subsequently used in the August 2016 standard setting meetings to anchor the standard setting process used to determine the threshold scores for the achievement levels.</p> <p>CA Board of Ed April 2016 Info Memo – Outlines process used to develop PLDs</p> <p>CA Board of Ed May 2016 Agenda and Minutes – Adoption of the PLDs</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required for the CAA.</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

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 align="center">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>Standard Setting Technical Report for the California Alternate Assessments, Evidence 131.</p> <p>September 2016 Agenda, Item 4. Evidence 25. Vote to approve the achievement levels for the English language arts/literacy and mathematics assessments that were recommended by the CDE following the Standard Setting Panel Meetings held August 16-26, 2016.</p> <p>September 2016 Meeting Minutes, page 8 Evidence 26 provides record of the vote.</p> <p>Standard Setting Tech Report CA Board of Ed Sept 2016 meeting agenda & minutes</p>	<p>Educational Testing Service (ETS) conducted standard-setting workshops in Sacramento, California, for the grades three through eight and grade eleven ELA and mathematics CAAs on August 16–19 (ELA) and August 22–26, 2016 (mathematics). Standard setting for ELA was conducted in week one and mathematics was conducted in week two. The Bookmark standard-setting method was applied to all items on each test, by grade. Eight panels of educators participated in the workshop; each panel worked on two tests except for grade eleven ELA and grade eleven mathematics. The panelists had appropriate experience and expertise for setting academic achievement standards.</p> <p>In standard setting report, Tables 6 and 9 would be more helpful if the theta values were reported for the cuts instead of reporting on a scale that isn't used. Since this was not reported, a discussion and rationale on how and why this was used.</p> <p>What is the relationship between the Level 2 cut score and the Stage 2 routing? Can a student achieve Level 2 if they stop testing at a particular point? Is that known to teachers?</p>
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for the CAA.</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>NCSC Writing Claims and Prioritized CCCs (Draft) Evidence 122</p> <p>CAA 2015-16 Technical Report. Evidence 61. CAA item development, page 34 Description of the development of the scale scores and achievement levels for the CAAs, page 80 Description of the standard-setting process used to determine scale scores and achievement levels, page 74</p> <p>CA State Board of Education, April 2016 Information Memorandum, Attachment 1. Evidence 27 The California Alternate Assessments Content-specific Performance Level Descriptor Development Report Evidence</p> <p>CAA Performance Level Descriptors for ELA, and CAA Performance Level Descriptors for Mathematics were adopted by the State Board of Education at their May 2016 board meeting Evidence 19</p> <p>Standard Setting Technical Report for the California Alternate Assessments Evidence 131.</p>	<p>Three achievement levels (Level 1—Alternate, Level 2—Alternate, and Level 3—Alternate) were developed to describe student performance on the CAAs in CAASPP reporting. Development of the achievement levels was informed primarily by the CCCs and EUs</p>
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required for the CAA.</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
------------------	--	--

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 style="text-align: center;">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>CAA Test Results Web Page Evidence 64</p> <p>Secure sites for districts- the Test Operations Management System (TOMS), the Online Reporting System (ORS)</p> <p>CAA Technical Report, 2015–16, Evidence 61 Section 7.3, Overview of Reporting, page 88. Statewide results are presented by subject and grade. Appendix 74.A, 7.B, and 7.C, pages 93–167. Demographic subgroup summary reports Appendix 7.D, pages 168–195. Procedures to calculate, pages 88-91.</p> <p>CAASPP 2016 Reporting Specifications. Evidence 70 Detailed specifications for online reporting Understanding the CAA Summary Reports Evidence 133. Interpretive information regarding the online reports is directly available</p> <p>2015–16 CAASPP Pretest Administration Workshop Slides, Evidence 3 Slide 112. Reporting Schedule</p> <p>CAA Post-Test Webcast Slides, November 2016 slide deck presents the reporting timeline.</p> <p>CAASPP Update, Issue 104, Evidence 90 CAA Web Page and CAA Test Results Web Page is used for public reporting.</p> <p>CAA 2016 Results – All Students Evidence 135-144 provides example reports from the public reporting Web site.</p> <p>CAA Post-Test Webcast Slides, November 2016 Evidence 55.</p>	<p><u>Data are redacted for reporting units made up of 10 or fewer students</u></p> <p>Public reporting webpage Percent per level Percent tested</p> <p>Online systems for LEAs and school systems</p> <p>Student score report Letter to parents Understanding your score report in several languages</p> <p>Reporting done in November for 2015 -16 and the 2016-17 School Years. This would not be an acceptable timeline for future years to inform parents and teachers.</p> <p>The ETS contract identifies that within 2 to 3 weeks after the student completes the testing, reports will be available. After 6 weeks of completing the printed version of the test, reports will be available. During the 2015-16 and 2016-17 school years, there was a delay in reporting because of post equating so the expectation is that results will be available according to the timelines outlined in the contract.</p> <p>Availability in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) was not discussed in the reporting section.</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>All data presented in ORS is considered preliminary until the testing window closes and all appeals have been closed. In mid-November of 2016, ETS provided a post-test reporting webcast.</p> <p>CAASPP Online Reporting System Guide July 2016 Evidence 75</p> <p>Examples for review include ORS LEA Dashboard Evidence 123 ORS LEA School Evidence 125 School Ethnicity Evidence 124 CAA Student Score Report to Parents Evidence 56</p> <p>CAASPP Post-Test Guide Technical Information for Student Score Reports– Evidence 77</p> <p>Chapter II.5 (pages 48-53) displays the Student Score Reports grades three, four, six, seven, and grade 11</p> <p>Chapter II.6 (pages 54-61) <u>results for grades five and eight</u></p> <p>Appendix A (page 70) <u>achievement level score ranges for ELA and mathematics.</u></p> <p>Appendix A (page 90) <u>displays an additional communication toolkit resource for the CAA</u></p> <p>CAA Student Score Report to Parents Evidence 58</p> <p>CAA Score Report Letter to Parents template, Evidence 56</p> <p>Samples of reports, Evidence 134-137</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding Your CAA Score Report, Grades Three Through Eleven Understanding Your CAA Score Report, Grades Three Through Eleven—Spanish Understanding Your CAA Score Report, Grades Five and Eight Understanding Your CAA Score Report, 	<p>Parents</p> <p>Individual student score reports, digital and paper copies were sent by ETS to LEAs in mid-November 2016. Normally, the ETS contract specifies that score reports should be delivered no later than three weeks after a student completes an examination. However, for 2015-16 and 2016-17 the CAA examinations were post equated, leading to a delay in the release of reports.</p> <p>Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.</p> <p>Example ? and how many requests?</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 align="center">Grades Five and Eight—Spanish</p> <p>The guides are translated into seven other languages commonly spoken by parents in California, Evidence 138-144</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding Your CAA SSR, Grade 11, Armenian (Eastern) • Understanding Your CAA SSR, Grade 11, Chinese (simplified) • Understanding Your CAA SSR, Grade 11, Chinese (traditional) • Understanding Your CAA SSR, Grade 11, Hmong • Understanding Your CAA SSR, Grade 11, Korean • Understanding Your CAA SSR, Grade 11, Tagalog • Understanding Your CAA SSR, Grade 11, Vietnamese 	
<p>stemming from 2016 peer review:</p> <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 or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand. 		
<p>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for the CAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) • Timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 		

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

February 201 State Assessment Peer Review Notes

(resubmission of evidence based on 2016 Peer Review)



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 Assessment Consortium

Contents

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	3
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	4
2.2 – Item Development.....	6
2.3 – Test Administration	7
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....	8
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	9
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	11
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	12
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	13
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	13
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	14
4.4 – Scoring	15
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	16
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	17
5.3 – Accommodations.....	18

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 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 Assessment Consortium

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

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

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all 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 Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>(stemming from 2016 review)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 and mathematics at each grade level. 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). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Evidence #S021</i> – Evaluating Alignment in Large-Scale Standards-Based Assessment Systems Evidence #S022 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Common Core State Standards Analysis: Eligible Content for the Summative Assessment, Final Report <i>Evidence #S023</i> – Race to the Top Application for New Grants Comprehensive Assessment Systems (p. 41) Evidence #12b – Smarter Balanced Content Specifications for Mathematics <i>Evidence #S024</i> – PCG - Claim/Target and Common Core Standard Associations Data Input Specifications Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity <i>Evidence #S029</i> – Summary of Smarter Balanced CAT Algorithm on Depth of Knowledge 	<p>Peers felt that S021 was not relevant for this request.</p> <p>S022 was previously provided and calls out 48 (R/LA) and 3 (Mathematics) standards as “not measurable.” However, they were judged “not measurable” using the item types proposed by SBAC: “A standard was considered measurable via on-demand summative assessment tasks if it can be assessed by any of the item types listed in the following subsection, as defined in the SBAC proposal (SBAC, 2010b, pp. 42, 52–53).” (p.9) Page 6 lists the item types. Peers feel that the standards should drive the item types / components of the assessment system. It seemed, however, that the item types were determining the assessable content, rather than the standards determining the item types / components. Regulation and Guidance clearly state “full depth and breadth for all of the academic standards.”</p> <p>S023 includes a statement of intent, not evidence for this CE.</p> <p>S024 described the new coding scheme for the items. Peers felt it was not relevant.</p> <p>Suggestion: SBAC might provide evidence of how the other components of the assessment system (formative, interim, benchmark) cover the standards deemed ineligible for the summative, AND that the states using the SBAC incorporate those other elements meaningfully into their assessment system. (That is, those other elements contribute to scores / performance levels.)</p> <p>Peers commend SBAC for conducting a thorough blueprint fidelity study, and for taking measures to correct the error identified for Grade 6 Math. We would like to see the blueprint fulfillment rates at the student level, in addition to the claim / content category level, as presented in S010a. In other words, we’d like data answering the question, “What percent of students received a test event conforming to the blueprint?,” rather than “What percent of test events fulfilled blueprint requirement X?”</p> <p>Peers feel that 100% blueprint fulfillment (at the student level) is implied by this CE. A reason for less than 100% blueprint fulfillment may reside in the way in the which algorithm treats blueprint fulfillment as described in S029 – that is, not as an absolute constraint.</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 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 Assessment Consortium

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"> 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 items. Evidence that the item pools for all versions of the assessments (i.e., general, American Sign Language, Braille and Spanish) are sufficient to support the test design requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Evidence #S023</i> – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Race to the Top Grant Proposal (pp. 45-46) Evidence #S025 – Smarter Balanced Mathematics Expanded Item Pools <i>Evidence #S026</i> – Pool Expansion Information Presentation Evidence #S027 – 2016-17 Expanded Pool Standards Alignment Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity <i>Evidence Packet #S012</i> – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses <i>S013</i> 	<p>This requirement is met.</p> <p>Peers would have appreciated a clarification that when expanded pool items are used, that the relevant psychometric considerations are being addressed – e.g., that item parameters used are established for all grades spanned.</p> <p>Peers noted that several items span a relatively large grade range (roughly 20% in MA and 13% in R/LA span 3 or more grades). (Peer calculations based on S027). This seemed high.</p> <p>Peers commend SBAC for producing the gap analyses (S012). Peers believe that steps taken to bridge the gaps as described in S013 should resolve the issues.</p> <p>Peers ask that the program continue to monitor those grades/versions where blueprint fulfillment was less than 100%, as well as those where there had yet to be administrations.</p>
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Evidence that the Smarter Balanced test design aligns the assessments to the full depth and breadth for all the academic content standards in R/LA and mathematics at each grade level. B. 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). C. Evidence that the item pools for all versions of the assessments (i.e., general, American Sign Language, Braille and Spanish) are sufficient to support the test design requirements. Provide, upon completion of the item development plans, evidence that 100% of test events for students receiving any version of the assessment conform to the test blueprints. 		

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 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 Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">2.2 – Item Development (stemming from 2016 review)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See evidence regarding DOK and item pools in element 2.1 above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Evidence #15a</i> – Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment Blueprints for Mathematics <i>Evidence #15b – Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment Blueprints for ELA/L</i> <i>Evidence #S008</i> – Smarter Balanced Math Summative CAT and Interim Assessment Item Development Plan <i>Evidence #S009 – Smarter Balanced ELA Summative CAT and Interim Assessment Item Development Plan</i> <i>Evidence Packet #S010</i> – Smarter Balanced Blueprint Fidelity Study <i>Evidence Packet #S012 – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses</i> <i>Evidence #S013</i> – Gap Analysis and Development Plans <i>Evidence Packet #S014 – Member Managed Item Development Assignments</i> <i>Evidence #S029</i> – Summary of Smarter Balanced CAT Algorithm on Depth of Knowledge 	<p>The item selection procedures for the CAT should result in test events that, for every student and for all versions of the assessments, meet all blueprint constraints.</p> <p>See Comments on 2.1, bullets 2 and 4.</p>
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> </u>x The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See 2.1 B and C. 		

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 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 Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>(stemming from 2016 review-individual States may provide own evidence to address this item)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of contingency plans to address potential technology issues during test administration 	<p>No evidence provided.</p>	<p><u>Peers assume this evidence is provided by States using Smarter Balanced.</u></p>
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence from States using SBAC is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of contingency plans to address potential technology issues during test administration. 		

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 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 Assessment Consortium

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all 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 Assessment Consortium

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 (stemming from 2016 peer review)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence as noted for all item pools in element 2.1 above. • Evidence of a summary report that the CAT administered test forms matched test blueprints. • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #S005 – Hawaii Smarter Balanced Technical Report, 2014-2015 (pp. 42-46) • Evidence #S006 – South Dakota Technical Report 2014-2015 (pp. 44-49) • Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity • Evidence Packet #012 – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses • Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity • Evidence #S011 – Smarter Balanced Technical Report, 2015-2016 (pp. 6-6 through 6-9) • Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity • Evidence #S030 – WestEd Alignment Study Proposal • Evidence #S032 – WestEd Alignment Study • Evidence #104 – Fordham Institute – Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation Assessments (p. 18) • Evidence #S008 – Smarter Balanced Math Summative CAT and Interim Assessment Item 	<p>See Comments in 2.1.</p> <p>See Comments in 2.1, bullets 2 and 4. The evidence was provided but it does not support the claim that the CAT administered test forms matched the test blueprints in every case.</p> <p>This evidence has been provided. See Comment in 2.1, bullet 3.</p> <p>The WestEd alignment study (S032) assessed the extent to which each item in the noted grades matched its targeted CCSS standard. However, for DoK (cognitive complexity), the study did not assess the extent to which each item matched the cognitive complexity implied by its targeted standard. Rather, it documented experts’ judgments of the level of cognitive complexity at which the item appears to be assessing the standard. The study’s design can furnish appropriate evidence to support (or refute) a claim concerning the degree of content alignment between items and standards, but it cannot provide appropriate evidence for a claim about the match between the cognitive complexity of a test and the cognitive complexity of the standards to which the test is written.</p> <p>Peers felt that the study does not address the question “Does the item match the DoK of the standard?”</p> <p>The measures taken to improve alignment are entirely appropriate. However, evidence of <i>improved</i> alignment was not provided. Peers expected to see a before-after comparison.</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 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 Assessment Consortium

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"> Evidence of improved alignment of the tests, based upon the findings of the independent alignment study. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Plan <i>Evidence Packet #S010</i> – Blueprint Fidelity Evidence Packet #S012 – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses <i>Evidence #S013</i> – Gap Analysis and Development Plans Evidence Packet #S014 – Member-Managed Assignments <i>Evidence Packet #S015</i> – Member-Managed Item Development Training 	
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> </u>x<u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See 2.1 B and C. Evidence of alignment of sample test forms for grades 3, 4, 6 and 7 in R/LA and mathematics, specifically with respect to cognitive complexity (DoK). Evidence of improved alignment of the tests, based upon the findings of the independent alignment study. 		

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 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 Assessment Consortium

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 (stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level data)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that supports the internal structure of the Smarter Balanced assessments using operational data from the summative assessments (e.g., a correlational analysis of subscores and total scores). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Evidence #S004</i> - Assessing the Dimensionality of Smarter Balanced Summative Tests (pp. 2-4). 	<p>S004 provides the evidence requested.</p> <p>Recommendation: Peers recognize the challenge of assessing dimensionality using item scores in a CAT context; SBAC could contribute meaningfully to the literature on this topic by taking it on as a special research study.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> No additional evidence is required</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 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 Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>(stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level data)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validity evidence that shows the Smarter Balanced assessment scores are related as expected with other variables for all student groups (e.g., comparison of subscore relationships within content areas to those across content areas; a confirmatory factor analysis of math & R/LA together; or other analyses that demonstrate positive correlations between assessment results and external measures that assess similar constructs). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence #S004 – Assessing the Dimensionality of Smarter Balanced Summative Test (pp. 2-5) Evidence #S005 – Hawaii Smarter Balanced Technical Report, 2014-2015 (pp. 48-50) Evidence #S006 – South Dakota Technical Report, 2014-2015 (pp. 53-55) Evidence #S007 – Dimensionality of the SBAC: An argument for its validity Evidence #S031 – South Dakota BOR Policy 	<p>Peers appreciated the concurrent validity studies for high school R/LA and Math (S005 and S006). We believe that these studies help establish external validity evidence for the program.</p> <p>However, no evidence of validity based on relationships with other variables was provided for Grades 3-8 Math and R/LA.</p> <p>Please provide the results of a study or studies addressing this CE, such as correlations between SBAC scores and grades or correlations between SBAC adjacent grade scores.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validity evidence that shows the Smarter Balanced assessment scores are related as expected with other variables for all student groups for Grades 3-8 R/LA and Math. 		

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 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 Assessment Consortium

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>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility (stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level data)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of estimated reliability for students receiving accommodations using operational data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Evidence #S011 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Draft 2015-16 Technical Report</u>, Chapter 2 <i>Index</i> 	<p>Estimated reliabilities for the tests administered to these students are in the Index in Tables 11.1 and 11.2. Peers note that a few of the coefficients are low enough to raise concerns.</p> <p>It would be helpful in evaluating Tables 11.1 and 11.2 to know the source(s) of the data.</p> <p>Peers request a clarification about how item development plans (S013) specifically address the pool factors that are related to the low reliabilities for special versions of the test.</p> <p>Peers are also concerned by the statement in the Index “Students with lower scores have lower reliability than those with higher scores.” (p. 57). We were not sure that it was accurate.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peers request a clarification about how item development plans (S013) specifically address the pool factors that are related to the low reliabilities for special versions of the test. 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all 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 Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>(stemming from 2016 peer review)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See evidence regarding DOK and item pools in element 2.1 above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Evidence #015a</i> – Final Blueprint for Mathematics Summative Assessment <i>Evidence #015b</i> – Final Blueprint for ELA/L Summative Assessment <i>Evidence Packet #S010</i> – Smarter Balanced Blueprint Fidelity Study <i>Evidence #S011</i> – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Technical Report, 2015-2016 <i>Evidence Packet #S012</i> – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses 	<p>See Comments for 2.1.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>x<u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See 2.1 B and C. 		

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 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 Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>(stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level evidence)</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 that the State has monitored the quality and reliability of performance task scoring conducted during its test administration for the Smarter Balanced tests. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence #065a – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium: State Procedures Manual, 2014 Evidence #S001 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium: Member Procedures Manual, 2016 <p style="text-align: center;">No evidence cited.</p>	<p>Peers appreciate the new guidance provided by the Consortium (S001). We believe the evidence requested was provided.</p> <p>Peers’ understanding is that this evidence is to be provided by States using Smarter Balanced.</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence from States using SBAC is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the State has monitored the quality and reliability of performance task scoring conducted during its test administration for the Smarter Balanced tests. 		

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 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 Assessment Consortium

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 (stemming from 2016 peer review)</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 ASL (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); and ○ paper in Spanish (math). • Evidence that item pools for these above-listed additional computer adaptive versions can support the adaptive test design. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Evidence #011a</i> – Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines • Evidence #143 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium: Signing Guidelines • <i>Evidence Packet #S010</i> – Blueprint Fidelity Studies • Evidence #144 – Unified English Braille Implementation Guide • <i>Evidence #146</i> – Theory of Test Translation Error • Evidence #S011 – Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment Technical Report, 2015-2016 • <i>Evidence Packet #S012</i> – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses • Evidence #S013 – Gap Analysis and Development Plans • <i>Evidence #S016</i> – Literature Review of Testing Accommodations and Accessibility Tools for Students with Disabilities • Evidence #S017 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Style Guide • <i>Evidence #S018</i> – Tri-Lin Proposal Response to Smarter Balanced RFP 13 • Evidence #S019 – Grade 8 Mathematics Item Specifications Claim 1 Target A 	<p>See Comments in 2.1 and 4.2.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>x The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Comments in 2.1 B and C, and 4.2. 		

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 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 Assessment Consortium

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 (stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level evidence)</p> <p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #11a – Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines (p. 11; pp. 32-33) • Evidence #68 – Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Implementation Guide • Evidence #69h – Accessibility and Accommodations Training Module (Slide 59) • Evidence #99 – Resources and Practices Comparison Crosswalk (p. 4) • Evidence #127 – ISAAP Training Module Screenshot • Evidence #S002 – UAAG Survey • Evidence #S003 – Including All Students in Assessments Digital Library Module • Evidence #S020 – Template Letter for Parents of English Learners 	<p>The SBAC response shows where to locate evidence of the guidance in the original submission, and evidence of communication of this guidance to school personnel. Provision of #S020 shows evidence of communication of this guidance to parents.</p> <p><u>The Peers understand that provision of greater specificity beyond the guidance provided by SBAC is a State level responsibility for any State using SBAC.</u></p>
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>x<u> </u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p> <p><u> </u>x<u> </u> The following additional evidence from States using SBAC is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of guidance regarding selection of the Spanish version of the Smarter Balanced assessments for English learners at a level of specificity such that an educator can apply the decision for an individual student. 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all 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 Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">5.3 – Accommodations (stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level evidence)</p> <p>Evidence of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</p>		<p>SBAC did not provide evidence for this request.</p> <p><u>Peers’ understanding is that States using Smarter Balanced are to provide this evidence.</u></p>
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence from States using SBAC is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 		

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 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.