



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Katy Anthes
Commissioner of Education
Colorado Department of Education,
201 East Colfax Avenue, Room 500
Denver, CO 80203

January 6, 2017

Dear Commissioner Anthes:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) maintains the essential requirements from NCLB that each State annually administer high-quality assessments in at least reading/language arts, mathematics, and science that meet nationally recognized professional and technical standards. Therefore, as you know, the Department reinstated peer review of State assessment systems so that each State receives feedback from external experts on the assessments it is currently administering. We appreciate the efforts required to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in April and June 2016. State assessment systems provide essential information that States, districts, principals, and teachers can use to identify the academic needs of students, target resources and supports toward students who need them most, evaluate school and program effectiveness, and close achievement gaps among students. A high-quality assessment system also provides useful information to parents about their child's advancement against and achievement of grade-level standards. The Department's peer review of State assessment systems is designed to provide feedback to States to support the development and administration of high-quality assessments.

On October 6, 2016, the Department sent a letter to chief State school officers outlining the outcomes for States related to the assessment peer review. I am writing to provide you feedback on Colorado Department of Education's (CDE) recent submission of evidence. External peer reviewers and Department staff evaluated Colorado's submission and found, based on the evidence received, that the components of your 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 (the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC)): **Substantially meets requirements**
- R/LA and mathematics general assessments in high school (PARCC): **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 alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) (Dynamic Learning Maps, Year-End Model (DLM-YE)) in grades 3-8 and high school: **Substantially meets requirements**
- General science assessments in grades 5 and 8 (Colorado Measures of Academic Success (CMAS)): **Substantially meets requirements**
- General science assessments in high school (CMAS): **Substantially meets requirements.**
- Science AA-AAAS for grades 3-5, 6-8, and high school (Colorado Alternate (CoAlt)) **Substantially meets requirements.**

Substantially meets requirements means that these components meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The Department expects that CDE should be able to provide this additional information within one year. Within 30 days of receiving the peer review determination letter, CDE must submit a plan and timeline outlining when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. If adequate progress is not made towards meeting the remaining requirements, the Department may take additional action.

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

Thank you for your ongoing commitment to improving educational outcomes for all students. I look forward to our continued partnership as we move ahead with this critical work. I appreciate the work you are doing to improve your schools and provide a high-quality education for your students. If you have any questions, please contact Cynthia Wright or Elizabeth Witt of my staff at: OSS.Colorado@ED.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

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

Enclosures

cc: Patrick Chapman, Executive Director, Federal Programs Unit
Joyce Zurkowski, Executive Director, Assessment Unit

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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<p>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</p>	<p>CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of policies to ensure that students placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services are included in the assessment system. • Evidence of policies and procedures that guide districts in determining, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, for a student taking a native language assessment.
<p>2.1 – Test Design and Development</p>	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the assessment design measures the full breadth and depth of the State’s academic content standards, including the speaking and listening aspect of the standards. <p>For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the assessment design measures the State’s academic content standards, including the language domain, or presents an explanation as to why this domain was not included.
<p>2.2 – Item Development</p>	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC). CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information about the composition and credentials of content and bias/sensitivity reviewers. Specifically, information about the subject area specialization of content and bias/sensitivity reviewers on this panel (grade level, general or special education specialization, English learner specialization).
<p>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</p>	<p>For the science AA-AAAS for grades 5, 8, and high school (CoAlt), CDE must submit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State conducted monitoring of the CoAlt test administration in 2014-15 to ensure that standardized test administration procedures for this assessment were implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p>	<p>CDE must submit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that State policies regarding minimum cell sizes for reporting are enforced across all test score reporting processes and reporting products.
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p>	<p>For the science assessments in grades 5, 8 and high school (CMAS), CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional alignment evidence that indicates the identified alignment deficiencies have been resolved.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>For the science AA-AAAS in grades 5, 8 and high school (CoAlt), CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional alignment evidence that indicates the identified alignment deficiencies have been resolved. <p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional alignment evidence that addresses grades 3, 4, 6, and 7 in both content areas. • Alignment evidence that supports a test design that assesses the full range of the State’s academic content standards is needed for all tested grades (including speaking and listening as previously noted in 2.1).
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional evidence, such as cognitive lab studies, that address the cognitive processes and cognitive complexity required by the standards across grades and content areas.
4.1 – Reliability	<p>For the CoAlt Science, CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence it has addressed issue of low classification consistency for the test. <p>For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of monitoring and refinement of the diagnostic classification models from subsequent test administrations.
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility	<p>For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the development and selection of reading passages that includes information about steps that test developers have taken to ensure reading passages are accessible to students with significant cognitive disabilities. • Evidence of the development and selection and/or creation of graphic components in the assessment (e.g., drawn or photographed images) that includes information about steps that test developers have taken to ensure passages from general grade-level texts are made accessible to students with significant cognitive disabilities.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cumulative frequency distributions across raw score/scale scores, that include the number and percentage of students scored at each raw/scale score point.
4.4 – Scoring	<p>For the science CoAlt assessments in grades 3-8 and high school, CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that demonstrates a rationale for the design of the CoAlt scoring rubric as a measure of student content mastery. • Evidence of training provided to test administrators on the use of the CoAlt scoring rubric. <p>For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of monitoring procedures used for scoring DLM-YE writing items, including measures of inter-rater reliability.
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	<p>For the CMAS Science assessments in all grades:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that computer and paper versions of the assessment yield comparable interpretations of results. <p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of continued mode comparability studies.
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	<p>For all subject areas of the AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school, CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of State and local policies that communicate the implications of a student’s participation in an AA-AAAS and; • Evidence of how parents of these children are informed of these implications.
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs	<p>For the CMAS and CoAlt assessments in grades 3-8 and high school, CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of guidance for districts and schools on the selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional information about areas of educational specialization for members of each achievement standards setting panel, especially the specialty areas of special education and English learners.
6.4-Reporting	<p>For all components of the State assessment system, CDE must submit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that individual student 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. • Evidence of a process and timeline for the delivery of student reports for all tests. <p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that CDE and PARCC provide reports that enable itemized score analyses to LEAs and schools.

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

June, 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR COLORADO

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS . 3
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students 3
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards 4
1.3 – Required Assessments (Reviewed by Department staff only) 5
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (Reviewed by Department staff only)..... 6
1.5 – Participation Data (Reviewed by Department staff only) 9

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 10
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 10
2.2 – Item Development..... 11
2.3 – Test Administration 12
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (Reviewed by Department staff only)13
2.5 – Test Security 15
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 16

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 17
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 17
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 18
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 19
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables 20

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 21
4.1 – Reliability..... 21
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 22
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 23
4.4 – Scoring 24
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 25
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 26
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... 27

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 28
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 28
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 30
5.3 – Accommodations..... 31
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 32

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 33
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 33
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 34
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 35
6.4 – Reporting..... 36

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 COLORADO

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>Evaluate for all subjects</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the State appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. (See CE 1.1.1 Evidences)</p>	
<p>Section 1.1 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 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 COLORADO

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>Evaluate for all three subjects</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the State appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. (See CE 1.2.1 Evidences)</p>	<p>The Peers note that CE1.2.1 Evidence #10 raises certain alignment questions. It would be useful if the State could address how these apparent issues were resolved.</p>
<p>Section 1.2 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 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 COLORADO

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>Evaluate for grade/subject combinations listed in left column</p> <p>Evidence 2 Colorado HB 15-1323</p>	<p>ELA/Math: Grades 3-9 Science: Once in elementary/middle/high schools</p> <p>Note: Colorado State Statute provides for R/LA and mathematics assessments through ninth grade. Although the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, requires annual general and alternate assessments in R/LA and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (defined as grades 10-12), the ESEA, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), which takes effect in the 2017–2018 school year, defines high school as grades (9-12).</p>
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR COLORADO

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment; ○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column-SWD and EL</p> <p>Students with Disabilities:</p> <p>CE 1.4.1 Evidence 1 – Colorado HB 15-1323</p> <p>CE 1.4.1 Evidence 2 Alternate Participation Guidelines</p>	<p>Students with disabilities:</p> <p>CE 1.4.1 Evidence 1 – Colorado HB 15-1323</p> <p>P. 4 of HB 14-1323:</p> <p>(3)(c) A student with IEP that specifies alternate assessment – does not need to take state assessment, but must take alternate assessment/other approved assessment</p> <p>(d) If a student has an individualized education program...that specifies that the student takes a state assessment, the enrolling local education provider shall assess the student in each instructional area for which there is a state test at the student’s grade level.</p> <p>CE 1.4.1 Evidence 2 Alternate Participation Guidelines - p. 3: The IEP team determines <u>how</u> individual students participate in assessment programs, not whether they participate. Federal law clearly includes all students in assessment and accountability. Since instruction drives assessment, it is the instructional standard that determines assessment.</p> <p>CE 1.4.1 Evidence 3, page 1:</p> <p>This section refers to students who are placed by a public agency in Residential Child Care Facilities, Residential Treatment Centers, Day Treatment Programs, or Hospitals with on-grounds schools approved by the Colorado State Board of Education.</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 COLORADO

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
years.		<p>These types of facilities are also known as “Eligible Facilities”, “Alternative Facilities”, or “Approved Facility Schools”. The list of facilities that currently fall under these categories can be found at the following link: http://www.cde.state.co.us/facilityschools/index.asp. Students who are placed in these types of state-operated programs will participate in the CMAS and CoAlt: Science and Social Studies assessments as appropriate. CDE’s Office of Facility Schools acts as the school district for purposes of distributing materials. There will be a state aggregate report for students in out-of-district placement—scores are not included in either the local school district or the student’s home district reports.</p> <p>English learners</p> <p>P. 5-6 of HB 14-1323:</p> <p>(4)(a)(I): The Department of Education in collaboration with local education providers shall administer the English versions of the State assessments and may administer an assessment adopted by the State board in languages other than English, as may be appropriate for English language learners. Except that a student who has participated in an English language proficiency program, as provided in article 24 of this title, for more than a total of three years is ineligible to take the State assessment in a language other than English; (II) [Unless ED provides a waiver, for an additional two years]</p> <p>(5)(1) Notwithstanding any provision of this 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 COLORADO

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>to the contrary, a student who is an English language learner...and who has been enrolled in school in the United States for fewer than twelve months is not required to take the English language arts assessment.</p> <p>Colorado statute indicates that the Department of Education may administer native language assessments, but does not provide evidence that the State administer such assessments.</p>
Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Colorado places students in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, Colorado must provide evidence that students are included in the assessment system. • If Colorado administers native language assessments to students who have been in the U.S. between three and five consecutive years, as authorized by State statute, Colorado must provide policies and procedures explaining how districts determine, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information for a student taking a native language assessment. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR COLORADO

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.5 – Participation Data</p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>	<p>Prompts for Reviewers: --data disaggregated by student group: ELA/Math/Science --Shows students tested and students enrolled for each breakout</p> <p>1.5.1, Evidence 1, 2, 3: 2015 CMAS PARCC ELA/PARCC Math/Science Participation</p> <p>--for end-of-course HS, procedures to ensure each student is tested and counted in participation rate along with data</p> <p>Colorado does not administer End of Course Tests</p> <p>--includes grade level tests and AA-AAAS</p> <p>1.5.1 Evidence 4, 5, 6: CoAlt</p>	<p>State submitted data, with appropriate breakdowns, but missed participation rates for multiple subgroups/subjects</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</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 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 COLORADO

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the State appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. (See CE 2.1.1 Evidences)</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the State appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. (See CE 2.1.2 Evidences)</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the State appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. (See CE 2.1.3 Evidences)</p> <p>N/A at the State-level (i.e., non-consortium assessments)</p>	<p>The Peers have concerns about lack of documentation regarding cognitive load of the items. Please see comments under Sections 3 and 4 for more details on this concern.</p>
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required for CO 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 COLORADO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.2 – Item Development</p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the State appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. (See CE 2.1.1 Evidences)</p>	<p>The Peers particularly note the use of Cognitive Labs in training as a very useful approach</p>
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required for CO 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 COLORADO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the State appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element for English/language arts, mathematics, and science. (See CE 2.3.1 Evidences)</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the State appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. (See CE 2.3.1 Evidences)</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the State appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. The technology specifications and training apply to PARCC and DLM as well as the State-developed assessments. (See CE 2.3.1 Evidences)</p>	
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required for CO, PARCC or DLM EOY</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 COLORADO

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p>CE 2.4.1 Evidence 9 Spring 2016 CMAS Test Monitoring Summary (draft) CE 2.4.1 Evidence 2 – CMAS Test Monitoring Training CE 2.4.1 Evidence 3 CMAS Test Monitoring Checklist CE 2.4.1 Evidence 4 – CoAlt Score Monitor Training CE 2.4.1 Evidence 5 CoAlt Score Monitor Checklist</p>	<p>State summary:</p> <p>2.4.1 Colorado has established and implemented On-site Visits and Monitoring During PARCC, CMAS, and CoAlt Science Administrations.</p> <p>Colorado conducts regional observations of testing at schools across the state to monitor fidelity to test security and standardized test administration procedures. In some cases, districts/schools may be selected in part due to historical challenges with adherence to test administration/security procedures. Colorado’s Assessment Unit coordinates the training and scheduling of all personnel who participate in monitoring. The purpose of monitoring is to observe testing to ensure that standardized testing procedures are followed and to obtain feedback for improvement of future testing.</p> <p>CE 2.4.1 – Evidence 9: Eight test monitors conducted twenty-nine interviews and observations across twenty-seven schools in Colorado. The school districts were located in all eight of the geographic regions of the state. Monitoring was conducted at Elementary, Middle and High Schools and included ELA, Math, Science and Social Studies. (Note: provides evidence of monitoring of CMAS, but does not reference CoAlt).</p> <p>Provided evidence of training for Test Monitors; Tools for Test Monitors (Checklist) – CMAS and CoAlt</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 COLORADO

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
		Provided contract language, regarding contractor responsibilities for monitoring/training – CMAS (2016) and CoAlt (2015)
Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence demonstrating that Colorado conducted monitoring for the CoAlt assessment; although the State provided evidence of training monitors, the State did not provide evidence that the monitoring occurred. 		

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 COLORADO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the State appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. (See CE 2.5.1 Evidences)</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the State appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. (See CE 2.5.2 Evidences)</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the State appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. (See CE 2.5.3 Evidences)</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the State appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. (See CE 2.5.4 Evidences)</p>	<p>Peers were unclear whether there is a means for anonymously reporting a suspected breach.</p> <p>A document identifying frequency of suspected breaches, outcomes of investigations, and resolutions would have been useful.</p>
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required for CO, PARCC or DLM EOY</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 COLORADO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the State appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. (See CE 2.6.1 Evidences)</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the State appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. (See CE 2.6.1 Evidences)</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the State appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. (See CE 2.6.1 Evidences)</p>	<p>The Peers note that 2.6.1 Evidence 15 appears to violate the policy regarding identification of individual or small groups of students, as described in 2.6.1 Evidence 13.</p>
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State must submit evidence explaining the apparent discrepancy between Evidences 13 and 15, noted above. 		

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 COLORADO

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 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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>CE 3.1.1 Evidence 1 provides an external alignment study that show deficiencies in Depth of Knowledge for Grade 5 and high school CMAS science, and in Range of Knowledge on the high school CMAS.</p> <p>CE 3.1.1 Evidence 2 provides an external alignment study that shows deficiencies in Depth of Knowledge, Range of Knowledge, and Categorical Concurrence at Grade 5, Grade 8, and on the high school CoALT.</p>	<p>The State might investigate whether increasing the number of items on the CoALT would help address this problem.</p>
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State must submit a plan and timeline for addressing CMAS and CoALT alignment issues or provide evidence that the identified deficiencies have been resolved. 		

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 COLORADO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the State appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. (See CE 3.2.1 Evidences)</p>	<p>The Peers commend the State on conducting Cognitive Labs as part of their validation process. Information on the findings of the Cognitive Labs, and documentation of how that feedback informed item and test development would have been useful.</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required for CO 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 COLORADO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the State appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. (See CE 3.3.1 Evidences)</p>	
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required for CO, PARCC or DLM EOY</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 COLORADO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the State appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. (See CE 3.4.1 Evidences)</p>	<p>Evidence of the relationship between DLM and CoALT scores might be useful information in subsequent submissions.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required for CO, PARCC or DLM EOY</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 COLORADO

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.1 – Reliability 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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the State appears to meet the requirements of this component of the Critical Element.</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the State appears to meet the requirements of this component of the Critical Element.</p> <p>Kappas for the CoALT Science, generally around .3, fall below the .6 minimum recommended in the Technical Manual (Evidence 6, page 3).</p> <p>N/A</p>	
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State must submit a plan and timeline for addressing the low CoALT classification consistency (Kappas). 		

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 COLORADO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the State appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element.</p>	
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required for CO 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 COLORADO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Previously noted external alignment studies document deficiencies in Depth of Knowledge, Range of Knowledge, and/or Categorical Consistency for both the CMAS and the CoALT. Also as previously noted in Section 3.1, the State must describe when and how they will address these issues.</p>	
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required for CO 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 COLORADO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Evidence of how and to what extent the State provides training on the CoALT scoring rubric was not found.</p>	<p>The Peers understand Evidence 7, Table 2 to suggest that students receive points for repeating back the correct answer after the test administrator tells them what the answer should be. The State must provide a rationale for how this contributes to understanding student mastery of the content standards.</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State must explain how the CoALT scoring rubric accurately demonstrates the level of students’ content mastery. • The State must provide evidence concerning training provided on applying the CoALT scoring rubric. 		

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 COLORADO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the State appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. (CE 4.5.1 Evidences)</p>	
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for CO, PARCC or DLM EOY</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 COLORADO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>The evidence submitted appeared to be insufficient to evaluate compliance with this Critical Element. In particular, Evidence 3 and 4 pertain to Virginia, not Colorado; and Evidences 5-8 appear to be generic rather than State-specific.</p>	<p>The Peers are unable to determine which students are taking the paper-and-pencil version and why they are not using a computer-based assessment. The State must provide specific evidence of comparability for Colorado assessments. This applies to the CMAS only.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • specific evidence of comparability on CMAS science for Colorado 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 COLORADO

<u>Critical Element</u>	<u>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</u>	<u>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</u>
<p>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Evidence of the TAC meeting more-or-less regularly is adequate to meet the requirements of this Critical Element.</p>	<p>It would be helpful, although not mandatory, to have received minutes of the TAC meetings. It would also be useful to know whether there is a framework that ensures that all appropriate elements of the assessment system are reviewed by the TAC.</p>
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required for CO, PARCC or DLM EOY</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 COLORADO

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the State appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. (CE 5.5.1 Evidences)</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 COLORADO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>disabilities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA; • Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments); • The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum. 		
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<u>X</u> No additional evidence is required for CO or for PARCC/DLM EOY		

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 COLORADO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the State appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. (CE 5.3.1 Evidences)</p>	
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<u>X</u> No additional evidence is required for CO assessments, PARCC or DLM EOY		

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 COLORADO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the State appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. (CE 6.2.1 Evidences)</p>	
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for CO 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 COLORADO

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the State appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. (CE 6.3.1 Evidences)</p>	<p>The Peers would have liked to see a more definitive definition of what constitutes “challenging content” and suggest that the State include this in future submissions.</p>
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for CO, PARCC, or DLM EOY</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 COLORADO

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>reports was not found, nor was evidence of a process by which parents can request them.</p> <p>Notwithstanding Evidence 19 (which was insufficient), evidence indicating how and when individual score reports are to be disseminated was not found.</p>	
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State must provide evidence that alternate format reports are available, and describe how and when parents may obtain them. • The State must provide evidence of how and when individual score reports are disseminated. 		

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

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

June 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes DLM End of Year Consortium Evidence



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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-
YEAR END MODEL**

Contents

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	3
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	3
2.2 – Item Development.....	6
2.3 – Test Administration	8
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only).....	11
2.5 – Test Security	12
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	13
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....	14
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	14
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	16
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	17
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	18
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	19
4.1 – Reliability.....	19
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	21
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	23
4.4 – Scoring	24
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	25
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	26
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance.....	27
SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS	28
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	28
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	31
5.3 – Accommodations.....	33
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	35
SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .	37
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 	37
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	39
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	40
6.4 – Reporting.....	41

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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; 	<p>Purposes and Intended Interpretations and Uses of Results</p> <p>File 06: page 1, page 5</p>	<p>PLEASE NOTE: The peer reviewers wish to acknowledge the magnitude and significance of this endeavor to create and implement a assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities based on an articulated learning map aligned to content standards for the general student population. While the feedback that follows contains questions and a few requests for additional evidence, as well as some suggestions for consideration in the future, peers were cognizant of the enormous amount of work and time that went into the DLM assessment.</p> <p>The technical manual provides a clear statement of the purpose and intended interpretations and uses of the results of the DLM assessment.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; 	<p>Test Structure and Blueprints</p> <p>File 06: pp. 41-46</p> <p>File 08</p> <p>File 09</p> <p>File 10</p> <p>File 11</p>	<p>Test blueprints clearly present the structure of the DLM testlets and the assessment as a whole.</p> <p>The DLM year-end-model assesses EEs in five conceptual areas across two claims. Coverage is summarized on page 2 of File 10.</p> <p>The DLM year-end-model assesses EEs in mathematics across all four major claims (File 11 p. 1).</p> <p>Peer reviewers were unable to gain a sufficiently clear understanding of how EEs were “prioritized” for inclusion in the assessment (which includes a subset of EEs rather than all per grade level).</p> <p>Although various documents (e.g., Sample Student</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>Report in File 07, Appendix E.1) illustrate that not all EEs eligible for assessment are addressed by every student, it would have been extremely helpful to peer reviewers for DLM to have provided more detail, and in the appropriate sections of the submission, on what constitutes a typical assessment experience at the student level. This might take the form of a summary that describes the minimum-maximum number of testlets, the minimum-maximum number of items per testlet, and the minimum-maximum coverage across EEs in both ELA and Math. To frame differently, it would have helped to see how the distribution of EEs presented in Files 10 and 11 is operationalized for individual students. The picture of the DLM assessment at the global level is far clearer and richer than the picture of the assessment at the student level.</p> <p>Peers could not find evidence that the EEs address Speaking and Listening, which are among the domains in the CCSS.</p> <p>While the ELA blueprints include a few EEs that correspond to certain CCSS Language standards, these are identified in the blueprint under one or another of the five Conceptual Areas (CAs) covered by the DLM assessment (sometimes C.1.2. and other times C.2.1.) The peers could not find evidence that the CCSS domain of Language is explicitly addressed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); 	<p>Representation of Knowledge and Skills in the Assessment and the Standards</p> <p>File 06: pp. 5-8, 24-28, 38-41, 46, 61-64</p>	<p>Evidence conveys the degree and nature of coverage of the EEs (learning targets for students with significant cognitive disabilities [SWSCD]) and their correspondence to CCSS.</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<p>Item Pool and Selection Procedures</p> <p>File 06: pp. 60-61, 83-84, 101-106, 112-114</p>	<p>The adaptive delivery of testlets via KITE is well designed as described in the Technical Manual (112-14).</p> <p>While computer-adaptive procedures described made clear how linkage level would be adjusted based on performance, the peers were unable to find evidence to explain how this might impact EE coverage at the student level.</p>
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DLM should explain why some CCSS ELA domains are not directly addressed (Language) or are not addressed at all (Speaking/Listening) 		

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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.2 – Item Development</p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p>Item Development</p> <p>File 06: Introduction, pp. 20-21, 46,47-48, 37-38, 69-70, 69, 65-68, 68-69, 61-64, 60-61, 85-87, 46-47, 75-76, 76-77, 82-83, 89-93,126-130, 219-233, 210-217</p> <p>File 18: pp. 9-10, 11-15</p>	<p>Evidence was sufficient for this section. Training materials for item writers are described and in some instances, provided in their entirety.</p> <p>One concern, however, is that peers could not find much evidence, beyond simple criteria for writing keys and distractors, that item development has attended fully and well to matters related to determining a correct/complete response (e.g., specifically how to screen for flaws in item options (ambiguous options, multiple options where not intended, etc.). Training might be enhanced with examples of well-written and poorly written items. If more training resources are available (e.g., the section of File 18 on bias and sensitivity review), then these should be cited, as they are likely to only strengthen the submission.</p> <p>The assumption must be made that all items are treated as dichotomous items, although this is never stated/made explicit. Why and how DLM decided against awarding partial credit for multiple select items and others with multiple correct response options should be included in evidence for this Critical Element. The testlet design (with % items correct to indicate “mastery”) may not permit this, but perhaps that should/could be explained.</p> <p>More detail on the duration of training of item writers—as well as a typical training agenda—would be useful as evidence of sound procedures to develop and select items.</p> <p>Some background/rationale for item types and</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>features (e.g., use of three response options in MC item, use of color photograph as text feature in ELA testlets) would be helpful—In other words, documentation of the research/best practice behind key item features/formats.</p> <p>Peers suggest that additional cognitive labs to investigate possible option order effect on student response be considered.</p>
	<p>Item Selection</p> <p>File 06: pp. 77- 82, p. 93, 46- 47, 75-83, 93-101, 97- 98, 101-106, 98</p>	<p>The Technical Manual (p. 233) indicates the intention to follow up on DIF analysis by expanding in future years; DLM should be encouraged to submit this supplementary analysis when available.</p> <p>Overall, the evidence was sufficient for this section. However, while observations are described as part of validity studies, peer reviewers did not see any evidence of the use of observation during field-testing to inform item development, review and revision. This additional source of information might be helpful and should be considered for future rounds of item development.</p>
<p>Section 2.2 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 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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; 	<p>Standardized Procedures</p> <p>File 05: pages 9-12, 89-116, 78-150, 149-159, 22-38, 38-50, 49-50</p> <p>File 02: pp. 7-13</p> <p>File 03: p. 8</p> <p>File 04: pp. 6-7</p>	<p>The evidence provided collectively identifies all of the steps necessary (and the resources to guide key individuals involved) to conduct standardized administrations of the assessment. The Test Administration manual is made easier to follow with supporting visuals (screen shots from Educator Portal and KITE) and numerous “hints” in sidebars to address specific needs/issues. DLM provides states with live updates through “state landing page” and updates on website.</p> <p>Detail is provided on the range of testing devices that may be used. DLM provides some information on handling such matters as extended inactivity when KITE is open, and exiting and returning. One incident summary (involving incorrect testlet information pages) is provided among evidence to illustrate/document contingency plans. State landing pages and updates on the DLM website appear to serve as a mechanism—if needed—to deal with unexpected technology challenges during test administration.</p>
	<p>Communication</p> <p>File 17: a) Sample state landing page from DLM website; b) Test updates – website and email example</p>	
	<p>Administration with Accommodations</p> <p>File 01: pp. 19-22, 15-18</p> <p>File 05: pp. 32-37</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

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"> 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. 	<p>Training</p> <p>File 06: pp.251-254, 250-251, 254, 248-249, 124-125</p> <p>File 07: Appendices G.1, C.14</p> <p>File 16: p. 5</p> <p>File 02: pp. 7-13</p> <p>File 03: p. 8</p> <p>File 04: pp. 6-7</p>	<p>Training resources are provided as evidence for all key personnel: Test Administrators, Data Stewards, and Technical Liaisons.</p> <p>Required training for test administrators consists of eight modules on such topics as accessibility, preparing for the test, computer delivered testlets and teacher delivered testlets. Detail on required performance (80%) on post-test quizzes is provided.</p> <p>Peer reviewers could not find any information on “next steps” or consequences if trainee failed to reach that performance on one or more of the post-test quizzes. More detail would be helpful on how training can ensure that ALL teachers of SWSCD will be able to administer DLM to their students.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>Technology Requirements</p> <p>File 06: pp.110, 251-254</p> <p>File 07: Appendix G.1</p> <p>File 04: pp. 9-13, 8</p> <p>File 05: pp. 149-150, 62-65</p> <p>File 02: p. 55</p>	
	<p>Contingency plans for technology-based assessment administration</p> <p>File 06: p. 111, 123-125, 133-134,193-195</p> <p>File 07: Appendix C.7</p>	<p>Good systems in place for addressing localized administration issues (Technical Manual, p. 111) and internet connectivity issues (see Technical Liaison Manual p. 12).</p> <p>Peer reviewers would like to have seen more</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	File 04: pp. 6-7, 12 File 17:	information on contingency plans based on potential disruptions of service/functioning of technology.
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required from the DLM consortium		

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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p>_____ policies and procedures apply to all grade-level and AA-AAAS in all subjects</p>	<p>The DLM consortium submitted evidence of procedures to monitor test administration (File 06 p. 123-125 and p. 225-231) and made a variety of materials and resources available to partner states for the purpose of monitoring test administration. These included a test administration monitoring protocol and an observation protocol for use by SEAs and LEAs. Among other things, the monitoring protocols captured accessibility supports used, level of engagement and barriers to engagement (File07 Appendix C 13). In addition, training tools were provided on the use of these protocols. Monitoring of test administrations was also possible at the SEA and LEA levels through the DLM Educator Portal which permitted checking on progress toward test completion at the student level. Again, training on this feature was submitted (File 07 appendix C 14). Focused monitoring of the test administration was conducted both by DLM and at the SEA and LEA levels, indicating fidelity of test administration (File 06 p.225-231). Errors in routing of students to testlets was also monitored and procedures provided to test administrators to rectify errors (File 06 pp. 142-143 and pp. 193-195) . Finally, states were provided with summaries of these errors as addenda to score reports (File 06 pp. 193-195)</p>
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> </u>x_ No additional evidence is required from the DLM consortium-State specific.</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; 	<p>Evidence of Prevention of Irregularities</p> <p>File 06: pp. 46-47, 68-69, 69-70, 75-76, 77, 132-133, 134, 133, 135, 252</p> <p>File 07: Appendices B.3 and C.3</p> <p>File 05: p. 121-12</p> <p>File 02: p. 36</p>	<p>Evidence of detection, remediation, and investigation of test irregularities focused on data breaches.</p> <p>Page 252 of File 06 provides a broad statement of expectations regarding security in context of training.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detection of test irregularities; 	<p>Evidence of Detection of Irregularities</p> <p>File 06: pp.135-136</p> <p>File 07: Appendix C.15</p>	<p>Evidence from DLM is sufficient in this section; more evidence is expected from States.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities 	<p>Evidence of Investigation of Remediation Following Incidents</p> <p>File 06: p. 133, 134-135</p> <p>File 07: Appendices C.5, C.6</p>	<p>Evidence from DLM is sufficient in this section; more evidence is expected from States.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; 	<p>THIS PORTION OF THE CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required from the DLM consortium.</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

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; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p>Security and Integrity of Test Materials</p> <p>File 06: pp. 133-134, 134- 135</p>	<p>Detailed evidence documenting policies and procedures to protect integrity and confidentiality of data is provided. Evidence includes definition of minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students/student groups.</p> <p>There is evidence of an appropriately hierarchical system of access to data based on scope of responsibility.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; 	<p>File 06: 133-134, 135</p> <p>File 07: Appendices C.4, C.5, C.6</p>	<p>Evidence is sufficient for this section.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>PII Protection in Reporting</p> <p>File 06: pp.134-135, 186-188, 191</p> <p>File 07: Appendices C.4, C.5, C.6</p>	<p>Evidence is sufficient for this section.</p>
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required from the DLM consortium.</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; 	<p>Validity Framework and Overall Evaluation</p> <p>File 06: pp. 5-7, 279-280 (Tables 108 and 109), 264-278), p. 281 (Table 110), 283-284, 282-283, 263-264</p>	<p>Overall, the interpretation and use argument was clearly tied to four validity claims (how the scores could be used) and these guided validation efforts.</p> <p>The submission provides evaluative evidence of technical quality through an overview of the review process, criteria used, and results (pp. 75-76; 77-82; 82-83). The External Alignment Study (File 15) provides detail on fidelity to the content in the grade-level standards (see pp. 4-8 for Executive Summary).</p> <p>It is worth noting that DLM acknowledges the need to do further alignment studies (see Technical Manual p. 267) since earlier study was done on limited sample rather than on operational testlets as administered.</p> <p>Over time peer reviewers would like to see more evidence of alignment between instructional content and assessment content.</p> <p>The Technical Manual (282-284) included a detailed account of anticipated areas for continuous improvement and future research.</p> <p>Follow-up on consequential validity evidence is advisable, since admittedly limited based on 2014-15 administration.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated 	<p>Measurement of Academic Content Standards</p> <p>File 06: Introduction, pp. 5-7, 10-21, 14-17, 17-19, 26-27, 38-41, 41- 46, 61-64, 46-47, 68-69, 75-82</p>	<p>Evidence demonstrates that the EEs of the DLM (the equivalent of alternate academic content standards) are adequately linked to State academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.		cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Testlets are constructed from items that each address an EE aligned to college and career ready standards.
	<p>Evaluative Evidence</p> <p>File 06: pp. 75-76, 77-82, 82-83</p> <p>File 12</p> <p>File 13</p> <p>File 15: pp. 8-9, 16 (Table 5), 15-16, Appendix B, 4-8</p> <p>File 07: Appendix H.1</p>	
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

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>Assessments Tap Intended Cognitive Processes</p> <p>File 06: pp. 61-64, 68-69, 46-47, 69-70, 75-76, p. 230 (Table 95), Conclusion, 270-271</p> <p>File 18: pp. 9- 19, Appendix A</p>	<p>The use of Essential Element Concept Maps (EECMs) in item and testlet development is intended to ensure that the assessments tap intended cognitive processes as represented in State academic content standards. This is confirmed in external review. For classification purposes, Anderson and Krathwohl’s (2001) revision to Bloom’s taxonomy is used by DLM. The assignment of cognitive levels for 2014-15 items/testlets was reviewed and confirmed by various stakeholders (item writers/reviewers, teachers, advisory panel members).</p>
	<p>Interaction with Testlet Content</p> <p>File 06: pp. 219-223, 224-225</p>	<p>Additional cognitive labs to investigate possible option order effect on student response.</p>
	<p>Fidelity of Administration</p> <p>File 06: p. 254, 251-254, 147 (Table 55), 117-121,123-124, 225- 229</p> <p>File 07: Appendix C.12</p>	<p>The submission contains adequate evidence of administration fidelity was provided.</p>
	<p>Accessibility</p> <p>File 06: pp. 125-132, 148-150, 119 (Table 43), 121, 150 (Table 57), p. 230 (Table 95), 252-253, 258- 259</p>	<p>The submission contains acceptable evidence of accessibility.</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

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>Scoring and reporting structures’ consistency with sub-domain structures</p> <p>File 06: Introduction, pp. 14-17, 43-46, 61-64, 85 (Table 21), 58-160, 190-191, 193, 25-34, 35-36, 28-29, 214-215, 263-264</p> <p>File 07: Appendices E.1, E2</p> <p>File 15: pp. 22-23</p>	<p>Adequate evidence has been provided. The data files provide for accountability and school improvement purposes indicate overall performance level results for each content area and highest linkage level mastered for each EE (See Chapter VII of Technical Manual).</p>
	<p>Consistency of Measurement</p> <p>File 06: pp. 203-204, 205-206, 207-209</p>	<p>Evidence is adequate for the consistency of the scoring and reporting with the sub-domain structures of the consortium content standards.</p>
	<p>Differential Item Functioning (DIF)</p> <p>File 06: pp. 231-236, 283-284</p>	<p>Evidence of appropriate procedures is provided; DLM has only considered gender because of sample size. Peers suggest that as more data are available (recommended as >200 per class), further analyses be conducted on other categories (e.g., race, ethnicity, different disability classifications, etc.)</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 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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>Score Relationship to Other Variables</p> <p>File 06: p. 85 (Table 21), 327 (Table 102)</p>	<p>DLM acknowledges that evidence of the relationship between student responses on the assessment and other measures is limited, given that the first operational administration was in 2014-2015. However, they provide information about test administrators’ judgments regarding difficulty level of testlets (Technical Manual, pp. 236-237).</p> <p>Per the DLM Consortium’s self-analysis of this Critical Element: “To date, evidence on the relationship between student responses on the DLM assessments and other measures is limited to teacher evaluations of student academic knowledge and skills as measured by the First Contact survey, and teacher perception of testlet difficulty.”</p> <p>Recognizing that that the submission reflects only the 2014-15 administration, peer reviewers would like to see included other evidence such as correlations between student performance on DLM and States’ previous alternative assessment or another measure (for consortium members who have such data available).</p>
<p>Section 3.4 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 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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; 	<p>Reliability for Student Population</p> <p>File 06: pp. 161- 162, 190- 193, 203-204, 205-206, 207-209)</p>	<p>General comment: DLM made a very strong assumption about the fungible item parameters (items at the same linkage level have the same intercept and main effect). Peers have not found any evidence that this assumption was tested.</p> <p>DLM calculates reliability by using simulation. They use a model but peers did not see evidence that the model fits adequately to the data. Peers acknowledge that DLM plans to examine model fit (File 06, p. 36) and support that plan.</p> <p>Evidence includes documentation of involvement of TAC in decisions regarding the scoring model (p.162).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; 	<p>Overall and Conditional Standard Error of Measurement</p> <p>File 06: pp. 196-200, 283-284</p>	<p>DLM indicates that due to the model chosen, they will report classification consistency instead of overall and conditional standard error.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; 	<p>Achievement Levels</p> <p>File 06: pp. 203-204</p>	<p>From Table 74 in File 06 (p. 204), results appear to be adequate. These analyses need to be extended to subgroups as more data are available.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 	<p>Computer-Adaptive Tests</p> <p>File 06: pp. 207-209</p>	<p>From Table 77 in File 06 (page 208), results are acceptable. Again, these analyses need to be extended to subgroups as more data are available.</p>
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beyond the one paragraph on p. 162 of File 06, provide clarification as to what was done so far and anticipated plans for what will be done in the future with 		

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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

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

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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

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>Accessibility</p> <p>File 06: 61-64, 46-61, 37, 69-70, 83, 69, 61-64, 82, 126-130, 136-139, 219-223, 225- 229</p> <p>File 01: 15-18</p> <p>File 18: 11-16</p> <p>File 19: 5-16</p>	<p>External review of testlets is described in the Technical Manual (pp. 78-82). Content review criteria are provided (p. 79). These seem very general and perhaps limited in scope (e.g., nothing to direct writers to ordering of response options, inadvertent cueing). This has a potential impact on fairness and accessibility.</p> <p>The ability to evaluate the sufficiency of evidence related to fairness and accessibility is impacted by the fact that there is no reference in evidence to the process by which text passages are created (when, by whom, using what specific selection and creation/revision processes, specification, etc.) beyond indicating that they are based on/drawn from grade appropriate selections and then reduced in cognitive complexity level. (See p. 48; “short narrative passages were constructed from books commonly taught in general education, and short informational texts were written to relate to thematic elements from narratives”). There is also no reference to the processes involved in providing images/graphic adjuncts to items and testlets.</p> <p>Peer reviewers could find no information on when, how, and by whom images included in the assessment are selected and/or created, nor could they find any evidence of specifications or review criteria for this component of items and testlets.</p>
	<p>Fairness</p> <p>File 06: pp. 69-70, 78-82, 130-132, 133, 219-223, 225-229, 231-236</p>	<p>See comments about DIF (3.3)</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	File 05: pp. 51-53	
Section 4.2 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include detail on development and selection of reading passages to address accessibility per above. Peers need to see steps that test developers have taken to ensure passages from general grade level texts are made accessible to SWSCD. • DLM needs to provide information to address the selection and/or creation of graphic components in the assessment (e.g., drawn or photographed images) and include criteria used to evaluate this component to ensure fairness and accessibility. 		

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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

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>Adequately Precise Estimate Across the Continuum</p> <p>File 06: p. 83, 112-114, 161-162, 162, 184-185,189-190, 203-204, 205-206, 207-209</p> <p>File 14: 62- 63</p>	<p>The design of the DLM (nodes, linkage levels, EEs, etc.) and test administration placement (see first contact survey, Technical Manual pp. 83) and adaptive delivery (Technical Manual pp. 112-114) supports the capacity of the assessment to provide an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum as reflected in the linkage levels.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 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 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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>Standardized Scoring Procedures</p> <p>File 06: pp. 47-48, 52-56, 151-152, 161-162, 172-178, 190- 193, 194-195, 193-195, 193-195, 203-204, 205- 206, 207-209, 253, 254.</p> <p>File 05: pp. 38-50</p> <p>File 17: pp. 8-10)</p>	<p>The evidence provided makes clear the automated scoring procedures for the majority of items in the DLM assessment system.</p> <p>However, additional information may be warranted for those writing testlets (File 06, pp. 47-48) and other testlets for which teachers make score judgments while the testlet is being administered. While there is documentation of support for teacher fidelity in the training modules (pp. 253 and 254) and teacher input on student response was evaluated as part of DLM’s validity studies, peer reviewers were unable to find any evidence of monitoring procedures for this particular aspect of scoring to ensure reliable results (e.g., inter-rater reliability). That is, where the Test Administer must “choose the description that matches the highest level of evaluation of the student’s writing” (File 05, p. 47), it is not clear whether, or how often, these choices that impact scoring are checked/confirmed.</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Because some writing testlets and other testlets involve teacher judgment on scores, DLM needs to provide an explanation of what scoring monitoring procedures (e.g., the equivalent of “read-behinds”) are being used, or what one(s) were considered but rejected and the rationale for that decision (fidelity of scoring). 		

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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>Assessment Forms Represent Academic Content Standards</p> <p>File 06: pp. 112-114, 142-143, 125</p> <p>File 07: Appendix C.7</p>	<p>While the DLM assessments are customized to each student—who is assigned a series of testlets rather than a fixed test form—each battery selectively represents an approved minimum number of Essential Elements which correspond to state academic content standards. The adaptive delivery method is designed to ensure coverage of the test blueprint (pp. 112-114).</p> <p>However, peers noted that the ELA test blueprint is presented by grade, and it is not clear what the EE coverage for each student might be (see FILE 10: ELA Blueprint—specifically page 2). See comments under 2.1.</p> <p>Peer reviewers were unable to find evidence to explain the comparability of coverage among students, given that each will address different EEs (although distribution of EEs across Conceptual Areas appears to be the same).</p>
	<p>Assessment Forms Yield Consistent Score Interpretations</p> <p>File 06: pp. 101-106, 97-98, 61-64, 69-70, 93-101,161-162)</p>	<p>Because the calibrations were done separately for each linkage level, it was unclear to peer reviewers how estimated parameters were linked to the same scale. Peers felt it would be helpful if clarification were provided as to how item parameters were put on the same scale for a given linkage level.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 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 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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; 	<p>Comparable Interpretation of Results</p> <p>File 06: pp. 60-61, 69-70, 69, 61-64</p>	<p>The evidence supports comparable interpretation of results for students taking the general form of testlets, the version for students who are blind or have visual impairment (BVI), and blind/visually impaired students who read braille.</p> <p>The evidence provided focuses on the item writing process and resources (Technical Manual, pp. 69-70) but does not explicitly address the implications for developing alternate versions of testlets that have a considerable visual load—but based on sample items/testlets interspersed in the Technical Manual, it appears that many include images (drawings or photographs). It is not clear how the determination of general forms of testlets that would not introduce accessibility barriers for blind students is made, prior to transcription.</p> <p>Peers suggest including more detail on role/impact of graphic components in items/testlets and how this is addressed in multiple versions of the assessment.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>Documented Evidence of Comparability</p> <p>File 06: pp. 97-98, 101-106, 126, 121, 130- 132, 161-162</p>	<p>As more data become available, peers suggest conducting modality study(ies) comparing test administration modes.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 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 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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>Monitoring, Maintaining, and Improving Quality of Assessment</p> <p>File 06: pp. 64-75, 97- 98, 97, 135-136, 136- 139, 231-236,283-284, 279 (Table 108), 280 (Table 109)</p> <p>File 15</p> <p>File 20: pp. 2-17</p> <p>File 23</p> <p>File 14: Appendix B, pp. 62-63</p> <p>File 15: pp. 24-25, 25-30</p> <p>File 22.</p>	<p>In DLM notes under this section of their submission, they reference State partners’ responsibilities for maintenance of EEs (page 15 in Section 4). Peers were unclear as to what this entails.</p> <p>As DLM moves to subsequent years’ administrations, peers were interested in knowing how year-to-year equating would be conducted, based on the design features of this assessment.</p> <p>Procedures for obtaining reliability evidence are based on AERA Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (2014); see Technical Manual p. 203.</p> <p>DLM appears to have a solid system in place for identifying and implementing future studies to inform/enhance the assessment; However, it is not sufficiently clear to peers what role state partners play beyond input on topics (since the TAC “provides input on conceptualization, preliminary/exploratory analyses, and final products”), based on evidence provided (FILE 23: TAC Materials).</p> <p>Peers suggest that DLM clarify/provide more detail on roles/responsibilities of partners in future research.</p>
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; 	<p>THIS PORTION OF THE CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 	<p>THIS PORTION OF THE CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 	<p>Guidelines for choice of assessment</p> <p>File 06: pp. 252-253</p> <p>File 07: Appendix C.16, G1</p> <p>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC GUIDANCE IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	<p>Technical Manual Appendix C.16 sets forth three basic guidelines for assigning a student to the alternate assessment, as well as extraneous factors that should not come into play; The Technical Manual indicates these are all reinforced during test administrator training and this is borne out in Module 1 (FILE 07 pp. 199-227)</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

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"> Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; 	<p>Information on Supports and Accommodations</p> <p>File 06: pp. 125-132, 252-253</p> <p>File 07: Appendix G.1</p> <p>File 01: pp. 15-18</p> <p>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC GUIDANCE IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	<p>Peers noted that this was well addressed in the Technical Manual pp. 125-132 and Module 3 (FILE 07 pp. 242-278) and in Accessibility Manual (pp. 15-18) in section on DLM accessibility features.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; 	<p>Guidance on Selection of Accommodations</p> <p>File 01: pp. 11-12, 19-22, 30</p> <p>File 06: pp. 252-253</p> <p>File 07: Appendix G.1</p> <p>File 05: pp. 95-106, 60, 76</p> <p>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC GUIDANCE IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	<p>Peers took note of well documented procedures; a particular strength is the DLM practice of allowing test administrators to change PNP selections and evaluate the effectiveness of accommodations determined for each student (see p. 30 of FILE 01 for questions to guide this evaluation).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA; 	<p>Disability Categories for Alternate Assessment</p> <p>File 07: Appendix C.16</p> <p>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC GUIDANCE IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	<p>See under Guidelines for choice of assessment, above.</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 	<p>THIS PORTION OF THE CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	<p>N/A</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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);</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>Promote Access to the General Curriculum</p> <p>File 06: pp. 255-261, 254-261, 251-252</p> <p>File 07: Appendix G.1</p> <p>File 05: pp. 20-22</p> <p>File 08</p> <p>File 09</p> <p>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	<p>The submission includes ample evidence that the design of the alternate assessment promotes access to grade level content standards.</p>
<p>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); 	<p>Determining Appropriateness of Accommodation</p> <p>File 06: pp. 181-183</p> <p>File 01: pp. 13-30</p> <p>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC GUIDANCE IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	<p>There are procedures in place for determining accommodations that are appropriate for all SWSCD including ELS (File 01, pp. 13-30). ELs with significant cognitive disabilities may have translation provided outside the DLM system (p. 16, 17).</p> <p>Detail is provided in Testlet Information page (TIP) about any exceptions to allowable translation (e.g, a vocabulary item); test administrators are also permitted to translate words and provide synonyms and definitions in preferred language (FILE 05 p. 48-49).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; 	<p>Information on Supports and Accommodations</p> <p>File 06: pp. 125-132, 252-253</p> <p>File 07: Appendix G.1</p> <p>File 05: pp. 35-36, 48-49</p> <p>File 01</p> <p>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC GUIDANCE IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	<p>Evidence provided is adequate for this factor.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 	<p>Guidance on Selection of Accommodations</p> <p>File 06: pp. 125-132, 252-253</p> <p>File 01: pp. 15-18, 30</p> <p>File 05: p. 159, 60</p> <p>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL</p>	<p>Consortia-level evidence provided by DLM is adequate for this section. States must provide additional evidence.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC GUIDANCE IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.	
Section 5.2 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities (SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; 	<p>Evidence of appropriate accommodation availability</p> <p>File 06: pp. 125-132, 254</p> <p>File 01: pp. 11-12, 15-18</p> <p>File 05: pp. 51-53</p>	<p>Based on detail in the Technical Manual and Accessibility Manual, test administrators are trained annually on IEP decision-making, which drives selection of accommodations on the assessment.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); 	<p>Evidence of appropriate accommodations for English learners</p> <p>File 06: pp. 120-121, 181-183</p>	<p>Translation is available as an accommodation, appropriately implemented by the test administrator, given the small % of students with significant cognitive disabilities who are EL (no translated forms)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 	<p>Appropriateness and effectiveness of accommodations</p> <p>File 06: pp. 125-132, 143-147, 126-130, 130-132, 127-128, 217-218, 270-271, 283-284</p> <p>File 05: pp. 159, 55, 150-151</p> <p>File 01: p. 30</p> <p>File 21</p>	<p>Decisions on supports are well-grounded to support flexibility and equity of use, along with multiple means of engagement, representation, action and expression (pp. 130-132). Other key principles include student use of normal response mode and familiar, individualized manipulatives as required.</p> <p>One commendable feature is use of released testlets on which students can practice, in order to determine which accommodations will be most useful for him/her (KITE User Guide, pp. 150-151).</p> <p>Submission indicates plans (and rationales) for continuing research to improve use and effectiveness of accommodations; please note that rather than this detail appearing in File 06, pp. 217-18 as noted under DLM evidence, it actually appears on p. 150.</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

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"> Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<p>Exceptional accommodations requests:</p> <p>THIS PORTION OF THE CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; 	<p>Accommodations and participation decisions are consistent with state policy</p> <p>File 01: pp. 11-12, 15-18</p> <p>File 07: Appendix C.16</p> <p>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	<p>DLM provides guidelines through which state consortium members can monitor participation and accommodation assignment.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; 	<p>Appropriateness of accommodations and participation decisions for addressing student needs</p> <p>File 01: pp. 11-12, 15-18</p> <p>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	<p>Similarly, DLM provides guidance on the selection of accommodations based on student needs and preferences (Accessibility Manual pp. 11-2 and 15-18).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; 	<p>Consistent with accommodations during instruction and/or practice</p> <p>File 01: pp. 11 – 12, 19-22</p> <p>File 06: pp. 136-150, 283-284</p> <p>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	<p>DLM recommends that accommodations for use during assessment be consistent with those implemented in instructional contexts, but this must be monitored by each state. However, the consortium does collect indirect evidence of consistency between accommodations for assessment and instruction via a survey (Technical Manual p. 150).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team 	<p>Consistent with accommodations identified by team</p>	<p>DLM offers, via the KITE Educator Portal, the means by which state and local educators may</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;	File 02: pp. 44-46 THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.	produce lists of students' accommodations on their PNP profile. States may use this information for monitoring.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 	Administered with fidelity to procedures File 06: p.p. 124, 225-229 THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.	Along with SEA and LEA staff, DLM staff participates in monitoring the use of accommodations (Technical Manual p. 124).
Section 5.4 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; 	<p>THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 	<p>THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>x_ No additional evidence is required from DLM consortium-state specific.</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>Technically Sound Method</p> <p>File 14: pp. 19-20, 23- 24, 26-27, 31-32, 38-39, 33-34, 34-35, 34, 41, 53-57, 57-58, 44-49, 60-64, Appendix G, Appendix B, 62063</p> <p>File 06: pp. 203-204</p>	<p>Submission provides a clear explanation of application of well-established standard setting procedures to the unique features of the DLM assessment (FILE 14, pp. 19-20)</p>
	<p>Panelist experience and expertise</p> <p>File 14: pp.28, 30-31, 70-74, 51, Appendix L (201)</p>	<p>Standard-setting involved a range of participants, including TAC and state partners, and SEA staff, who reviewed and approved cuts. Panelist characteristics are well-defined in terms of professional role, experience with SWSCD, race, gender, geographic representation (FILE 14, pp. 30-31)</p> <p>Peer reviewers noticed, however, that representation was skewed toward females and Caucasians. While that may reflect the population that participants were drawn from, it would have been useful to make this clear. DLM should make an effort to better balance participation in the future.</p>
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

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>Challenging Alternate Academic Achievement Standards</p> <p>File 06: pp.17-19, 26-27, 38-41</p> <p>File 15: pp. 23-24</p> <p>File 18: pp. 63-67</p> <p>File 06: pp. 163-164, 179- 180, 165</p>	<p>Evidence demonstrates that EEs (extended content standards) were developed based on CCSS and later aligned with CETE learning maps. Performance level descriptors were developed through a process informed by research and professional judgment.</p>
	<p>Differentiated content across grades</p> <p>File 06: pp. 10-13, 26-27, 179-180</p>	<p>PLDs are clearly based on grade level content (FILE 06, pp. 179-80) and are aligned across grades to ensure increasing complexity.</p>
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; 	<p>Reporting Results</p> <p>File 06: pp. 165, 93-195, 282-283</p> <p>File 07: Appendix E.7</p> <p>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE- SPECIFIC REPORTING IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	<p>States are provided with detailed data files and resources to SEA staff on how they can be used (FILE 07, Appendix E7).</p> <p>It might be useful to peer reviewers to be able to access examples of the additional resources mentioned in Appendix E7 that are available to states on their website—even if limited to including static documents. Peers noted that the screenshot provided on p. 192 of FILE 07 gives some idea of a wide array of resources available to member states.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 	<p>Assessment results reported to support appropriate uses of results</p> <p>File 06: pp. 161- 162, 190- 193, 238-239, 244- 246</p> <p>File 07: Appendix E.2, E1</p> <p>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE- SPECIFIC REPORTING IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	<p>Submission notes indicate “preliminary evidence indicates that teachers are able to use ISRs to guide instructional planning” and reference FILE 06 pp. 244-246. Some indication of plans to obtain follow-up information would be useful.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results. 	<p>Interpretive Guides</p> <p>File 06: pp. 191-192</p> <p>File 07: Appendices E.3, E.9, E.10, E.4, E.5</p> <p>File 20</p> <p>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE- SPECIFIC INTERPRETIVE GUIDES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	<p>The last page of FILE 20 provides screenshot of a list of scoring and reporting resources available to states on the DLM website; access to these documents would enhance this submission.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State provides for the production and 	<p>Delivery of Student Reports</p>	<p>Overall, DLM provides ample evidence to address</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand; 	<p>File 06: pp. 203-209, 238-239, 191-192, 265-274</p> <p>File 07: Appendix E3</p> <p>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE- SPECIFIC INTERPRETIVE GUIDES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	<p>most aspects of this factor.</p> <p>Peer reviewers noted how detailed the score report is and wonder whether reliability evidence supports this much detail in score reporting.</p> <p>Peer reviewers ask DLM to consider conveying to parents that there <u>is</u> some error in scores (to address the reliability of information regarding a student’s achievement).</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>Process and Timeline</p> <p>File 06: pp. 190-193, 267</p> <p>File 07: Appendix E6</p> <p>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE- SPECIFIC INTERPRETIVE GUIDES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	<p>Evidence from DLM is sufficient for this section.</p>
<p>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required from the consortium.</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.

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

April, 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes—PARCC Consortium Evidence



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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM
EVIDENCE SUBMISSION**

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS	3
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students	3
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards	4
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)	5
SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	6
2.1 – Test Design and Development	6
2.2 – Item Development	8
2.3 – Test Administration	9
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)	10
2.5 – Test Security	11
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy	13
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY	14
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	14
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	16
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	17
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	18
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	20
4.1 – Reliability	20
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility	21
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	25
4.4 – Scoring	26
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	28
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	29
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	31
SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS	32
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	32
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs	34
5.3 – Accommodations	35
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	37
SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING	38
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	38
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting	39
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	40
6.4 – Reporting	41

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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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>1.1.1 Common Core State Standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts & Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Studies b. Common Core State Standards for Mathematics <p>Science standards not included</p>	
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See State evidence.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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>1.2.4 Reaching Higher: The Common Core State Standards Validation Committee a. Findings, pp. 2-3</p> <p>1.2.5 The Common Core State Standards: Insight into Their Development and Purpose</p> <p>NA for Science</p>	
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See State evidence.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment; ○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column-SWD and EL</p> <p>*PARCC Accessibility/Accommodations Manual</p>	<p>Several policy-like statements (Sections 3 and 4) support inclusions of all students, including those with disabilities and EL in statewide assessments</p> <p>Same sections also support inclusion of English Learners in statewide assessments.</p> <p>The PARCC manual submitted clearly outlines an approach for instructional staff to consider when considering accessibility features for all students.</p> <p>The manual also clearly outlines an approach for IEP teams to use when considering and selecting assessment accommodations.</p> <p>This manual also clearly outlines an approach for instructional staff to use when considering and selecting allowable accommodations for EL students.</p>
<p>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p>This summary feedback for “No Additional Evidence Needed”, or “Additional Evidence Needed” is most appropriately limited to the context of a specific state</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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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
submission. This consortium submission, however, provides very good evidence and support for element 1.4 criteria, for any state that implements the PARCC assessment system.		

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose 2.1.1.1 About PARCC Assessments; Intended Interpretation and uses of results 2.1.1.2 – 2.1.1.7 • Test blueprints and item specifications provide detailed guidance to item development that addresses coverage and support for interpretation and use of results 2.2.1a-2.1.2.6 • ECD, Claims Structure, and Descriptions provide information about content challenge and required complexity of items and tasks 2.1.2.7a-2.1.2.9 and 2.1.3.4a-2.1.3.14 • The PARCC Cognitive Complexity Study 2.1.3.1evaluation was intended to guide selection of items for test forms to meet challenge and complexity requirements. • The NNSTOY 2.1.3.3, Fordham 2.1.3.2a (intended to evaluate grades 5 and 8 for alignment and comparisons of challenge and rigor with other measures) and HumRRO 2.1.3.2b (intended to evaluate HS assessments for alignment and comparison to challenge and rigor of other measures) studies address issues of cognitive complexity. • Technology-based = Usability of accessibility tools 2.2.5 and 2.2.6 • NA-not computer-adaptive 	<p>More than adequate evidence is provided for the intended interpretation and uses of results both in an overarching statement and as communicated in score reports and interpretation guides to support score reports.</p> <p>Several documents provide guidance for item development to ensure appropriate content challenge and complexity. Pre-item development documentation supported item development that addressed a variety of complexity levels consistent with the intent of the full range of the grade-level academic content standards.</p> <p>PARCC Cognitive Complexity Study investigators evaluated item content for cognitive complexity for the purpose of assembling operational test forms to align with the content standards.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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 needed		

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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.2 – Item Development</p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content challenge and cognitive complexity are defined for use in item and task development in 2.2.12 and 2.2.21, 2.2.13-2.2.14, 2.2.21 • Item development processes 2.2.1-2.2.4, 2.2.9-2.2.10, 2.2.12, 2.2.15-2.2.16, 2.2.17-2.2.19 • Item research and reviews 2.2.5-2.2.8, 2.2.11, 2.2.20 	<p>Peers could not locate information about the composition (e.g., racial and geographic diversity) and credentials (e.g., certification, grade levels, special population, etc.) of those participating in the Content and Bias/Sensitivity.</p> <p>Peers could not locate information about the most common reasons for item rejections that should be useful in future item development.</p>
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Composition and credentials of Content and Bias/Sensitivity Reviewers 		

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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>Administration policies and procedures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicate admin procedures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Standardized 2.3.1.1 Admin Bulletin, 2.3.1.1 Technology Bulletin, TCM & TAMs 2.3.1.7 ○ Accommodations: Manual 2.3.1.8, TCM 2.3.1.6 pp 54-60 • Training: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Practice tests 2.3.1.2 ○ Sample items 2.3.1.3 ○ Tutorials 2.3.1.4 ○ Online Training Modules 2.3.1.5 ○ Test Admin study 2.3.2.1 • Technology: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Technology Bulletin 2.3.1.1 ○ Customer Support 2.3.1.9 ○ Technology Set-up Tools 2.3.3.1 ○ Contingency TCM 2.3.1.6 pp.33, Early Warning System 2.3.3.2, Error Codes 2.3.3.3, Escalation Protocol 2.3.3.4 <p>NA-AA-AAS</p>	<p>In the HumRRO report, reviewers found that accommodations offered were valid and appropriate based on current research, However, reviewers were unable to locate information regarding research regarding whether the accessibility features and accommodations alter the constructs measured.</p> <p>It is not clear who is and whether personnel are required to complete all training prior to administration. PARCC says they provide data to states on who has viewed which modules and completed the end-of-training quiz.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do States decide who takes the training? • Are States individually making policies concerning training requirements since format of training varies from state-to-state? • If so, how does this variation affect accuracy of results? (See Test Admin Study) <p>PARCC States should document fidelity of implementation of training materials provided by PARCC through the States’ monitoring processes.</p> <p>Use of a common test platform ensures consistency for delivery for training and test administration and a common experience for students. It also minimizes test administration problems that are introduced by the use of multiple platforms.</p>
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for PARCC.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p>2.4.1 PARCC State Alert/Escalation Protocol SECURE DOCUMENT</p> <p>2.4.2 Online Testing Support</p> <p>2.4.3 Troubleshooting Guide for Online Testing</p> <p>2.4.4 PARCC Service Now Dashboard</p> <p>2.4.5 Quality of Test Administration Study a. Including on-site observations from HumRRO, pp. 6-9</p> <p>2.4.6 PARCC Support Center</p> <p>2.4.7 Administration Scripts a. PARCC 2016 Spring ELA CBT Administration Scripts b. PARCC 2016 Spring ELA PBT Administration Scripts c. PARCC 2016 Spring Math CBT Administration Scripts d. PARCC 2016 Spring Math PBT Administration Scripts</p> <p>2.4.8 Data Forensics Study Plan SECURE DOCUMENT a. Pearson/Caveon response change analysis; Erasure analysis</p>	<p>2.4.1-outlines PARCC procedures to escalate various online testing issues to vendor via state contacts.</p> <p>2.4.2 describes various PARCC support options for online testing</p> <p>2.4.3 outlines PARCC procedures for trouble shooting</p> <p>2.4.4 example of PARCC online status monitoring interface.</p> <p>2.4.5 describes an HumRRO independent monitoring/observation study in 2015 participating states—test proctors, student, and LEA data gathered; combined with audit sample of testing sites (100+) during administration. Study provides direct evidence of consortium efforts to monitor test administration. This was a commendable effort to monitor, observe, and evaluate administration of a large-scale assessment and provide actionable feedback for system improvements.</p> <p>2.4.7 PARCC documents show standardized administration prompts for LEA test proctors</p> <p>2.4.8 shows PARCC data analysis plan for monitoring test anomalies</p>
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p>This summary feedback for “No Additional Evidence Needed” or “Additional Evidence Needed” is most appropriately limited to the context of a specific state submission.</p> <p>This consortium submission, however, provides very good evidence and support for element 2.4 criteria, for any state that implements the PARCC assessment system.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; Detection of test irregularities; Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. 	<p>2.5.1.1 TCM and TAMs 2.5.1.2 Security Agreement 2.5.1.3 Post-Test Certification Forms 2.5.1.4 Form to Report Testing Irregularities and Security Breaches 2.5.1.5 <u>Form to Report Contaminated, Damaged, Missing Materials</u> 2.5.1.6 <u>Chain-of-Custody Requirements in 2016 Spring Test Coordinator Manual</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2.1, pp. 3-5: Maintaining The Security of Test Materials and Content Section 3.3.2, p. 16: Security Plan Chain-of-Custody Forms <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Computer-Based Testing Form</u> <u>School-Level Paper-Based Testing Form</u> <u>LEA/District-Level Paper-Based Testing Form</u> <p>2.5.1.7 <u>TestNav Security Highlights</u> 2.5.1.8 <u>DDoS Migration AWS-Pearson SECURE DOCUMENT</u> 2.5.1.9 <u>Troubleshooting Guide for Online Testing</u> 2.5.1.10 <u>TestNav Early Warning System</u> 2.5.1.11 <u>PearsonAccessNext Operational Reports</u> 2.5.2.1 <u>Data Forensics Study Plan SECURE DOCUMENT</u> 2.5.2.2 <u>PARCC Handscoring Alert Process SECURE DOCUMENT</u> 2.5.3.1 <u>PARCC State Alert/Escalation Protocol SECURE DOCUMENT</u></p>	<p>PARCC Evidence of recommended Test Security procedures to create a secure environment and to protect PII is more than adequate.</p> <p>States need to demonstrate full use and application of these procedures and protections.</p>
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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>2.6.1.1 <u>Chain-of-Custody Requirements in 2016 Spring Test Coordinator Manual</u></p> <p>2.6.1.2 <u>Paper-Based Testing Materials Security Procedures in 2016 Spring Test Coordinator Manual</u></p> <p>2.6.1.3 <u>PARCC State Alert/Escalation Protocol</u> SECURE DOCUMENT</p> <p>2.6.1.4 <u>Data Forensics Study Plan</u> SECURE DOCUMENT</p> <p>2.6.1.5 <u>Student Registration/Personal Needs Profile Field Definitions</u></p> <p>2.6.1.6 <u>Non-Disclosure Agreements</u> for all item reviewers, forms reviewers, etc.</p> <p>2.6.1.7 <u>PARCC Data Privacy and Security Policy</u></p> <p>2.6.2.1 <u>Pearson Privacy Policy</u></p> <p>2.6.2.2 <u>Pearson Terms and Conditions</u></p> <p>2.6.2.3 <u>User Role Matrix for Pearson Access Next</u></p> <p>2.6.2.4 <u>Score Report Interpretation Guide</u></p> <p> a. Section 1.3, p. 1: Confidentiality of Reporting Results</p> <p>2.6.2.5 <u>Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974</u></p> <p>2.6.3.1 <u>Protection of Student Privacy: Aggregate Reports</u> SECURE DOCUMENT</p>	<p>Minimum cell sizes for reporting for PARCC is Performance View-16 students; Growth View-25.students. State member minimum cell sizes range from 10 to 25.</p> <p>Policies and procedures for reporting conform to industry standards. (PARCC honors the minimum // sizes and suppression rules for the respective states.)</p>
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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>3.1.1.1 <u>2015 PARCC Technical Report</u></p> <p>3.1.1.2 <u>Evidence of PARCC Validity</u></p> <p>3.1.1.3 <u>Quality of Items, Tasks, and Stimuli Study</u></p> <p>3.1.1.16 <u>Cognitive Complexity Study</u></p> <p><u>Evidence cited elsewhere relevant to this CE:</u> Thomas B. Fordham Institute, “Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation Assessments,” and HumRRO, “Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation High School Assessments”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Content (knowledge and process) 3.1.1.3 <u>Quality of Items, Tasks, and Stimuli Study</u> a. pp. 1-4, 8-17, 72-73, 79-80 ○ Range Fordham p.7 and 54 ○ Balance HumRRO p.25, 36, and 38 ○ Cognitive Complexity 3.1.1.16 <u>Cognitive Complexity Study</u> <p>NA for AA-AAA</p>	<p>NNSTOY, Fordham, and HumRRO reports evaluated alignment only for grades 5, 8, and High School in ELA/L and Mathematics. These investigators noted that more PLD Level 1 items are needed, particularly at grade 8 and High School Mathematics. PARCC has indicated they are adding items to address this concern. In addition, Fordham investigators were unable to summarize results for balanced emphasis as regards concepts, procedures, and applications.</p> <p>PARCC evidence of coverage of the full range of the grade-level academic content standards was lacking in both ELA and Mathematics particularly at grades 5 and 8. Future alignment studies that include multiple forms per grade for all grades tested may find that coverage is not an issue across forms. Further evidence is needed.</p> <p>PARCC Technical Report indicates that alignment studies found excellent alignment for both content and depth. However, the HumRRO study of the High School assessments found that the ELA/L assessment was limited overall for Depth. This finding contrasts with the Fordham study findings for ELA/L grades 5 and 8, where a good to excellent match was found for Depth. Both studies found a weak match at all levels for Speaking and Listening.</p> <p>Alignment study findings for Mathematics at all levels for most aspects of alignment were good to excellent, although Fordham found that the distribution of items for grade 8 was weak at DOK1. Fordham also experienced difficulty in</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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>ascertaining balance of emphasis across the key concepts of the domains. No summary result was provided for this dimension of alignment. Balance of emphasis is an essential dimension of alignment.</p> <p>As adjustments are made to address the DOK1 issue, PARCC needs to verify all aspects of alignment for adjusted forms.</p>
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peers were unable to find that grades other than grades 5, 8, and High School were included in alignment studies. It was also not clear how many forms were evaluated. PARCC should perform alignment studies to cover multiple operational forms that will be used in future administrations for every grade tested in both content areas. 		

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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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>3.2.1 <u>PARCC Item Development Research: Cognitive Labs</u></p> <p>3.2.2 <u>Quality of Items, Tasks, and Stimuli Study</u></p> <p>3.2.3 <u>Cognitive Complexity Study</u></p>	<p>PARCC evidence from 3.1 that applies to this critical element: 3.1.1.5a-3.1.1.7l documents provide additional evidence for cognitive processes in the design of items in ELA/L and Mathematics to meet the requirement.</p> <p>The recommendation was made in the Cognitive Complexity Study that this study be repeated based on 2015 operational data. What is PARCC’s plan to address this?</p> <p>PARCC cognitive labs that explore student performance on items to show the items require complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skill would more clearly support the validity of the assessment in eliciting the intended cognitive processes.</p> <p>See Peer Review Guidance 3.2. Examples page 36.</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct cognitive labs based on cognitive processes across grades and content areas, or • Conduct follow-up Cognitive Complexity Studies that focus on cognitive processes across grades and content areas. 		

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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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>3.3.1 2015 PARCC Technical Report Section 9.3: Evidence Based on Internal Structure (pp. 115-147)</p> <p>3.3.2 PARCC 2014 Field Test Technical Report Section 9: Dimensionality Analyses (pp. 115-209)</p>	<p>PARCC’s internal structure evidence and Dimensionality analyses provide strong evidence for validity.</p> <p>PARCC’s descriptive information for subclaim reporting as opposed to numerical scores was a useful approach for this critical element for users and sound approach for test developers.</p> <p>PARCC’s <i>DIF</i> Analyses were conducted and used as one piece of evidence to determine exclusion of items. Flagged items are designated as DNU (Do Not Use) or recommended to be re-field tested.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>2015 PARCC Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Section 9: Validity (pp. 115-147) b. Addendum 9: Validity (pp. 563-566) <p>Postsecondary Educators’ Judgment Study</p> <p>Benchmarking Study</p> <p>Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation Assessments:</p> <p>The Right Trajectory: State Teachers of the Year Compare Former and New State Assessments</p> <p>Quality of Test Administration Study</p> <p>Predictive Validity of MCAS and PARCC Study</p> <p>Evidence found elsewhere relevant to this Critical Element:</p> <p>PARCC College- and Career-Ready Determination Policy</p>	<p>PARCC’s convergent and divergent validity analysis results were reported.</p> <p>PARCC’s preliminary studies considering the relationship between the high school tests and post-secondary outcomes are reported.</p> <p>The PARCC Benchmarking Study 3.4.3 provides validity evidence for comparisons to other highly respected assessments.</p> <p>PARCC’s plans for future investigations of consequential validity are also reported.</p> <p>PARCC should continue to provide the results of these studies and actions taken based on the recommendations of these studies to USED.</p> <p>In the PARCC College- and Career-Ready Determination Policy, PARCC sets forth an agenda for empirical investigation of consequential validity: “The following statement will be used to conduct validation studies of the efficacy of PARCC’s College- and Career-Ready Determinations in the future.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Students who earn a College- and Career-Ready Determination by performing at level 4 in grade 11 ELA/literacy and enroll in College English Composition, Literature, and technical courses requiring college-level reading and writing have approximately a 0.75 probability of earning college credit by attaining at least a grade of C or its equivalent in those courses.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Students who earn a PARCC College- and Career-Ready Determination by performing at level 4 in Algebra II or Mathematics III</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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>and enroll in College Algebra, Introductory College Statistics, and technical courses requiring an equivalent level of mathematics have approximately a 0.75 probability of earning college credit by attaining at least a grade of C or its equivalent in those courses.</p> <p>In the statement above, a 0.75 probability of earning a C is used as a <i>benchmark</i> against which the CCR cut score on the PARCC assessments will be validated through empirical research.”</p> <p>The Peers look forward to examining the results of future validity studies as outlined in the PARCC evidence documents.</p>
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 	<p>4.1.1 2015 PARCC Technical Report a. Section 8: Reliability (pp. 76-114)</p>	<p>All reliabilities reported by PARCC met industry standards except for certain subjects, accommodations, and subgroups, e.g., American Indians/Alaska Natives, Students with Disabilities, and English learners.</p> <p>Overall SEMs and conditional SEMs (Addendum 7) are better than most state results, probably due to the much larger sample size, a benefit of consortium test participation. These are more than acceptable for a new assessment program.</p> <p>The Livingston Lewis procedures and the results were also acceptable at all cut score levels and achievement levels and when the proficiency levels were collapsed into pass/fail decisions for both accuracy and consistency, they were even higher. (Tables 8.27 and 8.29)</p> <p>NA-CAT</p>
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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>Test Design and Development:</p> <p>PARCC Accessibility Guidelines</p> <p>PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, Fourth Edition</p> <p>Creating Accessible PARCC Reading Assessments: Separating the Constructs and Providing Text-to-Speech Accommodations for Students with Disabilities by Daniel Wiener and Martha Thurlow</p> <p>PARCC Item Development Technical Guide</p> <p>Accommodations for English language learners and students with disabilities: A research-based decision algorithm</p> <p>Public Comment on Select Reading Access Accommodations & Calculator Accommodations for Students with Disabilities</p> <p>Public Comment on Writing Access Accommodations for Students with Disabilities</p> <p>NCEO Analysis of Public Comments in Response to PARCC Draft Accommodations Policies</p> <p>PARCC Accommodations Manual for Public Comment FAQ (Questions 11-12)</p> <p>Draft <i>PARCC Accommodations Manual</i> for Public Comment PowerPoint slides 14-16</p> <p>General Assessment Student Engagement: A Framework for Assessment Tasks</p>	<p>Design and development: The information contained in the documentation below describes a robust process indicative of the extensive work done by the consortium to do things according to industry standards. These include the development of the PARCC Accessibility Guidelines, the PARCC Accessibility and Accommodations advisory committee, the PARCC Accessibility, Accommodations, and Fairness Technical Working Group, the fourth edition of the PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual etc.</p> <p>Analysis: PARCC: Nearly all accommodated students were included in the IRT calibrations except for students taking certain forms including: a) Spanish forms (mathematics only), b) American Sign Language (ASL) forms online, and c) AT/Screen Reader forms online. The assumption was made that mathematics items translated into Spanish were equivalent to the same items in English. The results of Spanish versus English differential item functioning (DIF) analyses supported this assumption. Also, ASL and AT/Screen Reader forms were delivered online, but were constructed from PBT items. As a result, these students could not be combined with the CBT and/or PBT IRT data files in a psychometrically defensible way.</p> <p>Technical Report p.82. Two closed caption and text-to-speech had adequate sample size to examine reliability for ELA. In mathematics, PARCC calculated reliabilities only for text-to-speech.</p> <p>Does PARCC intend to generate a Spanish form for new base forms as they are administered each year?</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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Stereotype Threat and Enhancing Equity and Validity in Assessment</p> <p>Processing Demands Checking (Including Linguistic Complexity)</p> <p>WCAG Guidelines for ARIA tagging</p> <p>PARCC Heading Structure Guidelines for Screen Reader</p> <p>Audio Guidelines PARCC Text-to-Speech Phonetic-Mark-up Guide PARCC Audio and Non-Visual Guidelines for Text to Speech and Screen Reader Users</p> <p>PARCC Tactile Accessibility Guidelines</p> <p>Item Review and Analysis:</p> <p>PARCC Item Review for Universal Design as Applied to Assessment Training</p> <p>Bias and Sensitivity Text Review Training PowerPoint</p> <p>PARCC Fairness Guidelines</p> <p>PARCC Item Bias and Sensitivity Training PowerPoint</p> <p>Accommodated Test Form Test Construction Checklists by Accommodation Type</p> <p>PARCC Spanish Glossary</p> <p>PARCC Transadaptation Guidelines</p>	<p>Peers encourage PARCC to continue investigating accommodated forms as sample sizes allow.</p> <p>Are future accommodations studies planned to determine the use and impact of individual and bundled accommodation use? Match between PNP and accommodations received? Over/Under-accommodated?</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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>American Sign Language GAAP Guidelines</p> <p>Accommodated Test Form Validation Checklists by Accommodation Type</p> <p>PARCC Human Reader Script Guidelines</p> <p>PARCC 2015 Operational Equating Plan and Procedures, pages 18-25</p> <p>Sample Data Review Item Card Templates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sample ELA constructed response or technology-enhanced 2-point item card • Sample math constructed response 6-point item card • Sample PCR Task Try Out item card • Sample EBSR and TECR Task Try Out item card • Sample math constructed response 4-point item card • Sample math multiple choice item card • Sample math constructed response 3-point item card <p>TestNav Item Evaluation Iteration 1 – Students with Visual Impairments Usability Study Summary</p> <p>Findings from the PARCC Accommodations and Accessibility Studies Report</p> <p>Findings from the Quality of Items/Tasks/Stimuli Investigations: PARCC Field Tests</p> <p>PARCC Item Development Research: Cognitive Labs for Students with Disabilities and English Learners</p> <p>Product Review Board September Quarterly</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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	PowerPoint	
Section 4.2 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required at this early stage of the assessment.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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>2015 PARCC Technical Report a. Section 12: Scale Scores (pp. 193-219)</p>	<p>Technical Report Section 12 pp 204-215 data appears to support the findings of the Fordham and HumRRO studies regarding a lack of Level 1 items in certain grades and courses.</p> <p>Appendix 12.3 pp 383-384 (Grade 3 ELA/L) indicates that the top 20 achievable score points all round down to 850. This is pattern across grades. What did the TAC think of the impact on IRT calibrations?</p> <p>Peers would be interested in viewing the cumulative frequency distributions across raw score/scale scores – What number and percent of students scored at each raw/scale score point?</p> <p>NNSTOY, Fordham, and HumRRO reports evaluated alignment only for grades 5, 8, and High School in ELA/L and Mathematics. These investigators note that more PLD Level 1 items are needed, particularly at grade 8 and High School Mathematics. Further evidence was noted in the SEM findings from the operational test. Additional item development is reportedly planned to remedy this situation so that the performance of low-achieving students can be more precisely measured.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference questions in right hand column. 		

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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>2015 PARCC Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Section 4: Item Scoring, pp. 40-49 b. Section 10: IRT Calibration and Scaling in Operational Year One, pp. 148-186 c. Section 12: Scale Scores, pp. 193-219 <p>Handscoring Specifications: Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 Operational Assessments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. pp. 13-67 <p>Final Report: 2015 PARCC Operational Assessment: Psychometric Evaluation</p> <p>PARCC Spring 2015 Test Coordinator Manual, pp. 11-15</p>	<p>Evidence provided conforms to industry standards. Peers noted that “two separate vendors independently conducted the calibration and scaling of the Fall and Spring administrations with a third vendor conducting an external evaluation of these procedures.”</p> <p>Recommendations and suggestions noted on page 41 of the 2015 PARCC Operational Assessment: Psychometric Evaluation (4.4.3) should be incorporated by PARCC in future years.</p> <p>For human or hand-scored items (Tech Manual, Section 4.2), “the first score is the score to be reported, while the second, resolution, and adjudication scores are used to monitor scorer performance only.” Approximately 90% of the responses were scored only once. A random selection of ten percent of responses were scored a second time by human scorers.. Pearson backread approximately five percent of the hand-scored responses. Backreading scores were used to monitor scorer performance. The first score was always used for both second reads and back reads.</p> <p>Inter-rater agreement in PARCC Technical Report p. 49 for perfect agreement range in mathematics was 92% and in ELA/L was 65%; within one point for mathematics was 99% and for ELA/L was 98%. The inter-rater reliability for ELA/L at the 65% exact agreement expectation should be monitored closely in future years (Technical Report, page 49). Peers noted that this seems a low threshold for exact agreement and should be expected to improve as the assessment matures. PARCC should continue to work toward a more ideal perfect agreement rate on ELA/L scoring.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>To strengthen the credibility of results and precision of scoring, Peers recommend a deeper examination of ELA/L inter-rater exact agreement at the grade for specific areas of concern. Results of this examination could be used to reflect on the precision of rubrics and the adequacy of training for all scorers. Peers' concern is for the implications of the exact agreement rate for the 90% of scores not examined by a second reader for reliability.</p> <p>In Table 4.4 page 49 of the Technical Report, Peers recommend increasing exact agreement expectations for the future for Mathematics to maintain the high mark they have established in the actual results.</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required at this early stage in the assessment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>2015 PARCC Technical Report</p> <p>Operational Equating Plan and Procedures for the 2015 Spring and 2014 Fall Block Administrations</p> <p>ELA/Literacy Blueprints</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. ELA Blueprints, 2016 versions for: b. ELA Common Form Specifications for: c. Task Generation Models for: d. Item Guidelines for ELA/Literacy <p>Mathematics Blueprints</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. PARCC Mathematics High Level Blueprints b. PARCC Mathematics Assessment Unit Structure c. Mathematics Claim Structure Documents d. Math Subclaim Points Document 	<p>Form to form equating: ETS provided a more than adequate model for scaling, equating, etc. that was clearly described in the Technical Report.</p> <p>Peers recommend that PARCC have an independent third party replicate calibrating, scaling, and equating. Peers understand that for the first administration, Pearson attempted to replicate these procedures and the results were checked somewhat independently by Measured Progress. Peers feel a full replication by an independent third party would increase confidence of the final raw score to scale score tables that are used for reporting.</p> <p>Across years – not yet available.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required at this early stage of the assessment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>1. Design and Development Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2015 PARCC Technical Report ELA/Literacy Blueprints Math Blueprints <p>2. Comparability Studies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mode Comparability Study based on Spring 2015 operational test Spring 2014 Digital Devices Comparability Research Study Spring 2015 Digital Devices Comparability Research Study PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, 4th Edition 	<p>Multiple Versions: PBT v CBT =The Mode Comparability Study found significant mode differences between PBT and CBT versions of the test. A small number of items for English Language Arts/Literacy (i.e., 0 to 7 items per grade) and a slightly higher number of items for Mathematics (i.e., 2 to 17 items per grade) possessed either positive or negative C-level differential item functioning (DIF) across modes. CBT and PBT items were calibrated separately for each grade/subject. PARCC excluded items flagged for positive and negative C-DIF from the linking sets. Common items that behave differently across modes will have two sets of item parameter estimates: one set for online conversions and one set for paper. Technical Report pp.143-144.</p> <p>Because mode differences were found, Peers noted that PARCC, in the Technical Report referenced calibrating the PBT and CBT separately and post-equating them. This approach will allow for a strong interpretation and compensation for the mode difference. However, Peers were unable to ascertain whether the process was applied prior to reporting scores for the 2014-15 school year or was it done only within the Mode Comparability Study. Did PARCC apply this procedure prior to reporting the 2014-15 test scores?</p> <p>Mode Comparability Study leaders noted, “The current study was not conducted on all PARCC tests but on selected forms of certain grade levels and subjects from one state [sic]. The results varied across grade levels and subjects, which suggests that any preliminary and descriptive conclusions based on these selected tests cannot be generalized to the tests that were not included in this study.”</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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>What are PARCC’s plans for further comparability studies between computer and paper tests? What are the plans to address the issues raised by the study or further investigation given the limitations of this study?</p> <p>What is PARCC doing in the future to ensure score comparability across modes?</p> <p>When scores are reported, PARCC should ensure that adjustments are made across modes so that scores have the same meaning for all students.</p>
Section 4.6 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plans for applying findings/proposed methodology from the Mode Comparability Study to ensure scores in future years have the same meaning for all students, given possible mode comparability issues. 		

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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>2015 PARCC Technical Report Section 13: Quality Control Procedures, pp. 220-229</p> <p>PARCC Program Quality Plan</p> <p>Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members</p> <p>Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Agendas</p> <p>TAC White Papers commissioned by PARCC</p>	<p>Extensive evidence is provided for the examination and implementation of quality controls during the development of the assessment.</p> <p>TAC Agendas were interesting but excerpts from minutes or summaries of key TAC recommendations would have been more useful.</p> <p>Technical Report page 17 describes the process for evaluating the sufficiency of the item bank for ongoing maintenance of the assessment program, including replenishing items and passages. Peers also noted that field test items were embedded in the Spring 2015 forms.</p>
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; 	<p>PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, Fourth Edition</p> <p>Online Professional Development Module on the PARCC Accessibility System</p> <p>Training Module for PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations</p> <p>PARCC Assistive Technology Guidelines</p>	<p>Guidance is extensive and detailed and assumes compliance with IDEA. Training is also provided.</p> <p>In PARCC’s Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, Fourth Edition, IEP information is consistent with federal law and regulations.</p> <p>PARCC has provided a series of steps to guide schools in decision-making regarding accessibility and accommodations. However, it is up to PARCC states to develop and adopt policies for educators and ensure that policies are carried out to ensure fairness.</p> <p>PARCC States need to document fidelity of appropriate PNP registration to ensure student access to appropriate accessibility features provided by PARCC.</p> <p>NA per AA-AAS.</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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA; Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments); The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum. 		
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PARCC evidence can be used by the States to support the inclusion of all students in the general assessment. However, each State is ultimately responsible for implementing practices such as those contained in the PARCC materials to ensure that all students have a fair and equitable assessment experience. 		

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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 	<p>5.2.0.1 Informational brochures for students, parents, and educators in English and Spanish that pertain to EL participation in PARCC were developed and are available online:</p> <p>Parent PARCC Accessibility Brochure</p> <p>Training Module for PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations</p> <p>Initial Draft Development of ELL Section of PARCC Accommodation Manual</p> <p>PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, Fourth Edition Appendix K</p> <p>Bilingual Dictionaries and Glossaries Authorized for Use by English Language Learners on MCAS and PARCC</p>	<p>Guidance is extensive and detailed. Training is also provided.</p> <p>PARCC offers Spanish forms of all math assessments. Use of translated versions is a state option. A list of bilingual dictionaries is provided. Accessibility tools and features are available to all students including ELs. Future translations into other languages is planned as an option for States.</p> <p>Accommodations specific to ELs are also provided.</p> <p>PARCC has provided a series of steps to guide schools in decision-making regarding inclusion of and accommodations for EL students. However, it is up to PARCC states to develop and adopt policies for educators and ensure that policies are carried out to ensure fairness.</p> <p>PARCC States need to document fidelity of appropriate PNP registration to ensure student access to appropriate accessibility features provided by PARCC.</p>
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PARCC evidence can be used by the States to support the inclusion of EL students in the general assessment. However, each State is ultimately responsible for implementing the recommended practices contained in the PARCC materials to ensure that all students have a fair and equitable assessment experience. 		

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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<p>PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, Fourth Edition</p> <p>PARCC Translation Policy</p> <p>2015 PARCC Technical Report</p> <p>Findings from the Quality of Items/Tasks/Stimuli Investigations: PARCC Field Tests</p> <p>PARCC Item Development Research: Cognitive Labs (for Students with Disabilities and English Learners)</p> <p>Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation Assessments:</p> <p>5.3.4.2 PARCC Unique Accommodation Summary Request SECURE DOCUMENT</p> <p>Additional evidence found elsewhere:</p> <p>Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation High School Assessments</p> <p>Quality of Test Administration Investigation</p>	<p>A wide array of accommodations are available for SWD, EL, and students covered under section 504.</p> <p>PARCC evidence describes an array of accessibility features and accommodations provided. However, it is up to PARCC states to ensure they are made available to students with disabilities (IDEA), students covered by Section 504, and English learners.</p> <p>PARCC States need to document fidelity of appropriate PNP registration to ensure student access to appropriate accessibility features provided by PARCC.</p> <p>PARCC has conducted Cognitive Labs to gather initial information about the interaction of students with disabilities and English learners with items and accessibility tools.</p> <p>The HumRRO investigators note in <i>Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation High School Assessments</i> that “The Center’s forthcoming test characteristics methodology, that considers data from administered tests, will support a fuller examination of accessibility.”</p> <p>Findings from the PARCC <i>Quality of Test Administration Investigations</i> provide some initial findings from Year 1 operational test for the effectiveness of training and fidelity of use of accessibility features and accommodations. The observational sample was very small for this study. Most data was self-report via survey.</p> <p>Are further studies planned on exactly how well the accessibility tools and features, accommodations, and</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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>assistive technology worked in actual use during testing?</p> <p>PARCC provides procedures for exceptional requests to be reviewed and approved in addition to those routinely allowed. (5.3.4.2) During the first operational administration, there were twenty-five exceptional requests of which 17 were approved and 8 were denied. PARCC added one of those 17 approved were added to the fourth edition of the Accessibility and Accommodations Manual.</p> <p>NA per AA-AAS.</p>
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for PARCC at this early stage of the assessment program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each State is ultimately responsible for implementing the accommodations provided by PARCC to ensure that all students have a fair and equitable assessment experience. 		

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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 	<p>Findings from the PARCC Quality of Test Administration Investigations: Year I of the Operational Assessments Technical Report</p> <p>Additional evidence cited elsewhere: Test Administration Manual 2.6.1.1. Test Coordinator Manual</p>	<p>PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual provides guidance for policies for accommodations and describes their availability in the PARCC assessment.</p> <p>The TAM contains recommendations for test administration practices to support fidelity of test administration procedures.</p> <p>Because PARCC makes available data concerning individual accessibility features and accommodations for download by Test Coordinators, this information should be used by the states for monitoring.</p> <p>States are responsible for monitoring test administration of all assessments in the system.</p>
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for PARCC at this early stage of the assessment program.</p>		
<p>Each State is ultimately responsible for monitoring test administration of all assessments within the State system.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels. 	<p>Performance Level Setting Technical Report</p> <p>Performance Level Descriptors</p> <p>2015 PARCC Technical Report Section 12: Scale Scores, pp. 193-219</p>	<p>PARCC followed an established standard setting process. Cut scores were set for each grade in each content area and for each EOY assessment.</p> <p>PARCC developed achievement level descriptors at each grade level for each content area. Mathematics PLDs are more clearly differentiated and aligned with subclaims from grade to grade than ELA/L PLDs for reading. These were reviewed and confirmed as part of Standard Setting.</p> <p>NA for AA-AAS.</p> <p>State evidence is required to substantiate adoption.</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required from PARCC.</p> <p>States must provide evidence of formal adoption of academic achievement levels and performance levels.</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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>Performance Level Setting Technical Report</p> <p>Performance Level Descriptors</p>	<p>Achievement standards were developed using an industry standard methodology.</p> <p>In Appendix 5 of the Performance Level Setting Technical Report, general descriptive tables of panel participants are provided, but lack sufficient detail to understand the real composition of the panels.</p> <p>PLDs are grade and content specific and were reviewed.</p> <p>Standard setting panels are only described in general terms. Special education and EL participants are not specifically noted.</p>
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More descriptive information about the composition of each panel including certification, particularly for special education and English learners 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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>Postsecondary Educators’ Judgment Study</p> <p>PARCC Benchmarking Study</p> <p>Performance Level Setting Technical Report</p> <p>PARCC Pioneers Information</p> <p>Predictive Validity of MCAS and PARCC Study</p>	<p>Substantial effort has been made to validate the college and career readiness aspect of their PARCC academic achievement standards.</p> <p>NA-AA-AAS</p>
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to 	<p>2014-2015 Tables of Cross-State and State-Specific PARCC Results</p> <p>Score Report Interpretation Guide</p> <p>PARCC 2014-15 Published Report Guidance</p> <p>Score Report Interpretation Guide (for educators)</p> <p>Score Report Interpretation Guide For Parents</p> <p>Summative Record File, field definitions</p> <p>Parent Score Report Guides in English and Spanish</p> <p>Setting a New Baseline in English and Spanish</p> <p>Translated Individual Student Report shells, available in 10 languages</p> <p>Translated Score Report Interpretation Guide for Parents, available in 10 languages</p> <p>Report shipment memos (Memos were tailored for each state). Examples from 3 states</p> <p>PARCC 2014-15 Published Report Guidance</p> <p>Pearson key dates document: Overview of PARCC reports release dates. Each state had individual release dates within the PARCC window.</p>	<p>Public Reporting: States are responsible for this item.</p> <p>Educator Reporting: An Interpretation Guide is provided for educators for all reports available to them. Information is reported in the form of student rosters at the overall content area level and for subclaims for each school and district.</p> <p>How will teachers receive information about classroom performance? How are classroom results generated? What do they look like?</p> <p>Peers were unable to locate itemized score analyses. Are they available?</p> <p>Parent Reporting: PARCC score reports to parents are provide in multiple languages. The reports provide score information in the context of achievement levels and abbreviated subclaim PLDs at the proficient level. The reports are clear and supported by an Interpretation Guide that directs those interested to the location of complete PLDs available on-line.</p> <p>How will States calculate the percentage of students not tested? No enrollment data are indicated in consortium and State tables. 6.4.1.1. It is unlikely that PARCC has this information. If this is the case, then States will need to calculate and report the percentages of students not tested.</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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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. 		
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What mechanism does PARCC have in place to assist States to provide classroom level reports for teachers? 		

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.