



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Katy Anthes, Ph.D.
Commissioner of Education
Colorado Department of Education
201 East Colfax Avenue, Room 500
Denver, CO 80203-1799

May 10, 2018

Dear Commissioner Anthes:

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

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

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated CDE's submission, which included several assessments. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and the Department's analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following in regards to one of the submitted assessments:

- General assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics for grades 3-8 (Colorado Measures of Academic Success (CMAS)): **Meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**

Congratulations on this significant accomplishment. Assessments that produce valid and reliable results are fundamental to a State's accountability system. Please be aware that approval of CDE's CMAS for assessments is not a determination that the system complies with Federal civil rights requirements, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972,

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.

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, and requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Also, please remember that, if CDE makes significant changes in its CMAS assessments, the State must submit information about those changes to the Department for review and approval.

In regards to the other assessments that CDE's submitted for the February 2018 peer review, peer reviewers and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the components of CDE's assessment system meet most, but not all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- General assessments in science in grades 5 and 8 (CMAS): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and the ESSA**
- General assessments in high school (end-of-course in science) (CMAS): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and the ESSA**
- Alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for grades 5, 8 and high school in science (Colorado Alternate Assessment (CoAlt)): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and the ESSA**
- AA-AAAS for grades 3-8 and high school in reading/language arts and mathematics (Dynamic Learning Maps, Year-End Model (DLM-YE)): **Meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB. Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA**

I also remind you that because CDE has recently adopted new high school assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics, CDE will need to submit its new high school assessments for full peer review at a future date.

In saying that these assessments **substantially meet the requirements of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB**, the Department means that these assessments meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The Department expects that CDE may be able to provide this additional information within one year. The specific list of items required for CDE to submit is enclosed with this letter. CDE must provide to the Department a plan and timeline by which it will submit the additional documentation within 30 days of the receipt of this letter. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action.

Additionally, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) will monitor progress on matters pertaining to requirements in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) related to the participation of students with disabilities in Title I assessments. In particular, OSERS will monitor progress against critical elements 4.4 and 6.3. Insufficient progress to address such matters may lead OSERS to place a condition on CDE's federal fiscal year 2018 IDEA Part B grant award.

Please note that the assessment requirements for ESEA, as amended by the NCLB, were in effect through the end of the 2016-2017 school year. The CDE peer review was conducted under the requirements of this statute. Beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, the assessment requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, will apply to State assessments.

Given that this review began under the requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB, it is important to indicate that while the CMAS and the Co-Alt science assessments substantially meet most of the peer review guidance criteria under the NCLB, the State is still responsible to ensure that these

assessments also comply with the requirements of the ESSA. Department staff carefully reviewed CDE's evidence and peer review recommendations in light of the updated requirements for State assessments under the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. As a result of this additional review, I have determined that the CDE administration of the CMAS and the Co-Alt science assessments need to meet one additional requirement related to alternate academic achievement standards to fully meet ESSA requirements. The same is true of the DLM-YE; this assessment meets all NCLB requirements, but like CMAS and the Co-Alt science assessments, the DLM-YE does not meet one of the additional requirements of the ESSA. This requirement is listed under critical element 6.3 along with the other evidence needed from the February 2018 peer review.

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 Elizabeth Witt or Cynthia Wright of my staff at: OSS.Colorado@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/
Jason Botel
Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary,
Delegated the Authority to Perform the
Functions and Duties of the Assistant Secretary
of the Office of Elementary and Secondary
Education

Enclosures

cc: Joyce Zurkowski, Executive Director of Assessment

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

| Critical Element | Additional Evidence Needed |
|---|--|
| <p>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</p> | <p>For the science alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for grades 5, 8 and high school (Colorado Alternate Assessment (CoAlt)):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State-conducted monitoring process for the CoAlt test administration that was adequate to ensure that standardized test administration procedures for this assessment were implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. |
| <p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> | <p>For the science assessments in grades 5, 8 and high school (Colorado Measures of Academic Success (CMAS)) and the science AA-AAAS in grades 5, 8 and high school (CoAlt):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A plan and timeline for improving the alignment of the CMAS science tests or additional evidence that indicates the identified alignment deficiencies have been resolved. • A plan and timeline for improving the alignment of the CoAlt science tests or additional evidence that indicates the identified alignment deficiencies have been resolved. |
| <p>4.4 – Scoring</p> | <p>For the science CoAlt assessments in grades 5, 8 and high school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the CoAlt scoring rubric measures student performance of science academic content. |
| <p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards (additional requirement under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA)</p> | <p>For the reading/language arts and mathematics AA-AAAS for grades 3-8 and high school (Dynamic Learning Maps, Year-End Model (DLM-YE)) and the science AA-AAAS for grades 5, 8 and high school (CoAlt):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards (AAAS) ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 ESEA, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). |

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

February 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes-Resubmission



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

Note: Peer review notes provide the combined recommendations of the individual peers to the U.S. Department of Education (Department), based on the statute and regulations, 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
 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (from 2016 review)
 3
 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration..... 4
 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy (from 2016 review)
 6

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 8
 3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content (from 2016 review)
 8
 4.1 – Reliability (from 2016 review) 10
 4.4 – Scoring (from 2016 review)..... 11
 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment (from 2016 review) 12
 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities (from 2016 review)
 13
 5.2 – Procedures for including ELs (from 2016 review) 14
 6.4 – Reporting (from 2016 review) 15

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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—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 (from 2016 review) The Colorado Department of Education (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>Students placed in private schools: 1.4 Evidence #1: Colorado Revised Statute [22-7-409(1.2)(d)(I)(A)] 1.4 Evidence #2: Spring 2017 CMAS and CoAlt Procedures Manual Spring, pages 27-28 1.4 Evidence #3: Directory of Colorado Facility Schools</p> <p>Native language assessments 1.4 Evidence #4: Spring 2017 CMAS CoAlt Procedures Manual, 89; 101-109 1.4 Evidence #5: Spanish Eligibility Flowchart 1.4 Evidence #6: <i>PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual 5th Edition</i>, p 91</p> | <p>CDE has provided evidence that it has policies in place to ensure that students placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services are included in the assessment system.</p> <p>CDE has provided evidence that it has policies and procedures in place to guide districts in determining, on a case-by-case basis, when and how to use Spanish language assessments. The evidence provided is adequate to meet this requirement.</p> |
| <p>Section 1.4 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

| 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 For the science AA-AAAS for grades 5,8, and high school (Colorado Alternate CoAlt)), CDE must provide: 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> | <p>2.4 Evidence #1: 2014-2015 CoAlt Score Monitor Checklist Summary</p> | <p>The document provided indicates that score monitoring for the 2014-15 CoAlt assessments was done during the assessment window. CDE indicates that score monitors conducted 26 observations across eight school districts in Colorado, thirteen of which were for science. CDE provided summary results on the 14 questions examined during this monitoring.</p> <p>CDE has not provided sufficient information to show that monitoring procedures were in place that would show that standardized test administration procedures for this assessment were implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. The following information would show that appropriate monitoring procedures were in place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information about the identity of the monitors—it is unclear if they are SEA or LEA staff, or if they are contractors. • Information as to how the LEAs monitored were selected, or what the statewide cycle for monitoring, if any, is. • Information about the monitors’ roles or the responsibilities of key personnel. |
| <p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p> | | |
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: CDE has not provided the following the following information that would show that its monitoring process ensures that standardized test administration procedures for this assessment were implemented with fidelity across districts and schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information about the identity of the monitors—it is unclear if they are SEA or LEA staff, or contractors. | | |

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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 |
|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information as to how the 8 LEAs monitored were selected, or what the statewide cycle for monitoring, if any, is. • Information about the monitors’ roles or the responsibilities of key personnel. | | |

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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 (from 2016 review)</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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence supporting the State’s claim that policies regarding minimum cell sizes for reporting are being enforced was not found. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Peers note that the State says that LEAs must distribute reports in accordance with applicable State and Federal policies and laws. However, we did not find any evidence of (1) these policies and laws having been communicated to the LEAs or (2) any relevant ongoing training that may be done. By itself, the current disclaimer on the reports does not fulfill this requirement. The Peers understand that Colorado is a strong local control state, and strongly encourage the CDE to work with its LEAs to develop consensus around these and other issues discussed in this review. |

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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 |
|---|--|--|
| Section 2.6 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"> • Evidence supporting the State’s claim that policies regarding minimum cell sizes for reporting are being enforced must be submitted. Such evidence might include an overall guidance document, documentation of training on the dissemination and use of hard copy reports and electronic data (for example, a Power Point presentation used at a workshop, etc.), and specific references to applicable laws and policies that were discussed with the LEAs. This will be especially critical if the LEAs are able to modify State templates and generate their own reports. | | |

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

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 (from 2016 review) For the science assessments in grades 5, 8 and high school (Colorado Measures of Academic Success (CMAS)), CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a plan and timeline for improving the alignment of the CMAS science tests or additional alignment evidence that indicates the identified alignment deficiencies have been resolved. <p>For the science AA-AAAS in grades 5, 8 and high school (CoAlt), CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a plan and timeline for improving the alignment of the CoAlt science tests or additional alignment evidence that indicates the identified alignment deficiencies have been resolved. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a plan and timeline for improving the alignment of the CMAS science tests or additional alignment evidence that indicates the identified alignment deficiencies have been resolved was not found. • Evidence of a plan and timeline for improving the alignment of the CoAlt science tests or additional alignment evidence that indicates the identified alignment deficiencies have been resolved was not found. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Peers acknowledge that the State has indicated that standards will be revised in the future. Depending on how this is done, it may well help address the issues that currently exist. However, evidence of a plan and timeline for doing so was not found. |

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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 |
|---|--|--|
| Section 3.1 Summary Statement | | |
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a plan and timeline for improving the alignment of the CMAS science tests or additional alignment evidence that indicates the identified alignment deficiencies have been resolved. • Evidence of a plan and timeline for improving the alignment of the CoAlt science tests or additional alignment evidence that indicates the identified alignment 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

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 (from 2016 review) For the CoAlt Science, CDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of a plan and timeline for improving the reliability of the test, specifically the classification consistency. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The evidence including adjusted Kappas appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. Consequently, the previous request to provide a plan and timeline is now moot. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The adjusted Kappas appear to be within an acceptable range when corrected for bias. However, the Peers note that referencing other instances where states have been found to have low Kappas does not strengthen the argument in support of the reliability of Colorado’s assessment. |
| Section 4.1 Summary Statement | | |
| <u>X</u> 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 | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|---|--|
| <p>4.4 – Scoring (from 2016 review) 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the CoAlt scoring rubric measures student content mastery was not found. • 4.4 Evidence #2 appears to meet the evidence of training requirement. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Peers note that the PLDs are very content focused. However, the scoring rubric, as implemented, appears to focus at least in part on student interaction with the item. If students can not interact without overt involvement of the test administrator, it suggests a fundamental fairness issue. In the end, this seems very likely to provide parents with an unrealistic view of their child’s performance level. |
| Section 4.4 Summary Statement | | |
| <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the CoAlt scoring rubric measures student content mastery must be submitted. | | |

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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 (from 2016 review) 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.6 Evidence #1 appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The narrative provided by the State is sufficient. However, the Peers would have liked to see evidence of the process by which paper-and-pencil tests are created from the on-line version. To better explore the comparability of the accommodated assessments, the State might consider aggregating accommodated scores across years. |
| <p>Section 4.6 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 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 (from 2016 review) 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. • Evidence of how parents of these children are informed of these implications. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5.1 Evidence #1, outside back cover, supported by documentation of the IEP process, appears to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. | |
| <p>Section 5.1 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>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs (from 2016 review) 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The evidences provided appear to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. | |
| <p>Section 5.2 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 | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|--|
| <p>6.4 – Reporting (from 2016 review) 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The various evidences provided appear to meet the requirements of this Critical Element. | |
| <p>Section 6.4 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.

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

August 2017 State Assessment Combined Peer Review Notes for the DLM Year-End Assessment Consortium RESUBMISSION



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

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

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

Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS | 3 |
| 2.1 – Test Design and Development..... | 3 |
| 2.2 – Item Development..... | 4 |
| 2.3 – Test Administration | 5 |
| 2.5 – Test Security | 6 |
| 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... | 7 |
| SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... | 8 |
| 3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... | 8 |
| 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... | 9 |
| 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure | 10 |
| 3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables | 11 |
| SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER | 12 |
| 4.1 – Reliability..... | 12 |
| 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... | 13 |
| 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... | 14 |
| 4.4 – Scoring | 15 |
| 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms | 16 |
| 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment | 17 |
| 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... | 18 |
| SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS | 19 |
| 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities | 19 |
| 5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... | 21 |
| 5.3 – Accommodations..... | 22 |
| 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations..... | 23 |
| SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . | 24 |
| 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students | 24 |
| 6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... | 25 |
| 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards | 26 |
| 6.4 – Reporting..... | 27 |

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM R/LA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

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><u>YE 01</u> (Technical Manual Update YE 2015-16)</p> | <p>DLM provides a brief but adequate explanation for why speaking and listening standards (part of CCSS) were not included in the DLM ELA assessment, to the effect that partner states had not assessed these standards in their general assessments. For all students, therefore, including SWSCD, speaking and listening were to be taught and assessed at the local level (YE 01, pp. 9-10).</p> <p>It might have been useful (but not essential) to include participating state’s waiver letters to support this statement.</p> <p>The supplementary submission evidence did not address part of the summary statement request for additional evidence—specifically, an explanation of why Language is not directly addressed. A brief explanation such as that offered for the question about Speaking and Listening would have been helpful—which the reviewers assume is that in their general assessments, all of the partner states assess Language in the context of Reading or Writing (e.g., as is the case with PARCC).</p> |
| <p>Section 2.1 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 DLM R/LA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

| 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>Requirement previously met.</p> | |
| <p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p>Requirement previously met.</p> | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM R/LA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

| 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>Requirement previously met for consortium.</p> | |
| <p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p>Requirement previously met for 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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

| 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>Requirement previously met for consortium.</p> | |
| <p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p>Requirement previously met for 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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

| 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>Requirement previously met for consortium.</p> | |
| <p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p>Requirement previously met for 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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|--|
| <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>Requirement previously met for consortium.</p> | |
| <p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p>Requirement previously met for 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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

| 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>Requirement previously met for consortium.</p> | |
| <p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p>Requirement previously met for 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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
| <p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</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>Requirement previously met for consortium.</p> | |
| <p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p>Requirement previously met for 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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

| 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>Requirement previously met for consortium.</p> | |
| <p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p>Requirement previously met for 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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|---|
| <p>4.1 – 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> | | <p>DLM indicates that additional consortium-level evidence is required for this factor, and notes that it will be included in the December 2017 submission.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; | | <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this factor.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; | | <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this factor.</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>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this factor.</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>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this factor.</p> |
| <p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See 2016 Peer Review | | |

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

| 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>YE 01 (Technical Manual Update YE 2015-16), pp. 10-11, 13-14</p> <p>Appendix A: ELA Text Photograph Guidelines</p> | <p>DLM provides an adequate explanation of the development and selection of reading passages, including steps taken to ensure passages are accessible to SWSCD.</p> <p>The peers found Table 5 (p. 11) very helpful in clarifying internal and external passage review criteria. While not essential to document attention to this CE factor, it would have been of interest to not only cite a source of more information on p. 10 of YE 01 (“For a complete summary of external review of ELA passages, see Results from External Review During the 2014–2015 Academic Year [Clark, Swinburne Romine, Bell, & Karvonen, 2016]”), but to have provided it among sources of evidence.</p> <p>The explanation of steps taken in the selection and/or creation of graphic components was clear and complete. The reviewers appreciated inclusion of the specific guidelines used in selecting photographs for ELA passages.</p> <p>No additional evidence was required regarding steps taken to ensure that assessments are fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p> |
| <p>Section 4.2 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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

| 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>Requirement previously met for consortium.</p> | <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this factor.</p> |
| <p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p>Requirement previously met for 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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

| 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>DLM indicates that additional consortium-level evidence is required for this Critical Element, and notes that it will be included in the December 2017 submission.</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"> • See 2016 Peer Review | | |

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

| 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>Requirement previously met for consortium.</p> | |
| <p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p>Requirement previously met for 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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|--|
| <p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</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>Requirement previously met for consortium.</p> | |
| <p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p>Requirement previously met for 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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

| 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>Requirement previously met for consortium.</p> | |
| <p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p>Requirement previously met for 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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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>Requirement previously met for 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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

| 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 | | |
| Requirement previously met for 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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
| <p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</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>Requirement previously met for consortium.</p> | |
| <p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p>Requirement previously met for 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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

| 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>Requirement previously met for consortium.</p> | |
| <p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</p> <p>Requirement previously met for 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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

| 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>Requirement previously met for consortium.</p> | |
| <p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p>Requirement previously met for 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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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>N/A for consortium</p> | |
| <p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p>N/A for 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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

| 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>Requirement previously met for consortium.</p> | |
| <p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p>Requirement previously met for 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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

| 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>Requirement previously met for consortium.</p> | |
| <p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p>Requirement previously met for 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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

| 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>Requirement previously met for 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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;">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>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p>Requirement previously met for 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

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



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

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

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

Contents

| | |
|--|----------|
| SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS | 3 |
| 2.1 – Test Design and Development..... | 3 |
| SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER | 4 |
| 4.1 – Reliability..... | 4 |
| 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... | 6 |
| 4.4 – Scoring | 7 |

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

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><u>YE 01</u> (Technical Manual Update YE 2015-16)</p> | <p>DLM provides a brief but adequate explanation for why speaking and listening standards (part of CCSS) were not included in the DLM ELA assessment, to the effect that partner states had not assessed these standards in their general assessments. For all students, therefore, including SWSCD, speaking and listening were to be taught and assessed at the local level (YE 01, pp. 9-10).</p> <p>It might have been useful (but not essential) to include participating state’s waiver letters to support this statement.</p> <p>The supplementary submission evidence did not address part of the summary statement request for additional evidence—specifically, an explanation of why Language is not directly addressed. A brief explanation such as that offered for the question about Speaking and Listening would have been helpful—which the reviewers assume is that in their general assessments, all of the partner states assess Language in the context of Reading or Writing (e.g., as is the case with PARCC).</p> |
| <p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement (from August 2017 Peer Review)</p> | | |
| <p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required</p> | | |

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

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 (from 2016 peer review)</p> <p>For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), WVDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of monitoring and refinement of the diagnostic classification models from subsequent test administrations | <p>YE 01, pp. 43-46; 48-62.</p> <p>YE 03, pp. 102.</p> | <p>Overall, Peer Reviewers are impressed with the DLM learning and assessment models. Peers are hopeful that the psychometric model, which is less mature, will eventually be refined to a similar level, to capitalize on the advantages of the learning and assessment models.</p> <p>DLM provided detail in the Technical Manual Update YE 2016-17 (YE 01) as evidence of monitoring and refinement of the diagnostic classification models from test administrations subsequent to the initial administration. Given recommendations below, Peer Reviewers would expect that technical manuals in subsequent years continue to address and update evidence of monitoring and refinement of Diagnostic Classification Models.</p> <p>The DLM’s Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) discussed and indicated support for maintaining the current scoring model for 2017-18 while additional research is conducted on different methods for being able to support cross-linkage level inferences (YE 03).</p> <p>On p. 45, there is mention of the fact that non-masters sometimes have a greater than chance likelihood of providing correct responses to items measuring the linkage level, which may indicate that items or LLs as a whole are “easily guessable.” It would be useful to note what is being done to address that. Peer reviewers recommend checking this again with more operational data. If the issue remains, either model or items or both need to be changed.</p> |

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

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>In reference to the issue of Model Fit, peers were satisfied with the methods being followed to ensure that the model fits the data. However, the Peers suggest following the recommendations of the DLM Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to use a Bayesian estimation procedure to help address some of the methodological issues with the current approach to assessing model fit.</p> <p>Peers recommend that DLM continue to be guided by and to take into serious consideration the advice of the TAC in regards to refinement of the model and generation of data to demonstrate Model Fit.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | | |
| <p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><u> x </u> No additional evidence is required</p> | | |

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

August 2017 State Assessment Peer Review Notes for the PARCC Assessment Consortium RESUBMISSION

(follow up on evidence requested from 2016 Peer Review)



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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT
CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

Contents—NOTE—The items shown below represent areas from the 2016 consortium peer review where additional evidence was requested

| | |
|---|-----------|
| SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS | 3 |
| 2.1 – Test Design and Development..... | 3 |
| 2.2 – Item Development..... | 4 |
| SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... | 5 |
| 3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... | 5 |
| 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... | 6 |
| 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... | 7 |
| 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment | 8 |
| 6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... | 9 |
| 6.4 – Reporting..... | 10 |

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|---|---|
| <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><i>State-specific evidence. Individual states will respond as necessary.</i></p> | <p>The PARCC assessment does not currently assess speaking and listening. While it is the case that States currently have waivers, there is no assurance that the Department will continue to grant waivers for speaking and listening.</p> |
| <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “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.” NOTE—States must individually request a waiver from the requirement of testing the speaking and listening standards.</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"> • Provide a plan and timeline for addressing the speaking and listening aspect of the standards such that appropriate assessments will be available to the PARCC States when their waivers expire. | | |

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

| 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>Document 2.2_PARCC Item Review Committees_9 4 12</p> <p>lists available information about PARCC’s initial groups of item reviewers, including self-reported job title, organization, years of teaching experience, experience with special populations of students, geographic settings, and reviewer demographic information.</p> | <p>Document 2.2 provided evidence of representation on Item Review Committees.</p> |
| <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “Information about the composition and credentials of content and bias/sensitivity reviewers for the PARCC assessment. 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 (EL) specialization).”</p> | | |
| <p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p> | | |

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|---|--|
| <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>HumRRO, <u>Evaluating the Quality and Alignment of PARCC ELA/Literacy and Mathematics Assessments: Grades 3,4,6, and 7</u></p> | <p>The alignment study report notes that Speaking and Listening were not considered in the findings for ELA alignment. See 2.1.</p> <p>Per Recommendations on pages 28-30, PARCC needs a plan for addressing the recommendations resulting from the HumRRO alignment study. However, the report provided to the peers appears to have limited usefulness for improving the assessment. Peers are uncertain why the information is not provided in more detail. For example, item alignment to each standard rather than domain or cluster may be more helpful for developing plans for improving the assessment. PARCC may need to ask the contractors to provide more explicit findings.</p> <p>Peers were unable to find specific information regarding the composition and expertise of the 19 alignment study panel members.</p> <p>Will the PARCC program seek advice from the PARCC Technical Advisory Committee related to the study?</p> |
| <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “Additional alignment evidence that addresses all remaining grades (grades 3, 4, 6, and 7) in both content areas, and Alignment evidence that supports a test design that assesses the full range of the State’s academic content standards, including speaking and listening, is needed for all tested grades.”</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"> • As the plan for speaking and listening is developed, ensure that independent alignment studies will be completed. • Plan and timeline for how PARCC will address the alignment study recommendations for improving the assessments. | | |

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

| 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>HumRRO, <u>Evaluating the Quality and Alignment of PARCC ELA/Literacy and Mathematics Assessments: Grades 3,4,6, and 7</u></p> | <p>The alignment study notes that “Reviewers found PARCC’s cognitive complexity process and model difficult to understand and apply when confirming the quantitative and qualitative ratings. <u>Additional information about how these ratings are combined as well as information about the acceptable ranges is needed for others to effectively evaluate the cognitive complexity of PARCC’s ELA/literacy passages.</u>” (emphasis added) P. 28</p> <p>The alignment study notes that “Reviewers generally agreed with the cognitive complexity level that PARCC assigned the mathematics assessment items at grades 3, 4, 6, and 7. However, there were some exceptions. We recommend reviewing the cognitive complexity levels for Geometry at grade 3; Measurement and Data at grade 4; and Statistics and Probability, Number and Operations in Base Ten, and Number and Operations – Fractions, all at grade 6.”</p> <p>The report provided to the peers appears to have limited usefulness for improving the assessment. Peers are uncertain why the information is not provided in more detail. For example, item alignment to each standard rather than domain or cluster may be more helpful for developing plans for improving the assessment. PARCC may need to ask the contractors to provide more explicit findings.</p> |
| <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “Additional evidence, such as cognitive lab studies, that address the cognitive processes and cognitive complexity required by the standards across grades and content areas.”</p> | | |
| <p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan and timeline for how PARCC will address the alignment study recommendations for improving the assessments, as regards cognitive processes and cognitive complexity. | | |

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

| 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>Documents 4.3.1, 4.3.2, and 4.3.3 include scale score cumulative frequency distributions for each assessment administered in spring 2015, fall 2015, and spring 2016.</p> | <p>Peers appreciate the cumulative distribution of scale scores to numbers of students. The omission of raw scores is noted.</p> |
| <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “Cumulative frequency distributions across raw score/scale scores, that include the number and percent of students scored at each raw/scale score point.”</p> | | |
| <p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p> | | |

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|---|--|
| <p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</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>Document 4.6_PARCC Mode and Device Comparability Study Plan outlines PARCC’s plans to study mode and device comparability in spring 2017.</p> | <p>The Table of PARCC Research Studies 2016 on page 15 show dates in the past. What additional milestones and timelines have been added since November 2016?</p> |
| <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “A plan and timeline for the State/PARCC to continue studying the issue of mode comparability.”</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"> • An updated timeline and milestones and any completed study reports to document adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results among modes and devices. | | |

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

| 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>Document 6.2.1 PARCC Standard Setting Panels includes available information about standard setting panelists, including self-reported job title, organization, years of teaching experience, experience with special populations of students, geographic settings, and reviewer demographic information.</p> <p>Document 6.2.2 PARCC Standard Setting Panel Summary Information includes summary information of the self-reported information contained in Document 6.2.1.</p> | <p>Documents 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 provide evidence the standard-setting panels included members experienced in the areas of special education and EL.</p> |
| <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “Additional detailed information about areas of educational specialization for members of each achievement standards-setting panel, especially the specialty areas of special education and ELs.”</p> | | |
| <p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required</p> | | |

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|---|--|
| <p>6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language | <p><i>State-specific evidence. Individual states will respond as necessary.</i></p> | <p>PARCC produces item level data that are available to the States. However, States produce the reports.</p> |

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|--|
| <p>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>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “Evidence that MSDE and PARCC provide reports that enable itemized score analyses to local educational agencies and schools”</p> | | |
| <p>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p> | | |