



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Dianna R. Wentzell  
Commissioner of Education  
Connecticut State Education Department  
165 Capitol Avenue  
Hartford, CT 06106

August 14, 2018

Dear Commissioner Wentzell:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (the Department) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), which governed State assessments through the 2016-2017 school year. 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 Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) to prepare for the review, which occurred in March 2018 and which was a follow-up to reviews that occurred in April and June 2016.

State assessment systems provide essential information that States, districts, principals and teachers can use to identify the academic needs of students, target resources and supports toward students who need them most, evaluate school and program effectiveness and close achievement gaps among students. A high-quality assessment system also provides useful information to parents about their 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 CSDE's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the components of your assessment system meet many, but not all, of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and the Department's analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following in regards to the submitted assessments:

- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments for grades 3-8 (Smarter Balanced): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**
- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in high school (SAT): **Partially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**

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

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

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

The components that **partially meet requirements** do not meet a number of the requirements of the statute and regulations and/or CSDE will need to provide substantial additional information to demonstrate it meets the requirements. The Department expects that CSDE may not be able to submit all of the required information within one year.

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

The specific list of items required for CSDE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because the State has not fully satisfied the condition placed on the State's Title I, Part A grant award related to its State assessment system, the Department is continuing to place a condition on the State's Title I, Part A grant award related to those components of the assessment system. To satisfy this condition, CSDE must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. Within 30 days of receipt of this letter, CSDE must provide to the Department a plan and timeline by which it will submit the additional documentation. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action.

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 CSDE 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 CSDE assessments meet many of the peer review guidance criteria under the NCLB, the State is still responsible to ensure that these assessments also comply with the requirements of the ESSA. Department staff have carefully reviewed CSDE 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 CSDE administration of the CTAA assessment needs to meet one additional requirement related to alternate academic achievement standards to fully meet ESSA requirements. This requirement is listed under critical element 6.3 along with the other evidence needed from the March 2018 peer review. I have also determined that the CSDE administration of the SAT needs to meet two additional requirements, one related to accessibility and one related to equal benefits afforded to all students. These requirements can be found under critical elements 4.2 and 5.1 and 5.2 and 5.3 respectively.

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 5.1, 5.3, 5.4 and 6.3. Insufficient progress to address such matters may lead OSERS to place a condition on CSDE's federal fiscal year 2017 IDEA Part B grant award.

The full peer review notes from the review are also enclosed. These recommendations to the Department formed the basis of our determination. Please note that the peers' recommendations may differ from the Department's feedback; we encourage you to read the full peer notes for additional suggestions and recommendations for improving your assessment system beyond what is noted in the

Department's feedback. Department staff will reach out to your assessment director in the next few days to discuss the peer notes and the Department's determination and to answer any questions you may have.

Thank you for your ongoing commitment to improving educational outcomes for all students. I look forward to our continued partnership as we move ahead with this critical work. I appreciate the work you are doing to improve your schools and provide a high-quality education for your students. We have found it a pleasure working with your staff on this review. I wish you well in your continued efforts to improve student achievement in Connecticut.

If you have any questions, please contact Tanesha Hembrey of my staff at: [OSS.Connecticut@ed.gov](mailto:OSS.Connecticut@ed.gov).

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan  
Assistant Secretary for Elementary and  
Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Ajit Gopalakrishnan, Bureau Chief

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Additional Evidence Needed</b>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b>	For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A plan and a timeline to address the alignment issues identified in the existing alignment studies, particularly in mathematics.</li> </ul>
<b>2.2 – Item Development</b>	For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of 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.</li> <li>• Evidence of guidelines for item writers with respect to fairness in the development and review process.</li> </ul>
<b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b>	For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of how the State monitors administration to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</li> </ul>
<b>2.5 – Test Security</b>	For all assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of annual training requirements for test security policies and procedures for Connecticut educators for all assessments.</li> </ul>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b>	For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence requested in Critical Element 2.1 will satisfy this Critical Element.</li> </ul>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b>	For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for high school as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</li> </ul>
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b>	For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
<b>4.1 – Reliability</b>	For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reliability data for students with disabilities, English learners, and students who received accommodations.</li> </ul>
<b>4.2 – Fairness and accessibility</b>	For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the assessment is fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments, including data related to students with disabilities and ELs.</li> <li>• Evidence that the State supports and enhances the accessibility of the assessments through appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities, and, to the extent practicable, by incorporating principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (section</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	1111(b)(2)(B)(xiii) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA).
<b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of 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</li> </ul>
<b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the State’s process for ensuring that students with disabilities are included in the SAT with clear guidelines for accommodations and the receipt of college-reportable scores.</li> <li>• Evidence that children with disabilities are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</li> </ul>
<b>5.2 – Procedures for Including ELs</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of communicating this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>○ Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence that English learners are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</li> </ul>
<b>5.3 – Accommodations</b>	<p>For the CTAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s), (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.</li> </ul> <p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State 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.</li> <li>• As noted above in elements 5.1 and 5.2, evidence that children with disabilities are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment (evidence submitted for element 5.1 will address this concern).</li> </ul>
<b>5.4 – Monitoring Testing of Special Populations</b>	<p>For all assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that it monitors test administration in to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>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"> <li>○ Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>○ Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>○ Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>○ Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s individualized education programs team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; and</li> <li>○ Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards (additional requirement under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA)</b></p>	<p>For the CTAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 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 ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. The SEA should provide this evidence by December 15, 2020.</li> </ul> <p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence of how the 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.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence of reporting that 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 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"> <li>▪ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>▪ 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; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ A process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

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

## March 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

# STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

## Contents

<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	3
2.2 – Item Development.....	6
2.3 – Test Administration .....	8
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration.....	10
2.5 – Test Security .....	12
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	15
<b>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....</b>	<b>18</b>
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	18
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	21
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure .....	24
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables .....	29
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER .....</b>	<b>31</b>
4.1 – Reliability.....	31
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	32
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	34
4.4 – Scoring .....	35
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms .....	38
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment .....	39
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance.....	40
<b>SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS .....</b>	<b>43</b>
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities .....	43
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	46
5.3 – Accommodations.....	48
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations .....	51
<b>SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .</b>	<b>53</b>
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	53
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards .....	55
6.4 – Reporting.....	57

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT 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"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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);</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b>  <b>Evidence #2.1.1: SAT® Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)</b>                      The technical manual describes the test design and test development process for the SAT assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 1 - 20 provide an overview of the assessment, including a description its purpose, test format and content, scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results.</li> <li>• Pages 27 - 52 provide a detailed description of test development procedures.</li> <li>• Additionally, see the evidence presented in response to section 3 and 4 regarding the technical quality of the SAT.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2: College Board + Connecticut; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to Connecticut Standards (October 2016)</b>                      The College Board conducted an alignment study to determine how the SAT and its related assessment aligned to the Connecticut state standards. This document provides detailed information regarding the study findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 16 - 101 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to the state’s standards for English Language Arts and Math in grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.3: College Board + Delaware; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to Delaware Standards (October 2016)</b>                      The College Board conducted an alignment study to determine how the SAT and its related assessment aligned to the Delaware state standards. This</p>	<p><b>Purposes and intended interpretations</b>                      Overall, peers would like to see more claims and evidence regarding how states are incorporating SAT scores into their high school accountability system. What studies or information is being collected?</p> <p>Pg 9 “Because it is more closely aligned to both high school instruction and post-high school requirements, the SAT serves as evidence of the hard work students have performed in high school”. Peers would like to see evidence for this claim.</p> <p><b>Test Designs and Blueprints</b>                      2.1.8 Test Specs – detailed specs provided, when considered in conjunction with the individual states’ standards, does offer evidence of assessments that test whole range of standards, up to the limitations described in the “Connection to Content Standards.”</p> <p><b>Connection to Content Standards</b>                      Mathematical practices described on page 43. Math content appears to be focused on linear, quadratic, and other polynomial function families. No mention of logarithmic or exponential families that are in the CCSS. Check Table A-3.11 Exponential functions listed in Table A-3.11. There does not appear to be an alignment to the state’s academic content standards in math.</p> <p>States are advised to document plans to assess the full breadth of the adopted standard, including for ELA use of technology, conducting research, speaking, and listening, which are not addressed by the SAT suite. Other standards not included in the SAT are described in the Alignment document 2.1.3 (e.g.,</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>document provides detailed information regarding the study findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to the state’s standards for English Language Arts/Literacy and Math in grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.4: College Board + Maine; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to Maine Standards (October 2016)</b> The College Board conducted an alignment study to determine how the SAT and its related assessment aligned to the Maine state standards. This document provides detailed information regarding the study findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to the state’s standards for English Language Arts/Literacy and Math in grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.5: College Board + Michigan; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to Michigan Standards (2015)</b> The College Board conducted an alignment study to determine how the SAT and its related assessment aligned to the Michigan state standards.</p> <p>This document provides detailed information regarding the study findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to the state’s standards for English Language Arts/Literacy and Math in grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.6: College Board + New Hampshire; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to New Hampshire Standards (October 2016)</b> The College Board conducted an alignment study to determine how the SAT and its related assessment</p>	<p>Delaware)</p> <p>SAT indicated there was an independent alignment study conducted in 2016, but this study was not provided for review.</p> <p>Connecticut – non-third party alignment (conducted by College Board, Oct. 2016) study of CT’s 2010 standards: acknowledges which standards are not assessed, namely, speaking and listening, construction mathematical representations.</p> <p>Delaware - non-third party alignment (conducted by College Board, Oct. 2016) study of DE’s 2010 standards: acknowledge which standards are not assessed, namely, speaking and listening and standards related to technology use.</p> <p>Illinois – (2010) acknowledges which standards are not assessed, namely, speaking, listening, presentations, capitalization, spelling, construction mathematical representations.</p> <p>Maine: (2010) standards not addressed: speaking, listening, presentations, capitalization, spelling, constructing mathematical representations, as well as “advanced” standards, such as vectors, matrices, using probability to make decisions.</p> <p>Michigan: acknowledges which standards are not assessed, namely, speaking, listening, presentations, capitalization, spelling, construction mathematical representations.</p> <p>New Hampshire: standards not addressed: speaking, listening, capitalization, spelling, and several writing standards in history/social studies, science, and</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>aligned to the New Hampshire state standards. This document provides detailed information regarding the study findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to the state’s standards for English Language Arts/Literacy and Math in grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.7: College Board + Illinois; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to Illinois Standards (October 2016)</b>                      The College Board conducted an alignment study to determine how the SAT and its related assessment aligned to the Illinois state standards. This document provides detailed information regarding the study findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to the state’s standards for English Language Arts/Literacy and Math in grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b>                      This document provides details regarding how our test is constructed and includes test blueprints, evidentiary foundation, and examples of text complexity and sample questions. While we recommend that reviewers consider the entire development process.</p>	<p>technical subjects. Mathematical modeling is covered differently than stated in NH standards.</p> <p><b>Item Descriptions for ELA and Mathematics</b>                      The content specs and blueprint sections of Tech Manual Appendix 3 contain long lists of statements that could be used to infer what the items ask of students.</p> <p>Test specs document supplies the same descriptive information as Appendix 3, albeit with sample items. General descriptive information is given for broad swaths of item types.</p> <p>Detailed item descriptions, test development procedures and guiding principles, and sample items (2.1.8, Sections III and IV). “Important Features” details the type of skills, thinking, expected to be assessed by items.</p>
<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of 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);</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></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><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 28 – 34 describe the processes used to ensure the fairness of the assessment.</li> <li>• Pages 27 - 52 provide a detailed description of test development procedures.</li> <li>• Pages 108 - 114 describe the evidentiary foundation for the decisions made about the content included in the SAT.</li> <li>• Pages 120 - 133 describe the College Board pilot study of the predictive validity of the SAT.</li> <li>• Pages 133 - 135 describe how the SAT assesses student readiness for college.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board SAT Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire and Illinois</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 7 - 8 in each of the alignment documents contain a section called The Alignment conducted their alignment study.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please refer to the sections identified as evidence in support of Critical Element 2.2.</li> </ul>	<p>Is there information regarding the demographic characteristics of the item writers and reviewers? Do the states that use this assessment as an accountability assessment have teachers on the committees?</p> <p>Who are the “independent experts’ active in the field” and what is the set of criteria they use to judge an item?</p> <p>Where are the item writer guidelines that are described on page 41 (PDF page 50) of the technical manual? Is there diversity in the item writer pool or the review process?</p> <p>Tech Manual, Page 32 –lists typically classroom teachers. Is that enough to show representation from different ethnic and socio-economic groups to screen for sensitivity and fairness. Are there tables of the reviewers? For items, passages, forms?</p> <p>Page 32, 46. “The guidelines provided to our fairness reviewers as they review test questions and stimuli are summarized in this chapter.” The guidelines were not provided for review for verification of the process/procedures used.</p> <p>Evidence provided for cognitive complexity is minimal</p> <p>Lists 2.1.2 – 2.1.7 – state alignment documents. State alignment documents do not address cognitive processes alignment</p> <p>Lists 2.2.1 – this document discusses the predictive validity of the old test and proposed revisions to the SAT</p> <p>Lists 2.2.2 – this document is a study focused on the validity of using the SAT for college admission</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 SAT Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		decisions. It does not address cognitive processes Lists 3.2.2 – Summary of cognitive lab. More details about the methodology, content, and interpretations are needed to provide a convincing argument that the high level cognitive processes purported to be assessed are indeed drawn upon by students as they engage with the SAT.
<b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Evidence of reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of guidelines for item writers in fairness within the development and review process.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 53 - 59 describe the standardized test administration procedures for standard administrations and for administration of the test with accommodations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.1: The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <p>This manual provides instructions for supervisors who are responsible for overseeing the administration on how to prepare for test day, protocol for reporting test irregularities, and guidance on how to maintain test security.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.2: The SAT School Day Test Room Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <p>This manual provides instructions for associate supervisors (also referred to as test room coordinators) who will proctor the exam. This manual contains test day scripts for standard test administrations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <p>This manual provides instructions for supervisors who will be responsible for registering students for testing accommodations and managing nonstandard test administrations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.4: SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Training (2016)</b></p> <p>This PowerPoint deck contains the basic information presented to all Test Center Supervisors in online and in-person training sessions and reviews policies, procedures and best</p>	<p>Documentation in the administration manuals appears to be sufficient, except for accommodation administration.</p> <p>2.1.1 establishes standardized procedures and 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, &amp; 2.3.4 communicate these procedures</p> <p>Communication procedures appear to be sufficient across the different administration manuals for assessments administered to the general population. Training webinar slides are also informative for accommodations and how to get them approved.</p> <p>3.5 – Accommodations Webinar; however, this does not adequately address how to administer read aloud or scribe accommodations</p> <p><b>2.3.3:</b> detailed instructions and procedures</p> <p>2.3.5: training for testing with accommodations</p> <p>Does College Board collect information to ensure that school officials in every state have been trained and can administer the assessment under standardized conditions?</p> <p>Rosters may be maintained at the state level. Should SAT get a copy?</p> <p>2.3.7 There is no agreement in this form that the individual has participated in any training. No evidence that training occurred.</p> <p>There was no verification of training participation.</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>practices related to SAT test administration. This deck may have been customized for state partners based on particular local requirements. Please refer to the submissions of our state partners for additional information and evidence of test center supervisor training.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)</b> This PowerPoint deck contains the basic information presented to all SSD supervisors via online and in-person training sessions and reviews the policies and procedures related to nonstandard SAT administrations. This deck may have been customized for state partners based on particular local requirements. Please refer to the submissions of our state partners for additional information and evidence of accommodations training.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.7: SAT Testing Staff Agreement</b> Prior to test day, all testing staff must sign this agreement to signify that they accept the conditions and requirements of SAT administration.</p>	
<b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Provide evidence to address policies and procedures for standardized test administration that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, specifically administration with accommodations, that is, read aloud and scribe;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s assessment receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments, including verification of training.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

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><b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b></p> <p>The below information lists the resources the College Board provides to the states to support uniform standardized test administration procedures across districts and schools.</p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 55 describes the roles and responsibilities of different test administration staff, delineates the qualifications testing staff should possess, and explains the training testing staff should receive.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.1: The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 4 - 32: The College Board provides guidance on the number of staff needed to proctor and examination, how to set up test administration rooms and seating plans to facilitate implementation, and how to use the Supervisor irregularity form. The manual also includes a suggested timeline for when proctors and other test administration staff should be trained.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.2: The SAT School Day Test Room Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 3 - 12 include information on how to monitor test administration and report testing irregularities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p>	<p>The Technical Manual describes detailed requirements of test administrators (see p. 53), including qualifications, timing, test materials, and observation during testing. Specifications are provided for accommodations and handling of materials. Irregularity reports must be completed by administrators. A manual is provided for a Test Day Supervisor who is responsible for supervising all activities related to testing. Training is mandatory for Test Day Supervisors.</p> <p>However, the College Board does not provide guidance on specific monitoring procedures (e.g., protocols, forms, or schedule) to ensure administration of the assessment with fidelity across districts and schools. For example, will some schools be observed by a State or district representative who is not the Test Day Supervisor? This can be considered a State responsibility, should States provide such information.</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 SAT Consortium**

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"> <li>• Pages 13 - 23 include information on how to monitor the test administration and report testing irregularities that may take place during a nonstandard test administration.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.4: SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Training (2016)</b>                      This PowerPoint deck contains the basic information presented to all Test Center Supervisors in online and in-person training sessions and reviews policies, procedures and best practices related to SAT test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 9 - 36 review all of the actions that should take place before, during, and after the test administration. This section of the presentation clearly delineates the responsibilities of test center supervisors, proctors, monitors, and other staff.</li> </ul>	
<b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the SAT Day, evidence of how the State monitors administration to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></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"> <li>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;</li> <li>Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 58 - 59 describe the procedures the College Board has designed to maintain test security at all times.</li> <li>Pages 66 - 68 describe the College Board’s post-test analysis, which is conducted as a component of the company’s test security procedures.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.1: The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <p>This manual provides guidance for supervisors who are responsible for overseeing the administration on how to maintain test security:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 8 – 9 describe the information supervisors should communicate to staff in order to maintain test security. Seating policies, devised to reduce the possibility of cheating, are described in this section.</li> <li>Pages 12 – 13 describe how supervisors should prepare student for test day and includes information on items and behaviors that are not allowed in the test area.</li> <li>Pages 14 - 26 provide instructions on how to receive and securely store materials until test day, and how to report on test administration irregularities.</li> <li>Pages 39 - 40 include a sample irregularities report that supervisors use to begin investigation of test administration issues.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.2: The SAT School Day Test Room Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 1 - 12 provide instruction on standardized</li> </ul>	<p><b>Prevention of assessment irregularities</b></p> <p>Manuals provide sufficient documentation of recommended procedures. States should supply evidence that proctors have been trained. Perhaps local policies for checking in on test rooms that procedures have been implemented according to the documentation.</p> <p><b>Detection of irregularities</b></p> <p>2.3.1 pp. 39-40: form to report irregularities                  2.1.1 pp. 66-68: statistical analysis for irregularities                  2.3.4 pp. 23-30</p> <p>Unclear how states participate in monitoring, auditing, and evaluating these procedures,</p> <p><b>Investigations of irregularities</b></p> <p>SAT internal processes are described in 2.5.2 and 2.5.3; however, 2.5.3 is very high level and points to confidential procedures for investigating suspect scores.</p> <p>2.5.3 - 2.5.2: How and Why ETS Questions Scores (College Board Program) in cases not due to test irregularities</p> <p>Unclear how states participate in monitoring, auditing, and evaluating these procedures</p> <p>Should the state documentation also contain procedures for how local incidents are investigated and remediated?                  Generally, scores are canceled with the student’s knowledge, and there are various options offered to the student to remedy their records. See 2.5.2 for many details.                  2.5.3 –no specifics for remediation are provided.                  Unclear how states participate in monitoring,</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>testing procedures devised to maintain security during test administration. Information in this section includes how to maintain security in the testing room and report administration irregularities.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b>            • Pages 13 - 23 provide instruction on standardized testing procedures devised to maintain security during nonstandard test administrations. Information in this section includes how to maintain security in the testing room and report administration irregularities.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.4: SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Training (2016)</b>            • Pages 23 - 30: The College Board trains test administration staff (including supervisors, coordinators, and administrators) on how to report and address irregularities they may encounter on test day.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.5.1: SAT School Day Registration and Questionnaire Guide (2017)</b>            This brochure provides important information for students so that they may prepare for test day.            • Pages 15 – 21 provide information on test security procedures, what will be allowed into testing rooms, and how to report suspicious behavior.            • Pages 25 – 26 and 27 - 30 describe processes that may take place in order to conserve test integrity and maintain test security.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.5.2: Why and How ETS Questions Scores (College Board Programs) (2016)</b></p>	<p>auditing, and evaluating these procedures            2.5.2 &amp; 2.5.3 – ETS procedures for handling irregularities</p> <p>Does SAT conduct any analysis on the irregularity reports or conduct any statistical analysis on potential irregularity issues? This evidence was not provided. Substantial evidence provided illustrated proactive steps to prevent issues but not much about post-irregularity issues. The ETS report indicates it does review individual student level cheating issues. Peers are unclear about how College Board reviews potential school-wide, district-wide, or state-level issues? Are there any reports or analysis done for the state at a school/district level?</p> <p>SAT did not provide specifics on remediation- what does the state do and how does SAT inform the SEA?</p> <p>The state documentation will need to include procedures on how local incidents are investigated and remediated.</p> <p>Individual states should provide evidence that these procedures are implemented and how they deal with detected irregularities (whether detected at test time or during post-test analysis at ETS).</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>This document describes the ways that ETS, our testing subcontractor, investigates cases that may affect the validity of test scores.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.5.3: Investigation and Remediation of SAT Irregularities (2018)</b></p> <p>This document provides a high level overview of the procedures the College Board undertakes to investigate irregularities and remediate any recurring issues.</p>	
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:            Evidence of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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 with documentation of training.</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities but no specific data was provided to verify this process.</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b></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"> <li>• To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results;</li> <li>• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 58 - 59 describe the procedures the College Board has designed to maintain test</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.1: The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <p>This manual provides guidance for supervisors who are responsible for overseeing the administration on how to maintain test security:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 12 – 13 describe how supervisors should prepare student for test day and includes information on items and behaviors that are not allowed in the test area.</li> <li>• Pages 14 - 26 provide instructions on how to receive and securely store materials until test day, and report on test administration irregularities.</li> <li>• Pages 39 - 40 include a sample irregularities report that supervisors use to begin investigation of test administration issues.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.2: The SAT School Day Test Room Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 1 - 12 provide instruction on standardized testing procedures devised to maintain security during test administration. Information in this section includes how to maintain security in the testing room and report administration irregularities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 13 - 23 provide instruction on standardized testing procedures devised to maintain security during nonstandard test administration. Information in this section includes how to maintain security in the testing room and report administration irregularities.</li> </ul>	<p><i>College Board Information Security Policy (2014)</i> is a confidential document. It is in the process of being updated.</p> <p><i>College Board Guidelines for the Release of Data (2009)</i> is in the process of being updated. In the 2009 College Board guidelines for the release of data, it states the College Board owns the data. Is this still true for states that administer the SAT statewide?</p> <p>More information is needed to describe the process used if a data breach occurs and what steps are taken.</p> <p>Updated guides for the security policy and release of data would be useful and are needed.</p> <p>How does the SAT protect the integrity of its test materials in development, administration, and storage and use of results?</p> <p>No evidence was provided regarding the security measures used to protect the item bank or test bank.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence related to test security before and during test administration is submitted</li> <li>• Two documents, not submitted, are in process of being updated: College Board Information Security Policy and College Board Guidelines for the Release of Data. These should be submitted for review when updated.</li> </ul> <p>2.1.1, pp. 58-59</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peers had difficulty understanding evidence 2.6.2 – high level, vendor-developed overview of Axway products. How are these applicable to and used within the SAT program?</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>Evidence #2.3.4: SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Training (2016)</b>            • Pages 23 - 30: The College Board trains test coordinators, and administrators) on how to report and address irregularities they may encounter on test day.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.5.1: SAT School Day Registration and Questionnaire Guide (2017)</b>            This brochure provides to students information about how the College Board secures their data and personally identifiable information.            • Pages 26 – 36 describe the College Board privacy policy as it relates to students. This section also provides information regarding instances where scores may be canceled due to testing irregularities or misconduct, and how students may securely send their scores to colleges and university systems.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.6.1: Description of Test Management and Reporting System (2017)</b>            This document provides an overview of the security of the College Board online test management and reporting system.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.6.2: Axway Secure Transport Data Sheet (2017)</b>            The College Board provides data files to the state using an SFTP ad-hoc file transfer process provide by Tumbleweed, a secure managed file transfer (MFT) site managed by Axway. This data sheet, created by Axway, provides a high-level overview of all of their Secure Transport products, including their web-based SFTP service.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.6.3: Description of Confidential College Board Information Security Policy (2017)</b></p>	<p>SAT indicates and N of 15. Each state will also have individual reporting requirements.</p> <p>Note: some of the suggested documents relate to cheating, not securing student data.</p> <p>Information on paper storage and retrieval secure handling was not discussed sufficiently. How is security handled as tests are transported from SAT to the schools? Printing, shipping to schools?</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>The College Board has created a high level policy document that describes the processes in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of student level data. The policy is confidential, so this summary provides high level information regarding what the policy contains.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.6.4: College Board Privacy Policy (January 15, 2016)</b>                      This policy is currently accessible at <a href="http://www.collegeboard.org/privacy-policy">www.collegeboard.org/privacy-policy</a>. The document, as it appeared on this site on August 31, 2017, is submitted as evidence. It describes the College Board Data Privacy policy and privacy statements.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.6.5: College Board Guidelines for the Release of Data (2009)</b>                      This white paper describes the guidelines for the release of data obtained from test results to third party research institutions. Page 14 lists no releasable data elements for the SAT.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.6.6: ETS Legal Privacy and Security Notice</b>                      ETS manages the online test rostering system for the SAT. This document provides ETS' legal privacy and security notice.</p>	
<b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:                      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"> <li>• To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data during test development, administration, and storage and use of results;</li> <li>• College Board Information Security Policy and College Board Guidelines for the Release of Data should be submitted for review when updated.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<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"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math, no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment.</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 1 - 20 provide an overview of the assessment, including a description its purpose, test format and content, scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results.</li> <li>• Pages 107 - 139 examine the validity of the SAT and includes information on the evidentiary foundations behind the test content, concordance between the current and previous version of the SAT, and the relationship between SAT scores and first-year grade point average, as well as the relationship between SAT scores and college and career readiness benchmarks.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tables A-3.1 – A-3.15 in Appendix 3 (pages 11-35) provide test content specifications and content domains and descriptions.</li> <li>• Appendix 5 (pages 37 – 65) provides additional detail regarding how statistical indices were computed.</li> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 – 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> <li>• Appendix 7 (pages 321 - 396) displays the results of analyses performed to evaluate the validity of the SAT.</li> </ul>	<p>What studies has or will College Board conduct regarding the results of the assessment about high school instruction? Or how states will be using the results in their accountability system? Predictive validity of college readiness is one thing but for the purposes of states, the question is also “how do we get students to be college career ready?” What inferences are states making about schools and school instruction if they have many students who are college ready or few students who are college ready and what evidence will be collected around these claims?</p> <p><b>Documentation of Independent Alignment</b></p> <p>Alignment studies indicated that the standards were not completely aligned, Please provide additional evidence as requested in critical element 2.1. Pg. 11 in the Delaware study states, “the redesigned assessments are not mysterious or tricky. They are completely transparent. They focus on the knowledge and skills that are worthy of practice.” Again, there is little evidence to support this claim without an independent alignment study or access to a test form or test items.</p> <p>SAT does not assess Speaking and Listening. Thus states should supply plans for how those domains are or will be assessed if Speaking and Listening is part of the state standards. Also, since the essay is optional, what evidence does the state supply to show that the full breadth of the writing standards is assessed?</p> <p>Per 2.1.2 – 2.1.7 introduction note, an independent review of alignment of the SAT to the CT standards was proposed for 2016; document 2.1.2 indicates a</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>Evidence #2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)</b>                      This paper provides validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores and important college outcomes. The evidence provided in this paper is based on a previous version of the SAT. Pages 131 – 135 of the <i>SAT Suite Technical Manual</i> describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)</b>                      This white paper provides preliminary validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores resulting for the redesigned SAT and important college outcomes. The College Board is in the process of completing a validity study to replicate the findings of this white paper with a large, nationally representative sample. The study will examine students in the entering college class of fall 2017, the first full cohort to be admitted to college with the new SAT. For more information regarding this planned study, please refer to page 152 of the SAT Technical Manual.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire and Illinois</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 7 - 9 of each document describe how alignment between the standards and the assessment is determined.</li> <li>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to each respective state’s English Language Arts/Literacy and Math standards for grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.1.1: SAT Practice Test 8 (2017)</b>                      This practice test is a version of a form that was used</p>	<p>revision in January 2018, but this revised document was not included.</p> <p>The third party independent alignment review mentioned in the documentation as planned for 2016 was not provided.</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 SAT Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	for a 2016 SAT test administration. The sample test includes the optional essay, answer key, answer sheet and instructions on how to score the test	
<b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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. An independent alignment review is needed.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></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><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math: Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 1 - 20 provide an overview of the assessment, including a description its purpose, test format and content, scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results.</li> <li>• Pages 107 - 139 examine the validity of the SAT and includes information on the evidentiary foundations behind the test content, concordance between the current and previous version of the SAT, and the relationship between SAT scores and first-year grade point average, as well as the relationship between SAT scores and college and career readiness benchmarks.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tables A-3.1 – A-3.15 in Appendix 3 (pages 11 – 35) provide test content specifications and content domains and descriptions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b></p> <p>This document provides information on the evidentiary foundations of the English Language Arts and Math domains of the SAT, the test specifications that describe how the SAT measures those content domains and a description of our test development processes.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)</b></p> <p>This paper provides validity evidence on the</p>	<p>Lists 2.1.2 – 2.1.7 – state alignment documents. The DE doc does not address cognitive processes alignment</p> <p>Lists 2.2.1 – this document discusses the predictive validity of the old test and proposed revisions to the SAT</p> <p>Lists 2.2.2 – this document is a study focused on the validity of using the SAT for college admission decisions. It does not address cognitive processes</p> <p>Lists 3.2.2 – Summary of cognitive lab study – why is this document marked as a draft? It is very short, does not give the items used in the study, nor does it name the cognitive processes each item was intended to evoke. It does not make explicit what evidence led to which conclusions. Plus, the number of items used in this study is very small (i.e., 10 math and 13 ELA). More details about the methodology, content, and interpretations are needed to provide a convincing argument that the high level cognitive processes purported to be assessed are indeed drawn upon by students as they engage with the SAT. This statement seems to contradict the summary.</p> <p>Cognitive study seemed like a summary of the study without any analysis. What were the specific interview questions? Besides vocabulary and wording being difficult, how did the students perform on the items they thought were hard or easy? How did the students perform? How did this research influence item development? Any ELL or special education students included? How does this study validate the intended and appropriate cognitive processes based on the states’ academic content standards?</p> <p>3.2.2, p. 4, cog lab study: <b>Conclusion</b> states, “The cognitive processes lab study conducted using TAPs</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>relationship between SAT scores and important college outcomes. The evidence provided in this paper is based on a previous version of the SAT. Pages 131 – 135 of the <i>SAT Suite Technical Manual</i> describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)</b> This white paper provides preliminary validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores resulting for the redesigned SAT and important college outcomes. The College Board is in the process of completing a validity study to replicate the findings of this white paper with a large, nationally representative sample. The study will examine students in the entering college class of fall 2017, the first full cohort to be admitted to college with the new SAT. For more information regarding this planned study, please refer to page 152 of the SAT Technical Manual.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire and Illinois</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 7 - 9 of each document describe how alignment between the standards and the assessment is determined.</li> <li>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to each respective state’s English Language Arts/Literacy and Math standards for grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.2.1: Summary of Validity Evidence for Cognitive Processes (2018)</b> This document provides an overview of how the</p>	<p>provided important feedback to College Board content experts during the development of questions for the SAT. Since the newly-designed question types presented in the study were ultimately incorporated into the Redesigned SAT, the study also provides important validation of the cognitive processes students use when approaching these and other questions now on the test.” However, data and analysis in support of this statement was not provided.</p> <p>2.2.1-Tech Manual, pp. 132-3: “the results of this pilot study showed that new SAT scores remain as predictive of college success as old SAT scores. This is important to note as the redesign of the SAT was first and foremost focused on more closely aligning the content and skills tested on the SAT with those content and skills that research indicates are critical for college success. In making these important changes to the test, that the strong predictive validity was also maintained is an important accomplishment of the redesign.” However, there was no evidence that the development and selection of 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 provided.</p> <p>3.2.1 – lists much of the alignment evidence provided by ETS, however, it’s not clear that these were conducted by external content experts to align with cognitive processes.</p> <p>3.2.2 (Revised) – Report provides some evidence that test-takers are not using intended cognitive processes, especially in mathematics, for some items. Limited number of items.</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>evidence listed above is pertinent to the claim that the SAT assesses the intended cognitive processes related to English Language Arts/ Literacy and Math in grades 11 and 12</p> <p><b>Evidence #3.2.2: CONFIDENTIAL Summary of Cognitive Laboratory Study for the Redesigned SAT Conducted on March 16, 2013 (2018)</b></p> <p>This white paper summarizes the results of a study using Think-aloud Protocols conducted during the design process for the Redesigned SAT. The study provided evidence for how students were approaching and interpreting items in English Language Arts, Literacy, and Math.</p>	<p>More evidence needed to indicate that the items are really tapping into the cognitive processes as indicated by the states' content standards.</p> <p>Cognitive processes study was conducted in 2013; updated study addressing more of the items should be conducted to address alignment with state standards</p>
<b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></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><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b></p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 39 - 45 describe how test items are created and reviewed. This section describes the statistical indices computed to determine the appropriateness of items for use in operational forms of the SAT (i.e. equated p-values, r-biserials, and Mantel-Haenszel DIF.</li> <li>• Pages 47 - 49 describe how the College Board develops the optional SAT Essay test, which is administered by some of our state clients to assess student writing skills.</li> <li>• Pages 75 - 106 describe various psychometric analysis and their results. These procedures include scaling procedures, equating, analysis of normative information, reliability analysis and additional psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> <li>• Pages 107 - 139 examine the validity of the SAT, including the relationship between SAT scores and first-year grade point average as well as the relationship between SAT scores and college and career readiness benchmarks.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 5 (pages 37 – 65) provides additional detail regarding how statistical indices were computed.</li> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 – 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> <li>• Appendix 7 (pages 321 – 396) displays the results of analyses performed to evaluate the validity of the</li> </ul>	<p>Benchmarks for Math and ERW were established using the previous version of the SAT (page 144 of the technical manual). These Benchmarks are purported to indicate 75% probabilities of earning a C or better in an introductory college level course.</p> <p>The sample score report, Evidence 5.1.4, was the evidence used to provide an overview of how scores and sub scores are reported. How does this relate back to the state standards and how can teachers use it? The sub score names on the score report do not match the sub domains of the content standards</p> <p>There are also studies linking the old SAT scores to the new SAT scores (concordance studies, p. 124 of the technical manual), but this text states explicitly that the scores are not interchangeable – likely due to different underlying structures of the old and new tests (e.g., relative weights of different content, etc.). With this in mind, the evidence of the use of SAT scores to predict college success seems adequate. But this does not indicate how the internal structure aligns to the state standards.</p> <p>3.3.2-3.37. Analyses of internal structure-item correlations and dimensionality of assessment are not consistent with standards and interpretation of results. The intercorrelations reveal a very large, but not perfect, correlation among sub scores of items. This is not strong evidence that the sub scores are measuring different underlying factors.</p> <p><b>2.1.1:</b> pp. 44, 45: description of DIF Analyses, with results in the appendix. <b>2.1.1.a,</b> pp. 50-63: results of DIF analyses indicate low or no DIF and does not</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>SAT.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b>                      This document provides details regarding how our test is constructed and includes test blueprints, evidentiary foundation, and examples of text complexity and sample questions. While we recommend that reviewers consider the entire document as evidence in support of this critical element, the following sections should be of particular interest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 41 – 69 provide test specifications and blueprints for the SAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing test including scores and sub-scores consistent with the sub-domain structures of the academic content standards on which the interpretations and uses of results are based.</li> <li>• Pages 70 - 81 provide test specifications for the optional SAT Essay test.</li> <li>• Pages 132 – 158 provide test specifications and blueprints for the SAT Math test including scores and sub-scores consistent with the sub-domain structures of the academic content standards on which the interpretations and uses of results are based.</li> <li>• Pages 198 – 206 provide an overview of SAT development process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.1: Scaling for the SAT Suite of Assessments (2017)</b>                      • Pages 66 – 74 describe the characteristics of SAT sub-score scaling</p> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.2: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report- Connecticut (April</b></p>	<p>include students with disabilities.</p> <p>DE, ME, and MI included correlations among sub scores on correlations between the Reading Test Score, the Writing and Language Test Score, the Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (ERW) Section Score, and the Dimension Scores on Essay. This provides evidence that these scores are only moderately correlated and measuring somewhat different constructs.</p> <p>However, no evidence was provided of a dimensionality (or factor) analysis of the SAT. There was no evidence provided that the sub scores are based on analyses.</p> <p>As states use the SAT as their accountability measure, the interpretations of the scores may be different than the originally intended use of SAT scores. Will College Board be studying this and produce research that is useful for states if they begin making claims that have not been previously studied on the SAT?</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>2017)</b>                      This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 Connecticut SAT school day administration. The report includes a variety of test analysis based on the data gathered from the test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 15 - 28 provide Scale Score Moments, Intercorrelations and Reliability for the two SAT Forms administered on test day. The tables in this section provided information for by form and disaggregated by various subgroups.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.3: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report- Delaware (April 2017)</b>                      This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school day administration. The report includes a variety of test analysis based on the data gathered from the test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 15 – 22 provide Scale Score Moments, Intercorrelations and Reliability for the two SAT Forms administered on test day. The tables in this section provided information for by form and disaggregated by various subgroups.</li> <li>• Page 60 provide tables demonstrating correlations of three essay dimension scores and correlations between the Reading Test</li> </ul> <p>Score, the Writing and Language Test Score, the Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (ERW) Section Score, and the Dimension Scores on Essay.</p> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.4: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Maine (April 2017)</b>                      This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>day administration. The report includes a variety of test analysis based on the data gathered from the test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 15 – 21 provide Scale Score Moments, Intercorrelations and Reliability for the two SAT Forms administered on test day. The tables in this section provided information for by form and disaggregated by various subgroups.</li> <li>• Page 60 provide tables demonstrating correlations of three essay dimension scores and correlations between the Reading Test Score, the Writing and Language Test Score, the Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (ERW) Section Score, and the Dimension Scores on Essay.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.5: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Michigan (April 2017)</b> This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school day administration. The report includes a variety of test analysis based on the data gathered from the test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 15 – 29 provide Scale Score Moments, Intercorrelations and Reliability for the two SAT Forms administered on test day. The tables in this section provided information for by form and disaggregated by various subgroups.</li> </ul> <p>Page 75 provide tables demonstrating correlations of three essay dimension scores and correlations between the Reading Test Score, the Writing and Language Test Score, the Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (ERW) Section Score, and the Dimension Scores on Essay.</p> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.6: SAT Suite of Assessments</b></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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>Administration Report – New Hampshire (April 2017)</b>                      This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school day administration. The report includes a variety of test analysis based on the data gathered from the test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 15 – 21 provide Scale Score Moments, Intercorrelations and Reliability for the two SAT Forms administered on test day. The tables in this section provided information for by form and disaggregated by various subgroups.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.7: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Illinois (April 2017)</b>                      This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school day administration. The report includes a variety of test analysis based on the data gathered from the test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 18 – 26 provide Scale Score Moments, Intercorrelations and Reliability for the two SAT Forms administered on test day. The tables in this section provided information for by form and disaggregated by various subgroups.</li> </ul>	
<b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  </u>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide 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.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 114 - 135 include information on concordance between the current and previous version of the SAT, the relationship between SAT scores and first-year grade point average, and the relationship between SAT scores and college and career readiness benchmarks.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)</b></p> <p>This paper provides validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores and important college outcomes. The evidence provided in this paper is based on a previous version of the SAT. Pages 131 – 135 of the <i>SAT Suite Technical Manual</i> describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)</b></p> <p>This white paper provides preliminary validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores resulting for the redesigned SAT and important college outcomes. The College Board is in the process of completing a validity study to replicate the findings of this white paper with a large, nationally representative sample. The study will examine students in the entering college class of fall 2017, the first full cohort to be admitted to college with the new SAT. For more information regarding this planned study, please refer to page 152 of the SAT Technical Manual.</p> <p><b>Evidence #4.7.1: Excerpt from TAC</b></p>	<p>The documentation showing the predictive relationships between the SAT and college success is adequate, particularly when taken with the evidence for the concordance studies between the old and new versions of the SAT.</p> <p><b>2.2.1:</b> Validity Primer provides strong predictive validity evidence, for a previous version of the SAT. Must rely on how well the old and new version correlate. <b>2.2.2:</b> Predictive validity study on new SAT provides evidence that new SAT has similar predictive validity, as claimed.</p> <p>College Board should consider conducting studies comparing other assessment programs like NAEP, SBAC or PARCC.</p> <p>SAT may wish to consider high school teacher grades and GPA as part of the evidence for this element to address career ready students and not just college bound students.</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>presentation regarding Validity Research</b>                      The College Board presents validity evidence to the Technical Advisory Committees of our state partners. These slides are an excerpt from these presentations and covers information regarding College Board past, current and future validity studies.</p>	
<b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables, not necessarily associated with college success only.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT 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><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></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 SWD, EL, and forms administered with accommodations. and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> </ul>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b>  <b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 75 - 106 describe various psychometric analysis and their results. These procedures include scaling procedures, equating, analysis of normative information, reliability analysis and additional psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 - 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #4.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report Table of Contents</b>  This document displays the contents of a typical post-administration Test Analysis Report for the national administration of the SAT. The College Board provides state level administration reports to its state partners.  Please refer to evidence #3.3.2 – 3.3.7 for the state specific administration reports.</p>	<p>There was very little analysis, interpretation of the data, lack of data for EL and SWD provided for this critical element.</p> <p>Tables were available for all demographic groups, but did not provide any information on students with disabilities, EL, or tests administered with accommodations.</p> <p><b>Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population-</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no information provided for EL and SWD.</li> </ul> <p><b>Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments</b>  Average CSEMs are reasonable to slightly large: most are 6 to 8% of score range.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population for students with disability, EL, and students who received accommodations.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b></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><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 21 - 26 provide an overview of College Board test development processes related to fairness.</li> <li>• Pages 27 - 52 provide a detailed description of test development procedures, including a description of item content and fairness reviews, item pre-testing and analysis, and information on the types of accommodations that are available to students.</li> <li>• Pages 60 - 74 describe the scoring procedures for the SAT, a description of how results are reported, and the item analysis that is performed on the operational items, including Differential Item Functioning (DIF) and Key Validation. The required qualifications for human scorers are also included in this section.</li> <li>• Pages 75 - 106 describe various psychometric analyses which are performed to identify any possible bias or inconsistent interpretations of assessment results across student groups.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 - 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <p>This manual provides instructions for supervisors who will be responsible for registering students for testing accommodations and managing nonstandard test administrations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)</b></p>	<p>2.3.3 and 2.3.5 relate to fairness with respect to test administration, but not design, development, or analysis.</p> <p>Peers could not evaluate the criteria for fairness since the College Board did not provide the guidelines used for training experts. No items or training materials were provided.</p> <p>Design and Development</p> <p>2.1.1, page 22 “all questions are reviewed by external, independent reviewers who are asked to evaluate each question according to a set of criteria for content accuracy and fairness.” Who are the experts and what are the demographics of the reviewers?</p> <p>2.1.1, pp. 27-43: listed the test design procedures to ensure fairness, including item review for bias. The writers were instructed to read and use the white paper. It wasn’t evident that this was included in training.</p> <p>4.2.1: Universal Design was listed, but nothing was provided to verify its use. SAT provided comment in its listing that “College Board assessment writers are instructed to reference this paper regarding Universally Designed Assessment when creating assessment items for the SAT.” However, the peers noted there is no indication of this as part of the training and no verification this process was followed. Are items rejected during item review process that may indicate these practices are not implemented?</p> <p>Analysis</p> <p>2.1.1.a, pp. 50-63: results of DIF analyses indicate low or no DIF, however, no DIF evidence was provided for SWD, EI and no interpretation provided.</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>This PowerPoint deck is presented to SSD supervisors via online training sessions and reviews the policies and procedures related to nonstandard SAT administrations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #4.2.1: Creating Better Tests for Everyone Through Universally Designed Assessments (2004)</b></p> <p>College Board assessment writers are instructed to reference this paper regarding Universally Designed Assessment when creating assessment items for the SAT.</p>	
<b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence for the 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, including the lack of any data related to students with disabilities and ELs.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></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><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 75 - 106 describe various psychometric analyses to study how the SAT assesses student performance across the full performance continuum.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 - 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #4.3.1: SAT Effectiveness at Representing Test Taker Achievement across the Performance Spectrum (2017)</b></p> <p>This document provides data regarding the SAT’s effectiveness at representing test taker achievement.</p>	<p>The graphs of different score distributions indicate that scores were earned across the continuum. Stated in 4.3.1, p. 3: “The normal curve with the corresponding mean and standard deviation is superimposed on each graph for comparison. The histograms show a reasonable spread of scores across the entire scale score range. The results reflect tests that well match the test taking population.”</p> <p>2.1.1.a: pp. 216 – 221 &amp; 4.3.1: CSEMs are almost identical across the score range, indicating similar precision across the spectrum (for low-, medium-, and high-achieving students).</p>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></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><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 2 - 4 describe the scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results.</li> <li>• Page 48 - 49 describes the inter-rater reliability statistics related to the essay portion of the assessment.</li> <li>• Pages 60 - 74 describe the scoring procedures for the SAT, a description of how results are reported, and the item analysis that is performed on the operational items, including Differential Item Functioning (DIF) and Key Validation. The required qualifications for human scorers are also included in this section.</li> <li>• Pages 75 - 106 describe scaling procedures, equating, analysis of normative information to support appropriate interpretations of the common score scales, reliability analysis and additional psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> <li>• Pages 133 - 135 describe the processes that were used to develop and validate the SAT benchmarks for college and career readiness.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 5 (pages 37 - 65) provides the essay scoring rubric and data to support the item analysis findings summarized in the technical manual.</li> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 – 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.1: Scaling for the SAT Suite of Assessments (2017)</b></p>	<p>The sample score report, Evidence 5.1.4, was the evidence used to get an overview of how scores and sub scores are reported.</p> <p>The subdivisions of the SAT do not map easily onto the Domains and Strands of the content standards.</p> <p>The state-specific alignment documents show how the standards fall into the different reported sections of the SAT</p> <p>Documentation provides evidence of scoring procedures and scoring involving human judgment; however, 3.3.3, 3.3.4, 3.3.5 do not provide I-RR; 3.3.7 does – how is this I-RR interpreted by states and ETS?</p> <p>The low IRR brings into question the validity of the scores for the essay test. What are SAT plans to address this issue?</p> <p>States that use the essay test should review and consider improvements in this section.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>This document describes the methodology and scale development process for the SAT Suite of Assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 8 - 11 provide a description of the scores derived from the SAT and an overview of how the scores were developed.</li> <li>• Pages 16 – 24 describe how the scaling study was designed.</li> <li>• Pages 25 – 40 describe the characteristics of SAT scaling.</li> <li>• Pages 66 – 74 describe the characteristics of SAT subscore scaling.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.3: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Delaware (April 2017)</b>            This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school day administration, and includes information on the inter-rater reliability of the essay test included in the SAT. Please refer to pages 51 of 68 – 63 of 68 for information on inter-rater (single rater) reliability, percentages of agreement, correlation coefficient, and kappa statistics.</p> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.4: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Maine (April 2017)</b>            This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school day administration, and includes information on the inter-rater reliability of the essay test included in the SAT. Please refer to pages 51 of 68 – 63 of 68 for information on inter-rater (single rater) reliability, percentages of agreement, correlation coefficient, and kappa statistics.</p> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.5: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Michigan (April 2017)</b>            This report summarizes the performance of 11th</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 SAT Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school day administration, and includes information on the inter-rater reliability of the essay test included in the SAT. Please refer to pages 65 of 84 – 79 of 84 for information on inter-rater (single rater) reliability, percentages of agreement, correlation coefficient, and kappa statistics.	
<b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide evidence of established and documented standardized essay scoring procedures and protocols that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of adequate inter-rater reliability.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b></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><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 39 - 49 describe how the test is constructed to ensure multiple forms of the assessment are comparable</li> <li>• Pages 82 - 90 describe equating procedures and results for the SAT.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 6; Tables A-6.3.2 through A-6.3.5 (pages 72 - 78) show data and sample sets related to the equating procedures described in pages 82 - 90 of evidence 2.1.1.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.2: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report- Connecticut (April 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 2 provides an executive summary which describes the number of forms used in the April 2017 administration of SAT SD in Connecticut.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.5: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report- Michigan (April 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 2 provides an executive summary which describes the number of forms used in the April 2017 administration of SAT SD in Michigan.</li> </ul>	<p>Documentation adequately provided for this critical element</p> <p>Peers noted it would have been helpful for an opportunity to review the forms or an independent audit of the multiple test forms.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></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"> <li>• Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>• Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math. The SAT has been administered in English and as a pencil and paper assessment.</b></p>	<p>This critical element does not apply to this review.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></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><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 1 - 20 provide an overview of the assessment, including a description its purpose, test format and content, scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results.</li> <li>• Pages 107 – 135 examine the validity of the SAT and includes information on the evidentiary foundations behind the test content, concordance between the current and previous version of the SAT, and the relationship between SAT scores and first-year grade point average, as well as the relationship between SAT scores and college and career readiness benchmarks.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tables A-3.1 – A-3.15 in Appendix 3 (pages 11 - 35) provide test content specifications and content domains and descriptions.</li> <li>• Appendix 5 (pages 37 - 65) provides additional detail regarding how statistical indices were computed.</li> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 – 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> <li>• Appendix 7 (pages 321 – 396) displays the results of analyses performed to evaluate the validity of the SAT.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 198 – 206 provide an overview of SAT development process.</li> </ul>	<p>4.7.1: “Initial findings from this large-scale study will be available in 2019.”</p> <p>No evidence of independent studies of alignment</p> <p>No evidence of states’ systems for monitoring and improving related to examples of evidence related to critical element</p> <p>Since states are using SAT as an accountability measure, evidence and claims will result in different needs which results in different studies to support this use.</p> <p>The College Board should plan to study the use of the SAT for state accountability vs. a predictive test for college admission.</p> <p>Evidence from the 2019 study and TAC recommendations may provide some information in meeting this element.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>Evidence #2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)</b>                      This paper provides validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores and important college outcomes. The evidence provided in this paper is based on a previous version of the SAT. Pages 131 – 135 of the <i>SAT Suite Technical Manual</i> describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)</b>                      This white paper provides preliminary validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores resulting for the redesigned SAT and important college outcomes. The College Board is in the process of completing a validity study to replicate the findings of this white paper with a large, nationally representative sample. The study will examine students in the entering college class of fall 2017, the first full cohort to be admitted to college with the new SAT. For more information regarding this planned study, please refer to page 152 of the SAT Technical Manual.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire and Illinois (2015 - 2018)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 7 - 9 of each document describe how alignment between the standards and the assessment is determined.</li> <li>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to each respective state’s English Language Arts/Literacy and Math standards for grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.1.1: SAT Practice Test 8 (2017)</b>                      This practice test is a version of a form that was</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>used for a 2016 SAT test administration. The sample test includes the optional essay, answer key, answer sheet and instructions on how to score the test.</p> <p><b>Evidence #4.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report Table of Contents</b>                      This document displays the contents of a typical post-administration Test Analysis Report for the national administration of the SAT. The College Board provides state level administration reports to its state partners. Please refer to evidence #3.3.2 – 3.3.7 for the state specific administration reports.</p> <p><b>Evidence #4.7.1: Excerpt from TAC presentation regarding Validity Research (February 2017)</b>                      The College Board presents validity evidence to the Technical Advisory Committees of our state partners. These slides are an excerpt from these presentations and covers information regarding College Board past, current and future validity studies.</p>	
<b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of 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</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT 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><b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b></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"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;</li> </ul>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math, so no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment. The state will determine which students take the general or the alternate assessment. Below we provide documentation regarding the accommodations that the College Board provides for administrations of the general assessment.</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 49 – 52 describe the types of available allowable accommodations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <p>This manual provides instructions for supervisors who will be responsible for registering students for testing accommodations, and managing the test administration for students who require testing accommodations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)</b></p> <p>This PowerPoint deck is presented to SSD supervisors via an online training session and reviews the policies and procedures related to SAT administrations for students who require testing accommodations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.1: Pages from the College Board Students with Disabilities website. (accessed September 1, 2017)</b></p> <p>This document provides images of the College Board</p>	<p><b>Participation Requirements for Students with Disabilities</b></p> <p>There is an online request system for accommodations for students with disabilities listed on page 58 of the technical manual.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All evidence is specific to the SAT; evidence required by states is not provided in this document.</li> </ul> <p>The evidence of the process used by the states lacks clarity, such as does the state upload a file detailing accommodations for efficient and effective data reporting? It is unclear based on the screen shots in the PowerPoint (2.3.5 webinar) whether this process is used.</p> <p><b>Decisions by IEP team based on individual need</b></p> <p>Since 1/1/2017, students receive the same accommodations on the SAT as they do routinely use in assessment situations based on the accommodations provided on the IEP. The request must still be submitted on the SAT online system as a simplified request.</p> <p>Some accommodations are listed on page 59(2.1.1) but a complete list and instructions for administering the accommodations are not provided.</p> <p>5.1.1 and 5.1.2 contains screens from the webpages, where more instructions are listed in detail for each type of accommodation and how to request it. The College Board stated that the accommodation list is not complete. A complete list of the approved accommodations should be provided.</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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;</li> <li>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);</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<p>web pages regarding the accommodations request and approval process. This information is available through the College Board website - <a href="https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities">https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities</a></p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.2: College Board Typical Accommodations (accessed October 2, 2017)</b> This document provides information regarding typical testing accommodations available for SAT test administrations. This information is available through the College Board website - <a href="https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities/typical-accommodations">https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities/typical-accommodations</a>.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.3: Support for Students with Temporary Physical/ Medical Conditions</b> This form is used to request testing support for students with temporary impairments (caused by injury, accident, etc) who cannot postpone their tests.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.4: Reports for Students who Test with State Allowed Accommodations</b> Students who test using state allowed accommodations will receive test results that are marked with an “SAA” label. These screen shots show how the designation appears on their reports.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.5: Parent Consent Form Templates</b> The College Board provides a template that district and school administrators may use to attain parental consent to administer the SAT with testing accommodations to particular students. This resource is optionally used by our state partners.</p>	<p>Clarity needs to be provided with respect to the flow of information between ETS and the SAT about requesting accommodations, particularly when these are not on an IEP and if the request is denied. How is this information provided to the state?</p> <p><b>Guidelines for IEP Team Decision-making, including accommodations</b> The SAT did not provide any evidence on the IEP team decision-making process for selection of accommodations.</p> <p><b>Accessibility Features and Selection of Appropriate Accommodations</b> Evidence appears to be adequate for this piece of the critical element.</p> <p><b>Parent Notification</b> Evidence 5.1.5 is the parent notification form for requesting accommodations that are not SAT identified. SAT has a form to request accommodations that will exclude the student’s score for college. Is SAT providing any guidance to states/IEP team use on score reporting for state approved accommodations and its impact on use of non-reportable scores for college admission purposes?</p> <p>Peers were not provided information about what information parents receive about SAT accommodations. There is a statement on the request form that the score may be non reportable, but there is no detail to explain to parents on the accommodation use. The student score report indicates that the score is</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 SAT Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>non reportable due to SAA accommodations</p> <p>What do states share with parents about accommodations and possible implications on score reporting to colleges?</p> <p>States may provide this information but SAT did not provide information for the parent.</p> <p>States will need to provide information on accommodations if SAT does not provide. An accommodation manual detailing the selection, use, and reporting of test accommodations and implications would be beneficial for parents and teachers.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:            Provide evidence of guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b></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"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<p>The College Board's policies and procedures are designed to ensure that appropriate testing accommodations are made available to students with disabilities, including English learners with a diagnosed disability. Students who are approved for and using testing accommodations at their school through a current Individualized Education Program (IEP) 504 Plan, or Formal Written Plan will have those same accommodations automatically approved for taking the SAT®, PSAT™10, PSAT/NMSQT®, SAT Subject Tests™, and AP® Exams. Please refer to the evidence provided in response to critical elements 5.1 and 5.3 for additional information regarding College Board accommodations processes.</p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 50 - 51 describe the types of accommodations available to English learners.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <p>This manual provides instructions on how to administer the SAT to English Learner students who are required to test with additional supports such as glossaries or translated instructions. Refer to pages iv, vi, and 30 for those instructions.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.2.1: College Board-Approved Word-to-Word Glossaries for the SAT® Suite of Assessments (2017)</b></p> <p>This document lists the word-to-word glossaries that the College Board has approved for use with the SAT by English Learner students. The state education agency decides which students can use these language supports. These supports do not require an accommodations request and provide</p>	<p>There was no guidance provided on the selection process for the two accommodations provided. The test directions may be read, but are the questions also read for the mathematics?</p> <p>Directions for administration of the two accommodations all EL may use (2.3.3, pp iv, vi, 30) and (5.2.2). There is a separate request for additional time for EL under 5.2.2.</p> <p><b>Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s)</b></p> <p>States are advised to produce the evidence on accommodations. SAT supplies options for ELs, but LEAs decide which students receive these accommodations.</p> <p>Although all ELs may use word-word dictionaries and translated directions (2.1.1, pp. 50-51), there are no procedures provided to determine whether an EL should be assessed with these accommodations.</p> <p>Accessibility tools and features are not addressed, but accommodations are listed on page 60. 1/1/2017 – state-funded daytime administrations – instructions in several native languages provided; glossaries available too.</p> <p>SAT appears to delegate this to the state by stating only two questions to be answered: Is the requested accommodation(s) in the student’s plan? Has the student used the accommodation(s) for school testing? (see Evidence 5.1.1) It is not clear if there is a different system for EL or SWD?</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>college reportable scores to students.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.2.2: College Board translated instructions for the SAT (2017)</b></p> <p>The College Board provides translated test instructions to English language learners in the following languages: (a) English, (b) Arabic, (c) Chinese, (d) Haitian Creole, (e) Polish, (f) Russian, (g) Portuguese, (h) Spanish, and (i) Vietnamese. The state education agency decides which students can use these language supports. These supports do not require an accommodations request and provide college reportable scores to students.</p>	<p>The evidence (2.3.5 webinar) suggests that extended time for ELs is a state accommodation only which has implications for score reporting and perhaps unintended consequence for the student because the score may not be reported for college admission.</p> <p>What is the decision-making process, how is this communicated to the EL team, how is this reported back to the state?</p> <p>It should be clear if this is used for a state test, which accommodations are provided and reported, who makes the selection decision, and how this is reported back to the state?</p> <p>Clarity between SAT and State guidance is needed for this element.</p> <p>Please provide the report regarding the effectiveness of the extended time accommodation for ELs.</p> <p>More evidence regarding the inclusion of ELs and accommodations is needed.</p>
<b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:            Evidence of communicating this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></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"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math, so no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment. The state will determine which students take the general or the alternate assessment. Below we provide documentation regarding the accommodations that the College Board provides for administrations of the general assessment. The processes described below apply to students with disabilities who are native English speakers and those who are English language learners.</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 49 – 51 describe the types of available allowable accommodations, including a description of the supports available for English learners.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)</b></p> <p><b>This PowerPoint deck is presented to SSD supervisors via an online training session and reviews the policies and procedures related to SAT administrations for students who require testing accommodations. All students with documented disabilities, including English learners, can request and are approved for disability accommodations.</b></p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.1: Pages from the College Board Students with Disabilities website. (accessed September 1, 2017)</b></p> <p>This document provides images of the College Board web pages regarding the accommodations request and approval process. All students with documented disabilities, including English learners,</p>	<p>SAT did not provide any information to ensure that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL)</p> <p>SSD and State Allowed Accommodations are treated differently by the College Board but it is not clear how this impacts state accountability requirements that ensure access for all students.</p> <p>No evidence of any College Board studies on their accommodations and the impact on student scores to validate the accommodations. Although the College Board indicated a study on extended time will be conducted, no evidence of a plan and timeline was provided to verify this statement.</p> <p>There was no data provided on the types and frequency of accommodation approval requests.</p> <p>Pg. 25. Technical manual: “the vast majority of students who are approved for and using testing accommodations at their school through a current IEP or 504 plan have those same accommodations automatically approved for taking the College Board assessment.” How many students automatically qualify and get approved? How many students do not qualify automatically and get approved or not approved? How is the decision made?</p> <p><b>Ensures Availability/Appropriateness/Selection for SWD and EL</b></p> <p>States should supply evidence of how LEAs select accommodations for SWD and EL.</p> <p>There was no evidence provided to address whether the accommodations do not alter the construct being</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 SAT Consortium**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>can request and are approved for disability accommodations. This information is available through the College Board website - <a href="https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities">https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities</a></p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.2: College Board Typical Accommodations (accessed October 2, 2017)</b> This document provides information regarding typical testing accommodations available for SAT test administrations. This information is available through the College Board website - <a href="https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities/typical-accommodations">https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities/typical-accommodations</a>.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.3: Support for Students with Temporary Physical/ Medical Conditions</b> This form is used to request testing support for students with temporary impairments (caused by injury, accident, etc.) who cannot postpone their tests.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.4: Reports for Students who Test with State Allowed Accommodations</b> Student who test with State Allowed Accommodations receive a non-college reportable score. This document shows the online and paper-based score report that these students obtain. In adherence to applicable state and federal accessibility laws, College Board reports and resources are designed to meet accessibility standards including Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.5: Parent Consent Forms Templates</b> The College Board provides to its state clients templates that they may use to obtain parental consent for students to test with College Board</p>	<p>assessed, and allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</p> <p>Is the read-aloud test format available for the Reading test? How is this not interfering with the tested construct?</p> <p>Per the sample score report for tests given with State Allowed Accommodations (5.1.4), scores may not be used for college admission or scholarship purposes, indicating they are not valid for these decisions. Where are the studies providing evidence that accommodated forms scores are valid for other uses such as tracking college and career readiness?</p> <p><b>Process for exceptional accommodation request</b> Special cases addressed in 2.3.5 include changes to previously requested accommodations and transfer students. Slide 4, 2.3.5 indicates that SAT reviews requests for other accommodations. SAT has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed but data was not provided on the impact such accommodations may have on score reportability for state accountability vs. SAT college reporting.</p> <p>The SAT did not provide evidence that the accommodations 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</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 SAT Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	approved accommodations or State Allowed Accommodations. The template is included here as evidence of supports the College Board provides to the state.	for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.
<b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide Evidence that the State ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed but data was not provided and/or does this impact the score as reportable or non reportable.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></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"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math, so no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment. The state will determine which students take the general or the alternate assessment. Below we provide documentation regarding the accommodations that the College Board provides for administrations of the general assessment.</b></p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b> This manual provides instructions for supervisors who will be responsible for registering students for testing accommodations and managing the test administration for students who require testing accommodations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)</b> This PowerPoint deck is presented to SSD supervisors via an online training session and reviews the policies and procedures related to SAT administrations for students who require testing accommodations.</p>	<p><b>State Policies Consistency</b> What are state allowed accommodations that may not be accepted by SAT?</p> <p>Does College Board collect any information from states to ensure students receive the appropriate accommodations on the assessment? Is there any information on how many students do not receive or are denied accommodations via College Board’s process that should receive accommodations per state policy? Any studies?</p> <p><b>Consistent with instruction and IEP team process</b> There is no evidence that SAT communicates about the accommodations use with IEP teams or the state.</p> <p><b>Administered with fidelity to TA procedures</b> Is there any data to show that SAT has collected information from local test administrators regarding faithful implementation for special populations? The irregularities forms and procedures were included, but they seem to apply to the general population more than the special populations and accommodations. What training is provided to scribes and readers? This is critical training; slide 41 says training must be provided, but there is no further information.</p> <p><b>Process used to monitor compliance by districts with data to verify</b> No State or SAT monitoring information is provided-either before, during, or post administration.</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 SAT Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  </u>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:            Evidence 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"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT 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><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b></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><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math, so no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment.</b></p> <p><b>The College Board provides the below documentation to our state partners as support resources to be used during their standard setting process.</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 120 - 133 describe how the benchmarks were determined and how they are related to college outcomes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board SAT Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire, and Illinois</b></p> <p>Each of these College Board produced documents contains a detailed alignment between the state standards and the SAT. Please refer to Critical Element 2.1 for the relevant sections. These documents were provided to each panelist as a reference that could be used during the Achievement standards setting process.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b></p> <p>Panelists were provided with this document as a reference that could be used during the standards setting process.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.2.1: Final Report on the 2016 SAT Multi-State Standard Setting.</b></p> <p>This report summarizes the procedures used to</p>	<p><b>Method and Process</b></p> <p>Standard setting panels were rather small and lacked diversity, particularly in math. There was no EL representation on either standard setting panel.</p> <p>Process for setting achievement levels and descriptors appears to be sufficiently documented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6.2.1 references 4 states –does not include IL and MI.</li> <li>• Used Modified Angoff, p. 5</li> <li>• Description of Essay standard setting process is not included; only DE and ME did this standard-setting. What will other states do? P.73, Appendix J</li> <li>• P. 36 indicates that Math is aligned to CCSS; does not state the same for ERW</li> <li>• ALDs written by SME in 4 states – but no process described (p.4)</li> </ul> <p>2.1.1 pp, 120-135: setting benchmarks</p> <p>6.2.1, for CT, DE, ME, NH: standards setting procedures for the four states were documented. .</p> <p>Will the College Board be conducting any validity evidence on the achievement standards since states are using different points on the scale to make similar inferences (i.e., the group of states vs. Illinois)?</p> <p>IL and MI need to provide evidence of the standards setting process used.</p> <p>Is SAT going to provide evidence of validity of the different cut scores for IL. There was no information on the IL process for standard setting.</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence									
	obtain recommended cut scores from the standard setting panels, as well as the final cut scores that were agreed upon by the four states: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, and New Hampshire. First, an overview of the standard setting meeting is presented, followed by a detailed description of the procedures and results.	The peers located the cut score for proficient but there was no process or ALD development provided. Page 10-11. 3.3.7. How is the different cut scores addressed with 4 state participation in the standard setting? <table border="1"> <tr> <td>State</td> <td>EWR</td> <td>MSS</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IL</td> <td>540</td> <td>540</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DE</td> <td>480</td> <td>530</td> </tr> </table>	State	EWR	MSS	IL	540	540	DE	480	530
State	EWR	MSS									
IL	540	540									
DE	480	530									
<b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b>											
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards for IL and MI.</li> </ul>											

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b></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><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math, so no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment. The College Board provides the below documentation to our state partners as support resources to be used during their standard setting process.</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 21 - 26 describe the processes used to ensure the fairness of the assessment.</li> <li>• Pages 27 - 52 provide a detailed description of test development procedures.</li> <li>• Pages 108 - 114 describe the evidentiary foundation for the decisions made about the content included in the SAT.</li> <li>• Pages 120 - 133 describe how the benchmarks were determined and how they are related to college outcomes.</li> <li>• Pages 133 - 135 describe how the SAT assesses student readiness for college.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board SAT Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire, and Illinois</b></p> <p>Each of these College Board produced documents contains a detailed alignment between the state standards and the SAT. Please refer to Critical Element 2.1 for the relevant sections. These documents were provided to each panelist as a reference that could be used during the Achievement standards setting process.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b></p> <p>Panelists were provided with this document as a reference that could be used during the standards setting process.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)</b></p> <p>This paper provides validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores and important college outcomes. The</p>	<p><b>Challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards</b></p> <p>The description of process to develop ALDs is lacking in 6.2.1. The process is not described.</p> <p>Evidence that academic achievement standards are challenging was not provided.</p> <p>Will the College Board be conducting any validity evidence on the achievement standards since states are using different points on the scale to make similar inferences (i.e., the group of states vs. Illinois)?</p> <p>It is not clear how the ALDs represent the State’s academic content standards, the evidence shows alignment with the SAT benchmarks.</p> <p>Page 36.Appendix C. SAT states there is alignment with the state academic standards but there is no evidence or documentation provided to verify the statement.</p> <p>Page 45. 6.2.1. ALDs designed to describe SAT performance but not the state academic achievement standards or the depth of the coverage. An independent alignment study may address this element.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence			
	<p>evidence provided in this paper is based on a previous version of the SAT. Pages 131 – 135 of the SAT Suite Technical Manual describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)</b>                      This white paper provides preliminary validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores resulting for the redesigned SAT and important college outcomes. The College Board is in the process of completing a validity study to replicate the findings of this white paper with a large, nationally representative sample. The study will examine students in the entering college class of fall 2017, the first full cohort to be admitted to college with the new SAT. For more information regarding this planned study, please refer to page 152 of the SAT Technical Manual.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.2.1: Final Report on the 2016 SAT Multi-State Standard Setting.</b></p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>                     This report summarizes the procedures used to obtain recommended cut scores from the standard setting panels, as well as the final cut scores that were agreed upon by the four states: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, and New Hampshire. First, an overview of the standard setting meeting is presented, followed by a detailed description of the procedures and results.                 </td> <td></td> </tr> </table>		This report summarizes the procedures used to obtain recommended cut scores from the standard setting panels, as well as the final cut scores that were agreed upon by the four states: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, and New Hampshire. First, an overview of the standard setting meeting is presented, followed by a detailed description of the procedures and results.		
	This report summarizes the procedures used to obtain recommended cut scores from the standard setting panels, as well as the final cut scores that were agreed upon by the four states: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, and New Hampshire. First, an overview of the standard setting meeting is presented, followed by a detailed description of the procedures and results.				
<p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></p>					
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of how the 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.</li> </ul>					

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></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"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g.,</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The following documents are reference materials provided by the College Board to educators to support their use of the College Board reporting platform.</p> <p>In adherence to applicable state and federal accessibility laws, College Board reports and resources are designed to meet accessibility standards including Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.4.1: K–12 Educator Brief: The College and Career Readiness Benchmarks for the SAT® Suite of Assessments (April 2016)</b> This brochure explains how the SAT benchmarks were derived and how to interpret SAT test results. It also provides a set of frequently asked questions regarding the assessment reporting.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.4.2: K-12 Educator Brief: The SAT® Suite of Assessments: Using Scores and Reporting to Inform Instruction (2015)</b> This educator brief provides an overview of the different reports available to teachers, and how these reports can be used for curricular and intervention purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 23 - 41 display and explain the uses for sample reports available through the College Board reporting portal.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #6.4.3: SAT Understanding Scores 2017 (2017)</b> This brochure provides information to educators regarding scoring benchmarks, how the assessment is scored and how to access score reports on the College Board reporting portal. It also provides a guide on how to interpret student score reports.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.4.4: Professional Development</b></p>	<p>The College Board indicated it is developing a Spanish Language version of Evidence #6.4.3 for the 2018-19 school year but the peers did not receive any evidence to support the statement.</p> <p>SAT supplies the tools for reporting including assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address needs based on the SAT framework but not the state standards.</p> <p>States should supply evidence of such reports as generated and published.</p> <p>For the individual student reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No State evidence for each of these criteria is provided. Not clear if there is state material that accompanies the SAT score reports. What reports are delivered to parents – same as student reports?</li> <li>• SAT information is provided, but not connected to requirements for States.</li> <li>• How are achievement standards (PLDs) reflected on SAT reports?</li> <li>• If SAT is given in grade 11 for these states, all the SAT material only indicates that the SAT is grade 11 and grade 12 – how do states address grade 11 vs. 12 for reporting purposes?</li> <li>• An individual score report was not provided for review to address the reporting requirements.</li> </ul> <p>When do parents receive the reports with a guide to interpret the test results? Do teachers receive reports in time and with resources to help guide instruction? There is no information on the timeline for parent delivery.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Module #6: Using Scores and Reporting to Inform Instruction (2015)</b>            This PowerPoint presentation can be used to train educators on how to access, interpret and apply score report results to inform classroom instruction.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.4.5: Facilitator Guide to Professional Development Module #6: Using Scores and Reporting to Inform Instruction (2015)</b>            This guide is a companion to the PowerPoint presentation and is intended as a support resource for administrators or district trainers who will be training their educators on how score reporting.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.4.6: Educator Online Reporting Screen Shot Demo (February 2017)</b>            This PowerPoint shows the different reports that available through the College Board online reporting system.</p>	<p>Educators also have a dashboard for requesting a variety of reports.</p> <p>There is no process and timeline for delivery to parents for individual reports.</p> <p>There is no information on availability of alternate formats of the reports available upon request.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>Evidence of reporting that 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"> <li>• 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"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ 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;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>		

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

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

## February 201 State Assessment Peer Review Notes

(resubmission of evidence based on 2016 Peer Review)



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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium**

**Contents**

<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.2 – Item Development.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.3 – Test Administration .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>4.4 – Scoring .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>5.3 – Accommodations.....</b>	<b>16</b>

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that, for cases where an assessment includes off-grade-level content, assessments produce grade level student achievement scores that are based only on grade-level items.</li> <li>Evidence that the item pools for all versions of the assessments (i.e., general, American Sign Language, Braille and Spanish) are sufficient to support the test design requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Evidence #S023</i> – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Race to the Top Grant Proposal (<a href="#">pp. 45-46</a>)</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S025 – Smarter Balanced Mathematics Expanded Item Pools</a></li> <li><i>Evidence #S026</i> – Pool Expansion Information Presentation</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S027 – 2016-17 Expanded Pool Standards Alignment</a></li> <li><a href="#">Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity</a></li> <li><i>Evidence Packet #S012</i> – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses</li> <li><i>S013</i></li> </ul>	<p>blueprint fulfillment as described in S029 – that is, not as an absolute constraint.</p> <p>This requirement is met.</p> <p>Peers would have appreciated a clarification that when expanded pool items are used, that the relevant psychometric considerations are being addressed – e.g., that item parameters used are established for all grades spanned.</p> <p>Peers noted that several items span a relatively large grade range (roughly 20% in MA and 13% in R/LA span 3 or more grades). (Peer calculations based on S027). This seemed high.</p> <p>Peers commend SBAC for producing the gap analyses (S012). Peers believe that steps taken to bridge the gaps as described in S013 should resolve the issues.</p> <p>Peers ask that the program continue to monitor those grades/versions where blueprint fulfillment was less than 100%, as well as those where there had yet to be administrations.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>x The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Evidence that the Smarter Balanced test design aligns the assessments to the full depth and breadth for all the academic content standards in R/LA and mathematics at each grade level.</li> <li>B. Evidence that the item selection procedures for the computer adaptive test (CAT) online assessment adequately deliver tests that meet test design requirements for the intended depth of knowledge (DOK) of the assessments (also applies to evidence requested for element 2.2).</li> <li>C. Evidence that the item pools for all versions of the assessments (i.e., general, American Sign Language, Braille and Spanish) are sufficient to support the test design requirements. Provide, upon completion of the item development plans, evidence that 100% of test events for students receiving any version of the assessment conform to the test blueprints.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium**

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content (stemming from 2016 peer review)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence as noted for all item pools in element 2.1 above.</li> <li>Evidence of a summary report that the CAT administered test forms matched test blueprints.</li> <li>Evidence that Smarter Balanced assessments that include off-grade level content conform to the on-grade level blueprint for the assessment.</li> <li>Evidence of alignment of sample test forms for grades 3, 4, 6 and 7 in R/LA and mathematics.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S005 – Hawaii Smarter Balanced Technical Report, 2014-2015</a> (pp. 42-46)</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S006 – South Dakota Technical Report 2014-2015</a> (pp. 44-49)</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity</a></li> <li><a href="#">Evidence Packet #012 – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses</a></li> <li><a href="#">Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity</a></li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S011 – Smarter Balanced Technical Report, 2015-2016</a> (pp. 6-6 through 6-9)</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity</a></li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S030 – WestEd Alignment Study Proposal</a></li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S032 – WestEd Alignment Study</a></li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #104 – Fordham Institute – Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation Assessments</a> (p. 18)</li> </ul>	<p>See Comments in 2.1.</p> <p>See Comments in 2.1, bullets 2 and 4. The evidence was provided but it does not support the claim that the CAT administered test forms matched the test blueprints in every case.</p> <p>This evidence has been provided. See Comment in 2.1, bullet 3.</p> <p>The WestEd alignment study (S032) assessed the extent to which each item in the noted grades matched its targeted CCSS standard. However, for DoK (cognitive complexity), the study did not assess the extent to which each item matched the cognitive complexity implied by its targeted standard. Rather, it documented experts’ judgments of the level of cognitive complexity at which the item appears to be assessing the standard. The study’s design can furnish appropriate evidence to support (or refute) a claim concerning the degree of content alignment between items and standards, but it cannot provide appropriate evidence for a claim about the match between the cognitive complexity of a test and the cognitive complexity of the standards to which the test is written.</p> <p>Peers felt that the study does not address the question “Does the item match the DoK of the standard?”</p> <p>The measures taken to improve alignment are entirely appropriate. However, evidence of <i>improved</i> alignment was not provided. Peers expected to see a before-after comparison.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of improved alignment of the tests, based upon the findings of the independent alignment study.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S008 – Smarter Balanced Math Summative CAT and Interim Assessment Item Development Plan</a></li> <li><a href="#">Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity</a></li> <li><a href="#">Evidence Packet #S012 – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses</a></li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S013 – Gap Analysis and Development Plans</a></li> <li><a href="#">Evidence Packet #S014 – Member-Managed Assignments</a></li> <li><a href="#">Evidence Packet #S015 – Member-Managed Item Development Training</a></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See 2.1 B and C.</li> <li>Evidence of alignment of sample test forms for grades 3, 4, 6 and 7 in R/LA and mathematics, specifically with respect to cognitive complexity (DoK).</li> <li>Evidence of improved alignment of the tests, based upon the findings of the independent alignment study.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b>                      (stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level data)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that supports the internal structure of the Smarter Balanced assessments using operational data from the summative assessments (e.g., a correlational analysis of subscores and total scores).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Evidence #S004</i> - Assessing the Dimensionality of Smarter Balanced Summative Tests (pp. 2-4).</li> </ul>	<p>S004 provides the evidence requested.</p> <p>Recommendation: Peers recognize the challenge of assessing dimensionality using item scores in a CAT context; SBAC could contribute meaningfully to the literature on this topic by taking it on as a special research study.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></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 the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b> (stemming from 2016 peer review)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the design and development of the item pools used to support multiple versions of the assessments, specifically:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ computer-adaptive in ASL (R/LA listening only, Math);</li> <li>○ computer-adaptive in Braille (R/LA, math);</li> <li>○ computer-based fixed form in Braille (math);</li> <li>○ paper in Braille (R/LA, Math);</li> <li>○ computer-adaptive in Spanish (math); and</li> <li>○ paper in Spanish (math).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence that item pools for these above-listed additional computer adaptive versions can support the adaptive test design.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Evidence #011a</i> – Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines</li> <li>• <a href="#">Evidence #143 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium: Signing Guidelines</a></li> <li>• <i>Evidence Packet #S010</i> – Blueprint Fidelity Studies</li> <li>• <a href="#">Evidence #144 – Unified English Braille Implementation Guide</a></li> <li>• <i>Evidence #146</i> – Theory of Test Translation Error</li> <li>• <a href="#">Evidence #S011 – Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment Technical Report, 2015-2016</a></li> <li>• <i>Evidence Packet #S012</i> – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses</li> <li>• <a href="#">Evidence #S013 – Gap Analysis and Development Plans</a></li> <li>• <i>Evidence #S016</i> – Literature Review of Testing Accommodations and Accessibility Tools for Students with Disabilities</li> <li>• <a href="#">Evidence #S017 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Style Guide</a></li> <li>• <i>Evidence #S018</i> – Tri-Lin Proposal Response to Smarter Balanced RFP 13</li> <li>• <a href="#">Evidence #S019 – Grade 8 Mathematics Item Specifications Claim 1 Target A</a></li> </ul>	<p>See Comments in 2.1 and 4.2.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p> <p>_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Comments in 2.1 B and C, and 4.2.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium**

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

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

**U. S. Department of Education –  
NCSC  
Peer Review of State Assessment Systems  
August 2017 State Assessment Peer  
Review Notes for the NCSC 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 NCSC ASSESSMENT  
CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

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

<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.3 – Test Administration.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2.5 – Test Security .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>4.1 – Reliability.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>4.4 – Scoring.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>5.3 – Accommodations .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>6.4 – Reporting .....</b>	<b>26</b>

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></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"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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);</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 82 (Chapter 3, Study #5, Vertical Coherence)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 72-75 (Relationship of the CCCs to Grade-level CCSS Academic Content Standards: Alignment Question #1)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 65 (English Language Arts)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 28-29 (Adoption of Prioritized Academic Grade-Level Content)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 25-30 (Item Development)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 64 (Table 2-15b)</p>	<p><b>NCSC 15:</b> The Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015 was previously submitted for peer preview. At the time the technical manual was constructed, writing items were not part of the operational test.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> p. 28. The writing panelists indicated that the focal KSAs/Essential Understandings provided some evidence of the writing claim but fell short of providing full evidence in support of it.</p> <p>Of the three content areas, only writing panelists indicated that many of the focal KSAs/Essential understandings at higher grades represented skills identical to those at the lower grades.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> p. 83. The results from the Mathematics, Reading, and Writing Relationship Studies indicated that the prioritized academic grade-level content targets and their alignment to intended college and career ready standards was strong with regard to content centrality, performance centrality, and DOK.</p> <p>Results of the End of the Test Survey (EOTS) were not located in NCSC 15.</p> <p>While the NCSC Coordinated Peer Review Response lists “Balancing reading and writing items” as part of the process described on pgs.</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 RESUBMISSION**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 66-67 (Operational Design; Operational Core Items and Embedded Field Test Items; Specifications)</p> <p><b>NCSC 10:</b> Guide for Score Report Interpretation; pp. 27-34 (Performance Level Descriptors for ELA)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 187 (Reporting of the Writing Prompt (Field Test))</p> <p><b>NCSC 100:</b> Writing Timeline (2013-2015 Writing Timeline)</p>	<p>25-30, there is only one mention of balancing reading and writing, and it is just listed as a “factor” on p. 26. Peers were not clear on how decisions about balancing reading and writing for the ELA tests were made.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> pgs. 33-34 describes the Item Content Review Focus Group Reports for Math and for Reading. It is not clear if this not done for writing.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> p.65.The three CCCs prioritized for writing at each grade level consist of one CCC assessed by a Constructed Response item and two CCCs assessed by Student Response (SR) items. The CR writing items were considered field-test items and did not count toward the student’s score.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> p. 64. The writing CR items (prompts) were field tested as part of the 2015 administration, so are not represented as part of the actual ELA distribution of content shown in Table 2-15b. This table shows that writing comprises 19-21% of the overall ELA Blueprint across all grade levels but the guidelines on the same page account for 30%. It is assumed that the CR items will fill the additional 10-11%.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Page 73. The one major change that was made to the Pilot Phase 2 forms for the operational assessment was the addition of writing sessions to create a full ELA test.</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 RESUBMISSION**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		Tier 1 prompts were included in the overall ELA score for 2015. Tier 2 writing prompts were field tested in ELA in each grade. It is unclear if Tier 2 writing prompts been included as part of operational tests.
<b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b>		
“State must provide evidence to support the NCSC test design criteria for the writing portion of the reading/language arts AA-AAAS. This will also impact evidence for related critical elements in sections 3 and 4”		
<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State must provide evidence to support the NCSC test design criteria for the operational writing portion of the reading/language arts AA-AAAS. This will also impact evidence for related critical elements in sections 3 and 4. No new relevant information was presented.</li> </ul>		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC 1:</b> Test Administration Manual 2015; p. 13 (Sample Test Items)</p> <p><b>NCSC 1:</b> Test Administration Manual 2015; pp. 16-17, 19, 24 (Test Administration Training Requirements)</p> <p><b>NCSC 8:</b> System User Guide for Test Administrators; pp. 65-67 (Keyboard-Only Navigation Shortcuts, Technology Requirements)</p> <p><b>NCSC 9:</b> System User Guide for Test Coordinators; pp. 72-73 (Technology Requirements)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 94-95 (Administration Support, NCSC Service Center, Additional Supports)</p>	<p><b>NCSC 1, 8, 9, and 15:</b> The Test Administration Manual 2015, the System User Guide for Test Administrators, the System User Guide for Test Coordinators were previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p><b>NCSC 1:</b>p. 13, 16. Availability of sample items does not ensure that all students are familiar with the item format and online functionality. As a starting point, TAs are asked to review and complete the sample items with students Additionally, a policy statement and possibly some systematic documentation may be warranted.</p> <p><b>NCSC 1:</b> p.19. TCs must complete the NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Coordinators, including NCSC accommodations.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b>pp.94-95. Numerous examples of test administrative support and technical support through the NCSC Service Center during test administration were provided It appears that TAs and students do not have access to sample items in writing.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> p. 95. The Tip Sheet described on of might be meeting this need. The tip sheets developed in each year should probably be aggregated and given out at the beginning of</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 RESUBMISSION**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		the next year to help alert folks to commonly occurring issues. This meets the needs of the troubleshooting guide.
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the NCSC/MSAA assessments that include:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of a troubleshooting guide for the NCSC/MSAA to address technology-related contingency plans.</li> <li>○ Evidence of policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing.</li> <li>○ Evidence of training to ensure consistency of administration across districts and schools.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the NCSC assessments that include:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration in writing (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing.</li> <li>○ Evidence of training to ensure consistency of administration across districts and schools.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></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"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC 1:</b> Test Administration Manual 2015; pp. 16-17 (Responsibilities for Test Administrators)</p> <p><b>NCSC 1:</b> Test Administration Manual 2015; p.13 (Open Response: Foundational Reading)</p> <p><b>NCSC 123:</b> Architecture and Technology System Requirements; pp. 53-56; 64-69 (Component Transport; Security)</p>	<p><b>NCSC 1:</b> Test Administration Manual 2015 was previously submitted for peer review.</p> <p>NCSC noted that individual states handle investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. Training modules 1 and 2 were dedicated to testing irregularities and testing integrity.</p> <p><b>NCSC 5:</b> p. 31. TAs must follow their state procedures. Pages 33-36. The peers noted the quiz for TAs regarding inappropriate test practices is low level and an educator could likely pass it without taking the training.</p> <p>Note: While states have specific responsibility in test security, the underlying architecture responsibility is with NCSC. States using NCSC will need to be aware of their responsibility as part of Test Security.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide then State must):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the NCSC/MSAA, documentation of a process to prevent, detect, report, investigate, and remediate assessment regularities.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X_ No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></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"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p>No evidence was provided.</p>	<p>See Element 2.1</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b></p> <p>For the NCSC/MSAA, as noted in element 2.1, evidence that demonstrates its assessments measure the full breadth and depth of the State’s content standards (writing). Following that, the State will need to document adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, including evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards. This will also effect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</p>		
<p><b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the NCSC as noted in element 2.1, evidence that demonstrates its assessments measure the full breadth and depth of the State’s writing (ELA) content standards. Following that, the State will need to document adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, including evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards for writing.</li> </ul>		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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
This will also affect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4.		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></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>No evidence was provided.</p>	<p>See Element 2.1.</p> <p>See 3.1 comment NCSC may consider cognitive lab or observational data to address validity evidence for this critical element.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b> For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p>		
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the NCSC, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</li> </ul>		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></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><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 179-183 (Dimensionality Analyses)</p> <p><b>NCSC 104:</b> Exploring Dimensionality within the 2015 NCSC Operational Administration Data 12-16; pp. 5-10 (Exploratory Factor Analysis), pp. 15-20 (Dimensionality Review Workshops; Further Investigation; Discussion)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15-B:</b> Appendix 2_2015 Tech Manual Appendix 2-K update   pp. 2-3 (Table B1; B2)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 123-124 (Calibration; Item Response Theory Results)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15-F:</b> Appendix 6_2015 Tech Manual Appendix 6-A – 6-L)</p>	<p><b>NCSC 104:</b> p.6. The Center for Assessment essentially confirmed results from 2015 Technical Manual. All grade/content combinations showed two dimensions except ELA at third and fourth grade.</p> <p><b>NCSC 104:</b> p. 20. The quantitative and qualitative (review committee) results suggested that some students favor a particular response option and that this favoritism is reflected as multidimensionality on certain forms. It was suggested that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Future form development and revision carefully consider the balance of the number of correct responses per selected response option, particularly in math.</li> <li>2. Students’ preferential selection of a given response option be studied further, potentially using qualitative means. Such behavior, if undesirable, could be corrected through revisions to the test administration procedure.</li> </ol> <p>It is unclear whether the above two suggestions were implemented and if so, whether they worked. It is recommended that the current data be factor analyzed.</p> <p><b>NCSC 104:</b> makes the case that the tests, as a whole, function unidimensionally even though there with a few students with an aberrant item selection behavior. NCSC refers to Test Characteristic Curves (TCC), Test Information Function (TIF) curves, and Conditional</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
		Standard Error of Measurement (CSEM) curves, and the IRT model fit analyses as evidence.
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b>                      For the NCSC/MSAA, additional evidence that supports the internal structure of the tests, specifically a plan and timeline for documenting how the test meets item response theory (IRT) assumptions of test unidimensionality.</p>		
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence of how NCSC will address answer choice presentation and impact of scrolling in the administration of the test as evidenced by NCSC 104.</li> </ul>		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>No evidence provided</p>	<p>No new relevant information was presented.</p> <p>It is possible to address this by providing data to show correlations between writing and other variables such as math, science, reading or any other norm tests.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b> For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p>		
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the NCSC, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</li> </ul>		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 124-128; 171-177 (Item Response Theory Results; Chapter 8)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15-F:</b> Appendix 6_2015 Tech Manual Appendix 6-F</p> <p><b>NCSC 15-I:</b> Appendix 8_2015 Tech Manual Appendices 8-A and 8-B</p>	<p><b>NCSC 15, 15-F and 15-I:</b> Test Administration Manual 2015 plus the two appendices were previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p>Statistical tables show ELA and Mathematics, but not Writing.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15-F:</b> p.5, Appendix 6. Example item-level fit plots for Tier 1 Writing Prompt I items were presented. The purpose seemed to be determining whether combined or single item scores should be used, reporting reliability for Writing.</p> <p>ELA scores used in the various statistical analyses contained between 19% and 22% writing items.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15: p. 187.</b> Tier 2 writing prompts were field tested in ELA in each grade this year to enable further research and examination of results. Further development is in progress with the intention of including Tier 2 writing prompts in the overall ELA score for students in the future. Writing SRs and Tier 1 prompts were included in the overall ELA score for 2015.</p> <p>It is unclear if there will be writing reliability data independent of ELA. The TAC meeting discussion reviewed the writing issue, but did not provide any guidance.</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
		All data provided in evidence relates to field test writing items. No new evidence about operational items was presented.
<b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b> For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.		
<b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If NCSC implements CR operational writing items, appropriate studies must be conducted to determine reliability.</li> </ul>		

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></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><b>NCSC 15:</b> p. 19. To allow the widest possible range of students to demonstrate what they know and can do and to be able to make valid inferences about the performance of all students who participate in an assessment, universally designed assessments are developed from the beginning with an eye toward maximizing fairness.</p>	<p>See Element 2.1.</p> <p>The use of UDL (Universal Design for Learning) is designed to meet the full continuum.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b> For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p>		
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></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><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></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><b>NCSC 15: Operation Assessment Technical Manual 2015</b>  p. 105 -110 –training of scorers – on field-test items  p. 114 –Inter-rater reliability on Field Test Writing CR items  p. 187 Reporting of field-test Writing Prompt</p> <p><b>NCSC 10: Guide for Score Report Interpretation</b>  pgs. 27-34: Performance Level Descriptors for Writing are embedded in ELA</p>	<p>See Element 2.1.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> p. 188 – Some states opted to not report writing. It is unclear if this was true in 2016-17 as well as 2015.</p> <p>No new evidence was presented regarding training of raters, scoring rubrics, or evaluation of inter-rater reliability, other than on field-test writing items. It is unclear if this same process used for operational writing items.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b>  For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence of documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for constructed-response items in reading/language arts and mathematics and also operational writing items. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability;</li> <li>○ Clear scoring rubrics, comprehensive instructions for raters, adequate training of raters, evaluation of inter-rater reliability; and</li> <li>○ Documentation that the model-data fit issue identified in item 3.3 has been resolved.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the NCSC, evidence of documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for constructed-response items in reading/language arts and mathematics and also operational writing items. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability;</li> <li>○ Clear scoring rubrics, comprehensive instructions for raters, adequate training of raters, and evaluation of inter-rater reliability.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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"> <li>• Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>• Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC 1:</b> Test Administration Manual 2015; pp. 9, 24 (Overview of NCSC AA-AAS; Accommodations)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 67-68 (Table 2-16; Table 2-17)</p>	<p><b>NCSC 1 and 15:</b> The Test Administration Manual 2015 and the Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015 were previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p>The use of a paper-based presentation of test item/s is a state-specific policy. (P.9 and Appendix A).</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> p. 13. NCSC created and adopted policies for accessibility and item features that resulted in flexible assessment design and delivery (computer vs paper based). On p. 89, they refer to paper version of items as an accommodation.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b></p> <p>For NCSC/MSAA, evidence either that paper versions of the assessments are an accommodation or an analysis of the comparability of the meaning and interpretation of the assessment results across the technology-based and paper-based versions of the assessments.</p>		
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></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><b>NCSC 17:</b> Post-Operational NCSC Research Studies; pp. 1-15</p> <p><b>NCSC 106:</b> Final Project Meeting Agenda</p> <p><b>NCSC 107:</b> Final Project Meeting Evaluation</p> <p><b>NCSC 109:</b> Estimating and Evaluating Student Growth</p> <p><b>NCSC 110:</b> Evaluating Precision of NCSC Scores</p> <p><b>NCSC 111:</b> Future Test Development</p> <p><b>NCSC 112:</b> Item Difficulty Study</p> <p><b>NCSC 113:</b> Managing Assessment Assets</p> <p><b>NCSC 116:</b> Part Perf analysis as of 12-20-16</p> <p><b>NCSC 117:</b> Part Rate Follow-up as of 12-26-</p> <p><b>NCSC 118:</b> UKY Communication White Paper Final</p> <p><b>NCSC 119:</b> UKY Communicative Competence Policy Brief Final</p> <p><b>NCSC 120:</b> UKY On-line Learning Final</p> <p><b>NCSC 121:</b> UNCC 4 Studies 9-16</p> <p><b>NCSC 122:</b> UNCC How Teach Standards</p>	<p><b>NCSC 17:</b> The Post-Operational NCSC Research Studies was previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p>Writing scores were not analyzed independent of ELA.</p> <p>12 research reports documenting NCSC support for studies to do ongoing research for evaluating and improving the assessment system. The evidence provided are final reports. It is unclear if there are plans to do more research in the future. In NCSC 107, members indicated in using the information provided from studies to improve the system for the future.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b></p>		
<p>For NCSC/MSAA, evidence of a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of the assessments for future years</p>		
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></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><b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b></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"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC 2:</b> Guidance for IEP teams on participation decisions</p>	<p>See 5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p><b>NCSC 2:</b> p. 3-3. If ELLs have an IEP that calls for the alternate assessment, they will be included in this test. Accommodations will be determined for ELLs in the same way they are determined for all students taking this assessment.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15-B,</b> p. 6-7 accommodation          “All key information in dominant language is also available in prevalent first languages for second language learners” is listed as “allowed.” But this does not appear in any of the materials for TAs. (This is also pertinent for Critical Element 5.3.)</p> <p>It would be helpful if this is accommodation is communicated for TA use. Clarification should be provided to TAs regarding the accommodations listed as allowed.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</b>            For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); and</li> <li>o Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:            For the NCSC evidence that 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); and</li> </ul>		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li></ul>		

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></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"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC 2:</b> Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions; pp. 3-4 (Introduction; Description of the [NCSC Alternate Assessment]; Participation Decisions)</p> <p><b>NCSC 2:</b> Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions; p. 5 (Do Not Use the Following as Criteria for Participation Decisions)</p> <p><b>NCSC 2:</b> Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions; p. 8 (How do I know if the [NCSC Alternate Assessment] is appropriate for an ELL with an IEP whose language proficiency makes it difficult to assess content knowledge and skills?) Participation Decisions Document; pp. 52-63 (Student Profile Example C) pp. 12-18 (Appendices A-C)</p> <p><b>NCSC 1:</b> Test Administration Manual 2015; p. 23 (Table 11. NCSC Assessment Features) p. 24 (Accommodations) pp. 44-56 (Assessment Features)</p> <p><b>NCSC 5:</b> Test Administration Training for Test Administrators; p. 66 (What are test accommodations?)</p> <p><b>NCSC 8:</b> System User Guide for Test Administrators; pp. 18; 26-28 (Accommodations: Before Test &amp; After Test)</p>	<p><b>NCSC 1, 2, 5, 8, 15-B, 15, and 15-F:</b> were previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p><b>NCSC 2:</b> p. 7. “An ELL should be considered for the alternate assessment if (a) his/her intellectual functioning indicates a significant cognitive disability using assessments in his/her home language as appropriate, and (b) he/she meets the other participation guidelines for the [NCSC Alternate Assessment]”. Frequently Asked Questions</p> <p><b>NCSC 5:</b> pgs. 23-24. All accessibility features and accommodations listed in each student’s IEP are applicable to each eligible participant, including English Learners. Accessibility features are also listed in the training for TA.</p> <p><b>NCSC 5:</b> p. 66. Each state in the NCSC consortium has its own process by which unique/non-traditional accommodations are processed for approval</p> <p><b>NCSC 5:</b> p. 66. “Accommodations are changes in the materials or procedures of the assessment that do not alter the construct being measured.” “If a student requires an Accommodation for the assessment that is not currently in his/her IEP, please see TAM, Appendix A. State Specific Information.” The accommodations were designed to remove construct-irrelevant barriers related to individual characteristics that would interfere</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><b>NCSC 15-B:</b> Appendix 2; 2015 Tech Manual Appendix 2-B update 2.pdf; ELA Appendix C</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 88 (Documentation of Accommodations)</p> <p><b>NCSC 1:</b> Test Administration Manual 2015; p. 34 (Accommodations: After Test)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15-F:</b> Appendix 6; 2015 Tech Manual (Appendix 6-L – Accommodation Freqs-2.pdf)</p> <p><b>NCSC 101:</b> NCME 2016 Accessibility Presentation; (Appendix 6-L – Accommodation Freqs-2.pdf)</p> <p><b>NCSC 102:</b> NCME 2016 Accessibility Handout); Accessibility: Consideration of the Learner, the Teacher, and Item Performance</p>	<p>with the measurement of the target construct.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> p. 61. Recommendations for areas of further study included the use of accommodations. It is not clear if further study was completed. If so, what were the results?</p> <p>In <b>NCSC 15-B</b>, p. 6-7. the accommodation “All key information in dominant language is also available in prevalent first languages for second language learners” is listed as “allowed.” But this does not appear in any of the materials for TAs. (This is also pertinent for Critical Element 5.2.)</p> <p>Several studies are cited, but none seem to address the question of whether the accommodations provided allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</p>

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For both the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that the accommodations provided (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) 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.</li> <li>• Evidence that appropriate accommodations for English learners are available.</li> <li>• For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that the State has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the NCSC, evidence that the accommodations provided do not alter the construct being assessed, and 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.</li> </ul>		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></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"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC 103:</b> Reporting Timeline (2014-2016)</p> <p><b>NCSC 10:</b> Guide for Score Report Interpretation; pp. 24-26 (Appendix A: Individual Student Report)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 132-138 (Chapter 7: Standard Setting)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 139-140 (Chapter 7: Standard Setting)</p> <p><b>NCSC 124:</b> ADE November 2015 Examiner Newsletter; p. 7 (NCSC 2015 Reports)</p>	<p><b>NCSC 10 and 15:</b> were previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p>An expanded timeline with additional important dates for Alternate Assessment would be helpful. Testing window dates (March-May) were included in the Examiner Newsletter (p. 7).</p> <p>Student reports were delivered through an online reporting portal as soon as the reports and data had been verified and approved for each administration.</p> <p><b>NCSC 124:</b> AZ process is provided as an example of the reporting process.</p> <p>No evidence is provided regarding individual student reports being available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.</p>

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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>descriptors);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ 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;</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 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.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide then State must):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● For the NCSC/MSAA evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> <li>● For the NCSC/MSAA, 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.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● For the NCSC evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration</li> <li>● For the NCSC, 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. No new relevant information was presented.</li> </ul>		

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

## March 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

# STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut

## Contents

<b>SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students	3
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards	5
1.3 – Required Assessments	7
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments	9
1.5 – Participation Data	14
<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS</b>	<b>16</b>
2.1 – Test Design and Development	16
2.2 – Item Development	18
2.3 – Test Administration	19
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration	22
2.5 – Test Security	24
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy	28
<b>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY</b>	<b>29</b>
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	29
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	30
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	31
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	32
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER</b>	<b>33</b>
4.1 – Reliability	33
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility	34
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	35
4.4 – Scoring	36
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	37
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	38
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	39
<b>SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS</b>	<b>40</b>
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	40
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs	42
5.3 – Accommodations	44
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	46
<b>SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING</b>	<b>51</b>
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	51
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting	53
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	54
6.4 – Reporting	55

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut**

**SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p>	<p><b>Connecticut Specific Evidence</b>  <b>Evidence #1.1.1 – 1.1.18: Adoption Process &amp; Stakeholder Involvement</b>  <b>Evidence #1.1.1</b> - Letter to State Members CCSSO  <b>Evidence #1.1.2:</b> Common Core Cover Letter for ELA  <b>Evidence #1.1.3:</b> Common Core Cover Letter for Mathematics  <b>Evidence #1.1.4:</b> E-mail to CSDE Consultants of Draft K-12 Standards for State Review  <b>Evidence #1.1.5:</b> CCSS Working Draft for Mathematics (K-8)  <b>Evidence #1.1.6:</b> CCSS Working Draft for Mat (MS &amp; HS)  <b>Evidence #1.1.7:</b> CCSS Draft for ELA: Grades K-8  <b>Evidence #1.1.8:</b> Invitation to Connecticut (CT) Stakeholders  <b>Evidence #1.1.9:</b> List of Connecticut (CT) Stakeholders  <b>Evidence #1.1.10:</b> Common Core State Standards (CCSS) State Adoption Process Evaluation Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This evaluation was developed for the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) by Dr. Mhora Newsom-Stewart, Director of the Center for Collaborative Evaluation and Strategic Change.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #1.1.11:</b> Connecticut (CT) State Board of Education Meeting Minutes: July 7, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minutes capture the State Board of Education’s approval of the <i>K-12 Common Core State Standards</i> (Page 4)</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #1.1.12:</b> Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) Press Release</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Announces the State Board of Education’s adoption of the <i>Common Core State Standards</i> (CCSS).</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #1.1.13:</b> Spring 2011 Teaching and Learning E-Alert  <b>Evidence #1.1.14:</b> Common Core State Standards (CCSS) Crosswalk Document Meeting  <b>Evidence #1.1.15:</b> Transition to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for Mathematics in CT  <b>Evidence #1.1.16:</b> CT Race to the Top Phase II Reform Plan Details with the LEA</p>	<p><b>State Comment:</b> Evidence 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 1.1.5, 1.1.6 and 1.1.7 is watermarked Confidential given that the documents were considered draft at the time.</p> <p>Connecticut provided a great deal of information about the transition from the previous CT standards in ELA and math, although does not seem to be required by the critical element.</p> <p>1.1.11 documents board adoption for RLA and math.</p> <p>Evidence # 1.1.1-1.1.18 – Document the Review, Evaluation, &amp; Adoption Process (2009-11), including stakeholder involvement (2016; 1.1.9) and associated resources.</p> <p>No information on science standards adoption was included.</p> <p>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 Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<b>Evidence #1.1.17:</b> CT Core Standards Webpage <b>Evidence #1.1.18:</b> Letter to Supers Updated Information on CCSS 5-25-11	
<b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>	<p><b>Connecticut Specific Evidence:</b>  <b>Evidence #1.1.1:</b> Letter to State Members from CCSSO  <b>Evidence #1.1.8:</b> Invitation to CT Stakeholders  <b>Evidence #1.1.9:</b> List of Connecticut (CT) Stakeholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This Excel file contains the RSVPs submitted for the Education Stakeholder Engagement Conference.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #1.1.17:</b> Connecticut (CT) Core Standards Webpage  The Connecticut Core Standards webpage provides a series of resources to educators. This page specifically hosts a number of documents related to <i>Connecticut’s Common Core State Standards</i> for mathematics and English language arts, including standards progressions across all grades, and tools for teachers to use in the formative assessment process. This page also includes a virtual library that provides access to professional development opportunities, on-demand professional learning and materials across content areas (ELA, mathematics, science, social studies, world language, career &amp; technical education, arts, physical education, health and information technologies).</p> <p><b>Evidence #1.2.1:</b> ELA Exemplar Texts for Grades 6-8 and 11</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This document addresses considerations related to the selection of text exemplars for the K-12 English language arts standards. It contains samples of complex texts across literary and informational passages.</li> </ul> <p><b>The following crosswalks provide evidence of coherence of standards across grades:</b>  <b>Evidence #1.2.2:</b> ELA Grade 3 Crosswalk  <b>Evidence #1.2.3:</b> ELA Grade 4 Crosswalk  <b>Evidence #1.2.4:</b> ELA Grade 5 Crosswalk</p>	<p>Evidence 1.2.1 is watermarked Confidential given that the document was considered draft at the time.</p> <p>Evidence pieces provided for 1.1 (1.1.1, 1.1.8, 1.1.9, 1.1.17) document stakeholder involvement and content that is rigorous and coherent.</p> <p>CT showed evidence of a process for and implementation of stakeholder involvement; science standards were not included in the evidence. Evidence specific to 1.2 includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exemplar Texts for ELA across grade levels (1.2.1)</li> <li>• ELA Crosswalks relating CCS to CT Standards for grades 3-12 (1.2.2-1.2.9)</li> <li>• ESEA Flexibility Letter (1.2.10 through 2017-18 school year)</li> <li>• Math Crosswalks relating CCS to CT Standards for grades 3-12 (1.2.11-1.2.17)</li> <li>• Input on common core by parents &amp; educators (1.2.18 &amp; 1.2.19)</li> </ul> <p>No additional evidence is needed.</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 Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p><b>Evidence #1.2.5:</b> ELA Grade 6 Crosswalk  <b>Evidence #1.2.6:</b> ELA Grade 7 Crosswalk  <b>Evidence #1.2.7:</b> ELA Grade 8 Crosswalk  <b>Evidence #1.2.8:</b> ELA Grades 9-10 Crosswalk  <b>Evidence #1.2.9:</b> ELA Grades 11-12 Crosswalk  <b>Evidence #1.2.11:</b> Math Grade 3 Crosswalk  <b>Evidence #1.2.12:</b> Math Grade 4 Crosswalk  <b>Evidence #1.2.13:</b> Math Grade 5 Crosswalk  <b>Evidence #1.2.14:</b> Math Grade 6 Crosswalk  <b>Evidence #1.2.15:</b> Math Grade 7 Crosswalk  <b>Evidence #1.2.16:</b> Math Grade 8 Crosswalk  <b>Evidence #1.2.17:</b> Math Grades 9-12 Crosswalk  <b>Evidence #1.2.18:</b> Gov. Malloy Seeks Input of Teachers, Parents and Administrators on Common Core  <b>Evidence #1.2.19:</b> CSDE News: State Launches Common Core Website for Educators and Parents</p>	
<b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b>		
_X_ No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p>1.3 – Required Assessments</p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12);</li> <li>• Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Connecticut Specific Evidence</b></p> <p><b>Evidence #1.3.1:</b> State Assessment Webpage  <input type="checkbox"/> The CSDE 2017-18 Assessment webpage provides a list of state assessments and the corresponding testing dates, along with links to other statewide assessments, such as Smarter Balanced and the Connecticut Alternate Assessment.</p> <p><b>Evidence #1.3.2:</b> SAT Webpage  <input type="checkbox"/> The Connecticut SAT School Day website provides district and school administrators with access to administration materials, Assessment Newsletters, and all ancillary resources to support Connecticut SAT School Day.</p> <p><b>Evidence #1.3.3:</b> Administration of Annual Assessments 3-11-16  <input type="checkbox"/> Dated March 11, 2016, this letter from the Chief Academic Officer specifically addresses the request to opt children out of state assessments. The letter makes references to the statute and the ESEA; neither of which allow parents to exempt their children from taking the state assessments. This letter also identifies state and federal statutes requiring statewide assessments in certain grades and subject areas, and provides clarification regarding testing accommodations and supports for students who qualify.</p> <p><b>Evidence #1.3.4:</b> An Act Concerning Student Assessments  <input type="checkbox"/> Compiled by the CSDE, <i>An Act Concerning</i></p>	<p>Connecticut administers the following assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Connecticut Smarter Balanced Assessment for students in Grades 3 through 8.</li> <li>• The Next Generation Science Standards(NGSS) assessment for students in Grades 5, 8 and 11.</li> <li>• The Connecticut SAT School Day for students in Grade 11.</li> <li>• The Connecticut Alternate Assessment (CTAA) in Grades 3 through 8 and 11 and the Connecticut NGSS Alternate Assessment in Grades 5, 8 and 11 for students who may have significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul> <p>Note that Connecticut is field testing its science and alternate science assessments in 2018.</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 Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
	<i>Student Assessments</i> , identifies state statutes requiring the administration of annual assessments in Connecticut public schools in certain grades and subject areas.	
<b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
_x_ No additional evidence is required.		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;</li> <li>• For English learners (EL):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment;</li> <li>○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Connecticut Specific Evidence</b></p> <p><b>Evidence #1.3.1:</b> State Assessment Webpage  <input type="checkbox"/> The CSDE 2017-18 Assessment webpage provides a list of state assessments and the corresponding testing dates, along with links to other statewide assessments, such as Smarter Balanced and the Connecticut Alternate Assessment.</p> <p><b>Evidence #1.3.2:</b> SAT Webpage  <input type="checkbox"/> The Connecticut SAT School Day website provides district and school administrators with access to administration materials, Assessment Newsletters, and all ancillary resources to support Connecticut SAT School Day.</p> <p><b>Evidence #1.3.3:</b> Administration of Annual Assessments 3-11-16  <input type="checkbox"/> Dated March 11, 2016, this letter from the Chief Academic Officer specifically addresses the request to opt children out of state assessments. The letter makes references to the statute and the ESEA neither of which allow parents to exempt their children from taking the state assessments. This letter also identifies state and federal statutes requiring statewide assessments in certain grades and subject areas, and provides clarification regarding testing accommodations and supports for students who qualify.</p> <p><b>Evidence #1.3.4:</b> An Act Concerning Student Assessments  <input type="checkbox"/> Compiled by the CSDE, <i>An Act Concerning</i></p>	<p>Connecticut’s assessment guidelines establish that students enrolled in a state approved private special education program are tested by that private school. For students enrolled in non-approved private schools in Connecticut or out of state, the reporting district is accountable to test those students.</p> <p>Connecticut’s assessment guidance specifies that accommodations are allowable under Smarter Balanced and the science assessment. It is not specific regarding SAT Day.</p> <p>CT does not exempt first year English learners from taking assessments, although their scores do not count towards school accountability in the first two years.</p> <p>CT provides translation for math assessments and native language instructions for science, but does not provide native language assessments.</p> <p>FROM 2016: There is not sufficient evidence of test taking accommodations that are appropriate to English learners that are not exempt from taking the NCSC/CTAA. (see 5.2)</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
	<p><i>Student Assessments</i>, identifies state statutes requiring the administration of annual assessments in Connecticut public schools in certain grades and subject areas.</p> <p><b>Evidence #1.4.1:</b> Assessment Guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) requires that all public elementary and secondary school students are included in the state assessment system, and there are specific inclusion policies for students with disabilities and English learners.</li> <li>□ The CSDE <i>Assessment Guidelines</i> provide specific information for administering state assessments (such as Connecticut SAT School Day and the Connecticut Alternate Assessments) to students who receive special education services, students identified as disabled under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, students identified as English learners (EL), and students receiving designated supports.</li> <li>□ The <i>Assessment Guidelines</i> articulate all the accommodations and supports that are available for the students who are Special Education, 504, or English learners.</li> <li>□ Page 7 of the <i>Assessment Guidelines</i> explain the required participation for all public elementary and secondary school students; all students with disabilities, including those publicly placed into private schools, are required to participate in the assessment system; and all English learners are required to participate in the assessment system with exemption policies clearly explained.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #1.4.2:</b> Connecticut State Department of Education IEP Manual and Forms</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 Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> This document provides guidance when utilizing individualized education program (IEP) forms. Sections of this document explain the process for selecting general assessments without accommodations, general assessments with accommodations, or alternate assessments for any student with a disability specified by an IEP.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Pages 17-19 provides general information on accommodations and modifications provided in academic, nonacademic, and extracurricular activities available to a student.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Page 20 of this manual provides guidance on the selection and documentation of accommodations for statewide testing including Connecticut SAT School Day and the Connecticut Alternate Assessments.</p> <p><b>Evidence #1.4.3:</b> CSDE Special Population Documentation and Resources Webpage</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This webpage provides guidance for submitting testing accommodations for students with disabilities, students with a 504 Plan, and English learners.</p> <p><b>Evidence #1.4.4:</b> Connecticut Alternate Assessment (CTAA) Webpage</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This webpage provides a variety of resources to support the identification of students who may qualify for the Connecticut Alternate Assessment, in addition to the provision of resources related to the test administration of each of Connecticut’s alternate assessments.</p> <p><b>Evidence #1.4.5:</b> English Learners-Identification, Accountability and Assessment</p>	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Dated June 9, 2017, this letter from the Commissioner outlines the new policy related to testing EL in Connecticut.</p> <p><b>Evidence #1.4.6:</b> Connecticut SAT School Day Translated Directions  <input type="checkbox"/> This information is found on the Connecticut SAT School Day webpage and provides translated test directions in eight different languages.</p> <p><b>Evidence #1.4.7:</b> College Board Approved Word-to-Word Glossaries for the SAT Suite of Assessments  <input type="checkbox"/> This document lists the permitted word-to-word glossaries for EL students for the Connecticut SAT School Day.</p> <p><b>Evidence#1.4.8:</b> English Learner Identification Process  <input type="checkbox"/> This document describes the process for identifying EL students.</p> <p><b>Evidence#1.4.9:</b> Connecticut (CT) English Learner Exit Criteria Grades K-12  <input type="checkbox"/> This letter describes the updated criteria used to document students who are English learners exiting from programs of English language instruction. In order for students to exit either the Bilingual Education and/or English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Program and no longer receive English language acquisition support, the student must reach the state mandated exit requirements as described in this document.</p> <p><b>Evidence#1.4.10:</b> New Flexibility for English Learners District Test Coordinator and</p>	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
	<p>Administrator Information  <input type="checkbox"/> This document describes the flexibilities available for EL students on state assessments.</p> <p><b>Evidence#1.4.11:</b> New Flexibility for English Learners Information for Teachers  <input type="checkbox"/> This document describes the flexibilities available for EL students on state assessments and is geared for teachers.</p>	
<b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
X No further evidence 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 Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p>1.5 – Participation Data</p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>	<p><b>Connecticut Specific Evidence</b></p> <p><b>Evidence #1.5.1:</b> Screenshot Connecticut SAT School Day Results Sample  <input type="checkbox"/> This snapshot of an EdSight report includes participation data for selected public-school students in a district breakdown by gender. This information can be found using the EdSight Reporting tool for all student groups. Breakdowns can be run by Gender, Race/Ethnicity, Special Ed Status, Free/Reduced Meal Status, and English Learner Status. Additionally, reports can be run off EdSight as downloadable excel files.</p> <p><b>Evidence #1.5.2:</b> Screenshot of Participation by All Students on the SAT  <input type="checkbox"/> This screenshot reports participation by all students for the Connecticut SAT School Day. These data are available on EdSight.</p> <p><b>Evidence #1.5.3:</b> Using Accountability Results to Guide Improvement  <input type="checkbox"/> Pages 43-44: Participation and Achievement Inclusion rules for reporting.</p> <p><b>Evidence #1.5.4:</b> 2016 Accountability Results File  <input type="checkbox"/> This document shows the accountability results calculated in 2016. Note the participation rates are displayed on the bottom right of the first page.</p> <p><b>Evidence #1.5.5:</b> Memo to Superintendents about Low Participation  <input type="checkbox"/> This memo to Superintendents describes CSDE’s USED approved participation rate accountability</p>	<p>CSDE did not provide evidence in this submission of participation data for students by subgroup. However, CSDE has provided evidence of participation on math, ELA, and science through the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). The State does not administer end of course assessments.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
	plan and tiered consequences, based on student test data from 2014-15.	
<b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
__x_ No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut**

**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><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></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"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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);</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Connecticut adheres to the evidence provided in the unified submission by the College Board for the Connecticut SAT School Day.</b></p> <p><b>Connecticut Specific Evidence</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The following state-developed documents complement the Connecticut SAT School Day specifications, as well as provide additional guidance under state policy and procedures.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #1.4.1:</b> Assessment Guidelines  <b>Evidence #2.1.1:</b> PowerPoint Presentation  <b>Evidence #2.1.2:</b> FAQ for Schools and Districts  <b>Evidence #2.1.3:</b> FAQ for Parents  <b>Evidence #2.1.4:</b> Connecticut SAT School Day PowerPoint  <b>Evidence #2.1.5:</b> SAT Alignment E-mail Invite Message  <input type="checkbox"/> This e-mail invite was sent to educators from a cross section of Connecticut School Districts to participate in an independent alignment study of the Connecticut SAT School Day and the Connecticut Core Standards in Mathematics and ELA. SAT  <b>Evidence #2.1.6:</b> List of Participants in Connecticut SAT School Day Alignment Study Day Alignment Study Report  <b>Evidence #2.1.7:</b> Connecticut SAT School Day Alignment Study  <b>Evidence #2.1.8:</b> College Board Independent Alignment Study</p>	<p>Note: See the SAT Consortium peer review notes for additional information.</p> <p>2.1.3 gives parents the purpose of the SAT School Day Assessment. There was no additional information submitted related to the purposes of the assessment, including interpretation and use of results.</p> <p>Both alignment studies indicate that there are alignment issues between the CT academic content standards and the SAT School Day. There was no plan submitted to address this issue. In addition, the alignment study (2.1.7) is a one-way alignment (page 6). The State needs to conduct an independent alignment study that show the extent to which the CT Core Standards are related to the SAT School Day, identifying any gaps of standards that may not be assessed.</p> <p>The evidence focuses on test taking, including accommodations, and alignment.</p> <p>Reviewers assume that the blueprints are part of the review by the consortium.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<b>See 2017 NSC and 2018 Smarter Balanced peer review notes</b>		
<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed by the State for the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An explanation of the purposes of the SAT assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results in Connecticut’s accountability system.</li> <li>• An independent alignment study to show the extent to which the CT Core Standards are related to the SAT School Day, identifying any gaps of standards that may not be assessed (from the standards to the test; the evidence provided was a one-way study from the test to the standards only.).</li> <li>• A plan and a timeline to address the alignment issues identified in 2.1.7 and 2.1.8 for the SAT School Day.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></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><b>SB</b>                      Connecticut adheres to the additional evidence provided in the unified submission by the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium to satisfy the additional information requested in this section.</p> <p>Connecticut adheres to the evidence provided in the unified submission by the College Board for the Connecticut SAT School Day.</p> <p><b>SAT Connecticut Specific Evidence</b>                      The CSDE conducted an independent content validation study for the SAT in January 2016.  <b>Evidence #2.1.5:</b> SAT Alignment E-mail Invite Message  <b>Evidence #2.1.6:</b> List of Participants in Connecticut SAT School Day Alignment Study  <b>Evidence #2.1.7:</b> Connecticut SAT School Day Alignment Study Report (page 32)  <b>Evidence #2.1.8:</b> College Board Independent Alignment Study (page 1)  <b>Evidence #2.2.1:</b> E-mail Invite for SAT Standard Setting Message  <b>Evidence #2.2.2:</b> List of Connecticut Participants for SAT Standard Setting  <b>Evidence #2.2.3:</b> SAT Multi-State Standard Setting Report</p>	<p>Peers observed that 2.1.6: List of Participants in Connecticut SAT School Day Alignment Study needs to include demographic information, including school district, role, and areas of expertise.</p> <p>Connecticut should refer to the SAT Consortium submission.</p> <p>Since Connecticut does not develop items for the SAT, there is no evidence for Connecticut to submit for this critical element.</p>
<p><b>See 2017 NSC and 2018 Smarter Balanced peer review notes Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> No additional evidence is required from the State for the SAT.</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 Connecticut**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p>The additional evidence <b>NCSC - 2.3 – additional - Contingency Procedures in the Test Delivery System</b> provides a more comprehensive explanation of contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during the test administration.</p> <p>The additional evidence <b>NCSC - 2.3 – additional - CTAA Test Administration Manual 2015-2016</b> provides descriptions regarding the access of the sample items in the practice test on pages 8, 10, 12, and 14. Optimal testing conditions related to accessibility begin on page 14, and reviews the importance of providing students an appropriate testing environment including accessibility features and accommodations.</p> <p>The additional evidence provided in the <b>NCSC - 2.3 – additional - CTAA System User Guide</b> describes procedures and reminders related to the practice site on pages 3, 4, 21, 34, and 56. NCSC Connecticut adheres to the additional evidence provided in the unified submission by the NCSC/MSAA Consortium to satisfy the additional information requested in this section.</p> <p>The <b>SB - 2.3 – additional - Contingency Procedures in the Test Delivery System</b> evidence provides a more comprehensive explanation of contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during the test administration. SB</p> <p>Connecticut adheres to the evidence provided in the unified submission by the College Board for the Connecticut SAT School Day.</p>	<p>The state has provided sufficient evidence for this critical element for Connecticut SAT School Day and has also provided the evidence for NCSC and SB as requested from the prior review. No additional evidence is required.</p> <p><b>CTAA - NCSC - 2.3 – additional - Contingency Procedures in the Test Delivery System</b>, pg. 1, paragraph 8, “Every time a student answers a question, the response is saved to AIR Servers.” Implies a piece of a contingency plan, and the explanation is expanded in the next paragraph. The “Disaster Prevention and Recovery” section on page 2 expands the description of the backup system.</p> <p><b>NCSC - 2.3 – additional - CTAA Test Administration Manual 2015-2016</b> seems to cover concerns about consistency of administration across schools and districts. The “Trouble Shooting” section (beginning on page 48) further explains how to deal with testing irregularities in the CTAA and provides evidence of student access to practice testing before the operational test administration of the alternate.</p> <p><b>SB - 2.3 – additional - Contingency Procedures in the Test Delivery System</b> describes the AIR system with the applicable “Disaster Prevention and Recovery” section.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>Connecticut Specific Evidence</b></p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.1:</b> 2017 CT SAT School Day Supervisor Manual</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.2:</b> 2017 CT SAT School Day Testing Room Manual</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3:</b> 2017 Connecticut SAT School Day Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD) Coordinator Manual</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2:</b> FAQ for Schools and Districts · This FAQ provides answers to common questions from schools and districts about the Connecticut SAT School Day. SAT</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.3:</b> FAQ for Parents</p> <p><b>Evidence #1.3.2:</b> SAT Webpage</p> <p><b>Evidence #1.4.1:</b> Assessment Guidelines</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1:</b> PowerPoint Presentation</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.4:</b> Test Center Supervisor Workshop Presentation</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.5:</b> Invitation to Test Center Supervisor Workshops in Student Assessment News 12-4-17</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.6:</b> Example of the Student Assessment News</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.7:</b> Connecticut SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Online Training</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.8:</b> Online Test Center Supervisor Online Training Report</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.9:</b> Online Supervisors Website Manual · <b>Evidence #2.3.10:</b> Transfer Scenarios and Guidance</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.11:</b> SAT School Day Test Parent Letter</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.12:</b> E-mail Invite for Test Administration Procedures Committee (TAPC) Message</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 Connecticut**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>Evidence #2.3.13:</b> Summary of the meeting of the Connecticut SAT School Day Test Administration Procedures Committee Day Survey</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.15:</b> Connecticut SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Survey Report</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.16:</b> Connecticut SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Log</p>	
<p><b>from 2016 review</b></p> <p>Evidence that CSDE established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the NCSC/MSAA assessments that include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a troubleshooting guide to address technology-related contingency plans.</li> <li>• Evidence of policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing.</li> <li>• Evidence of training to ensure consistency of administration across districts and schools.</li> </ul> <p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), CSDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a comprehensive contingency plan to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></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 Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p><b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p><b>Connecticut adheres to the evidence provided in the unified submission by the College Board for the Connecticut SAT School Day.</b></p> <p><b>Connecticut Specific Evidence.</b>  <b>Evidence #2.3.1:</b> 2017 Connecticut SAT School Day Supervisor Manual</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This manual is the test supervisor’s manual that was customized for Connecticut.</li> <li>• Pages 15-25: This section titled Maintaining Test Security, articulates the procedures to manage irregularities and test security incidences.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.4.1:</b> CSDE Database for Irregularities Snapshot</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The <i>Irregularities Log</i> is used by CSDE Assessment staff to document irregularities that schools are required to phone in. This snapshot is a screenshot of our system that was used to note phone calls for Connecticut SAT School Day.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.4.2:</b> Connecticut SAT School Day Guide to Handling Testing Administration Irregularities</p> <p>□ This document is used by CSDE Assessment staff for information on handling irregularities during the administration of the Connecticut SAT School Day.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.4.3:</b> CT College Board Account Manager cases 2016-17</p>	<p>Met in 2016 for SBAC and NCSC.</p> <p>For SAT: The evidence provided by Connecticut demonstrates administration guidelines and procedures to manage irregularities and test security incidences. Not provided, however, is any process for systemic monitoring to ensure that procedures are implemented with fidelity.</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 Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> This is a call log of phone calls made to the Connecticut Hotline prior to the test administration. It provides general information of the type of calls that were received.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.4.4:</b> Connecticut SAT School Day April 5 Test Irregularity Report  <input type="checkbox"/> This is a report of irregularities noted on the April 5, 2017, administration of the Connecticut SAT School Day. It outlines details of the issue and actions that have been taken.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.4.5:</b> State Contract Implementations Customer Service Training January 2017  <input type="checkbox"/> This is a training delivered to College Board customer support about states implementing the SAT.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.4.6:</b> Connecticut Customer Service FAQs  <input type="checkbox"/> This is a FAQ for the College Board customer support that has answers specific to the administration of the Connecticut SAT School Day.</p>	
<b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the SAT Day, evidence of how the State monitors administration to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></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"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>SAT</b>  <b>Connecticut adheres to the evidence provided in the unified submission by the College Board for the Connecticut SAT School Day.</b></p> <p><b>Connecticut Specific Evidence</b>  <b>Evidence #2.3.1:</b> 2017 Connecticut SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (pages 18-25, test irregularities)  <b>Evidence #2.3.4:</b> Test Center Supervisor Workshop Presentation  <b>Evidence #2.4.1:</b> CSDE Database for Irregularities Snapshot  <b>Evidence #2.4.2:</b> Connecticut SAT School Day Guide to Handling Testing Administration Irregularities  <b>Evidence #2.4.3:</b> CT College Board Account Manager Cases 2016-17  <b>Evidence #2.4.4:</b> Connecticut SAT School Day April 5 Test Irregularity Report  <b>Evidence #2.4.5:</b> State Contract Implementations Customer Service Training January 2017  <b>2.4.6:</b> Connecticut Customer Service FAQs</p> <p><b>NCSC Evidence:</b>  <b>NCSC - 2.3 – additional - CTAA Test Administration Manual 2015-2016</b> in section III about Testing Integrity, Appropriate and Inappropriate Test Practices. Beginning on page 21, there is guidance provided regarding Connecticut’s Test security policy, secure handling of test materials, and preparing a secure test environment. Examples of testing improprieties are provided, as well as reporting procedures and consequences.</p> <p><b>The additional evidence NCSC - 2.5 – additional</b></p>	<p>Peers were unable to locate evidence of a monitoring process that is in place to ensure that appropriate security procedures are followed. (see 2.4)</p> <p>Evidence #2.4.4: Connecticut SAT School Day Test Irregularity Report documents individual test taking irregularities, but does not indicate follow-up procedures, any remediation that may be required, and an investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</p> <p>Peers did not find evidence related to training requirements for test security policies and procedures for Connecticut educators for all assessments.</p> <p>The State did provide some evidence of follow-up on testing irregularities, but more comprehensive evidence would be helpful (e.g., follow-up on irregularities noted in 2.4.4)</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 Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>- <b>The Connecticut Code of Professional Responsibility for School Administrators</b> and <b>NCSC - 2.5 – additional - The Connecticut Code of Professional Responsibility for Teachers</b> describe expectations for professional ethical behaviors of administrators and teachers.</p> <p><b>The additional evidence NCSC - 2.5 – additional - The Update on State Testing Legal Actions November 2017</b> is an internal memorandum describing the status of current legal cases related to assessment investigations. Connecticut adheres to the additional evidence provided in the unified submission by the NCSC/MSAA Consortium to satisfy the additional information requested in this section.</p> <p><b>SB Evidence</b> The CSDE believes that it has already submitted adequate evidence on these points. In particular, please see the following evidence previously submitted by the CSDE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See page 24 of <b>SB - 2.3.2 – From Original Submission</b> for information about preventing and detecting test irregularities.</li> <li>- See page 24 of <b>SB - 2.3.2 – From Original Submission</b> for information about consequences related to test irregularities.</li> <li>- See page 31 of <b>SB - 2.3.2 – From Original Submission</b> for information about remediation protocols after any test security issues.</li> <li>- See also pages 14 – 16 of <b>SB - 2.3.7 – From Original Submission</b> for training that is required of test coordinators to limit test security issues.</li> </ul> <p>Additionally, to further enhance test security and prevent irregularities, the CSDE implemented</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 Connecticut

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>additional procedures and protocols during the 2016 - 17 and 2017 - 18 test administration. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Students who require accommodations now must be indicated in the Test Delivery System as Special Education or Disabled Under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act. Students who are not indicated as one of the two, will not be eligible to receive accommodations. See page 4 of the <b>SB - 2.5 additional - March 9 Student Assessment News</b> for communication about this policy to districts. This enhancement will help to prevent irregularities by not allowing students who are not eligible to receive accommodations to receive them.</li> <li>- <i>Item Security</i> – The American Institutes for Research (AIR) designed a new tool on the test delivery system that can detect the source of an image when a photo is taken of an item. All items contain a multicolored “banner” that contains information, when decoded, about the specific student assigned to that item and resulting related information. An image of a sample item with the associated banner can be found on <b>SB - 2.5 – additional -New Item Security Evidence</b> for this new enhancement. This tool will help to detect future irregularities by sensing this important information if items are circulated.</li> <li>- <i>Additional Appeals</i> – In order to prevent and detect any irregularities, additional “appeals” were created in the Test Information Distribution Delivery Engine (TIDE) appeals system to prevent districts from incorrectly accessing tests. For example, one of the new appeals is “Reopen a Test Segment” that allows users to open only the test segment of a test and not the whole test. Examples of all the appeals now are presented on Page 28 of</li> </ul>	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>the <b>SB - 2.5 – additional - 2017 Test Coordinators Presentation</b>.</p> <p>- <i>Parent Visit Procedures</i> – Occasionally, the CSDE has had requests for parental visits to view their child’s test, as well as responses. The CSDE has revised the <b>SB - 2.5 – additional - Parental Visit Procedures</b> and documented them so when a request is made, there is a uniform response to the request. These procedures were revised and improved this past year. These improved procedures help to avoid security issues when parental visits are requested.</p> <p>- <i>Update on State Testing Legal Actions November 2017</i> – Please see the <b>SB - 2.5 – additional - Update on State Testing Legal Actions November 2017</b> letter that describes current legal actions that are being pursued related to several test irregularities.</p>	
<p><b>from 2016 review</b></p> <p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced) AND for R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAAS (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and high school, CSDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Prevention of any assessment irregularities,</li> <li>o Detection of test irregularities, and</li> <li>o Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the assessments,</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence of consequences in the State for confirmed violations of test security.</li> <li>• Evidence of annual training requirements for test security policies and procedures for Connecticut educators.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments.</li> <li>• Evidence of investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities, regarding document 2.4.4.</li> <li>• Evidence of annual training requirements for test security policies and procedures for Connecticut educators for all assessments.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b></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"> <li>• To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results;</li> <li>• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p>Connecticut adheres to the evidence provided in the unified submission by the College Board for the Connecticut SAT School Day.</p> <p><b>Connecticut Specific Evidence</b>  <b>Evidence #2.6.1:</b> CSDE Data Suppression Rules          · These rules have been vetted by representatives of the US Department of Education (USDE) and the Privacy Technical Assistance Center within the USDE. These rules are applied by CSDE when publicly reporting all data including assessment data.  <b>Evidence #2.6.2:</b> CSDE Data Protection and Privacy FAQ  <b>Evidence #2.6.3:</b> CSDE/College Board Contract          · Page 14: See this page for explanation of the security aspects of the College Board systems.          · Page 16: On this page there is an explanation of the procedures for test irregularities and breaches.          · Page 25: Beginning on this page are detailed provisions for the protection of confidential information.  <b>Evidence #2.6.4:</b> Data Collections Guide for the Public School Information System</p>	<p>Evidence presented for Connecticut SAT School Day meets the requirements of this critical element.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></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"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC Evidence:</b> Connecticut adheres to the additional evidence provided in the unified submission by the NCSC/MSAA Consortium to satisfy the additional information requested in this section.</p> <p><b>SB</b> The CSDE does not include off grade level content in standard assessments.</p> <p>Connecticut adheres to the additional evidence provided in the unified submission by the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium to satisfy the additional information requested in this section.</p> <p><b>SAT</b> Connecticut adheres to the evidence provided in the unified submission by the College Board for the Connecticut SAT School Day.</p>	<p><b>N/A – not reviewed</b></p>
<p><b>(note: 2016 reviews for smarter balanced and msaa had consortium evidence requested for this critical element-consortium panels will review)</b> <b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>See SAT review notes</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 Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></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><b>NCSC</b> Connecticut adheres to the additional evidence provided in the unified submission by the NCSC/MSAA Consortium to satisfy the additional information requested in this section.</p> <p><b>SAT</b> Connecticut adheres to the evidence provided in the unified submission by the College Board for the Connecticut SAT School Day.</p>	<p><b>N/A – not reviewed</b></p>
<p><b>(note: 2016 reviews for msaa had consortium evidence requested for this critical element-consortium panel will review)</b></p>		
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></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 Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></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><b>NCSC Evidence:</b>                      In additional evidence NCSC - <b>3.3 – additional - CTAA Sp16 Technical Report</b> in Section 5.4 - Dimensionality, the results presented for the dimensionality analyses of the 2016 Connecticut Alternate Assessment (CTAA) indicates the assessment for each grade and in each subject measures one dominant construct. This confirms the unidimensionality assumption used for this assessment.                      Connecticut adheres to the additional evidence provided in the unified submission by the NCSC/MSAA Consortium to satisfy the additional information requested in this section.</p> <p><b>SAT:</b>                      Connecticut adheres to the evidence provided in the unified submission by the College Board for the Connecticut SAT School Day.</p>	<p>Additional evidence for 3.3 of NCSC was not requested. However, the evidence does address the dimensionality question.</p>
<p><b>(note: 2016 reviews for msaa had consortium evidence requested for this critical element-consortium panel will review)</b></p>		
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></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 Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<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><b>NCSC:</b> Connecticut adheres to the additional evidence provided in the unified submission by the NCSC/MSAA Consortium to satisfy the additional information requested in this section.</p> <p><b>SAT</b> Connecticut adheres to the evidence provided in the unified submission by the College Board for the Connecticut SAT School Day.</p>	<p>N/A – not reviewed</p>
<p><b>(note: 2016 reviews for msaa had consortium evidence requested for this critical element-consortium panel will review)</b></p>		
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>x<u>  </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 Connecticut**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC</b> Connecticut adheres to the additional evidence provided in the unified submission by the NCSC/MSAA Consortium to satisfy the additional information requested in this section.</p> <p><b>SAT</b> Connecticut adheres to the evidence provided in the unified submission by the College Board for the Connecticut SAT School Day.</p>	<p><b>N/A – not reviewed</b></p>
<p><b>(note: 2016 reviews for msaa had consortium evidence requested for this critical element-consortium panel will review)</b></p>		
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></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 Connecticut**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b></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><b>SB</b> Connecticut adheres to the additional evidence provided in the unified submission by the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium to satisfy the additional information requested in this section.</p> <p><b>SAT</b> Connecticut adheres to the evidence provided in the unified submission by the College Board for the Connecticut SAT School Day.</p>	<p><b>N/A – not reviewed</b></p>
<p><b>(note: 2016 reviews for smarter balanced had consortium evidence requested for this critical element-consortium panel will review)</b></p>		
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></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 Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></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><b>NCSC</b> Connecticut adheres to the additional evidence provided in the unified submission by the NCSC/MSAA Consortium to satisfy the additional information requested in this section.</p> <p><b>SB</b> Connecticut adheres to the additional evidence provided in the unified submission by the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium to satisfy the additional information requested in this section.</p> <p><b>SAT</b> Connecticut adheres to the evidence provided in the unified submission by the College Board for the Connecticut SAT School Day.</p>	<p><b>N/A – not reviewed</b></p>
<p><b>(note: 2016 reviews for smarter balanced and msaa had consortium evidence requested for this critical element-consortium panels will review)</b></p>		
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></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 Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></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><b>NCSC</b> Connecticut adheres to the additional evidence provided in the unified submission by the NCSC/MSAA Consortium to satisfy the additional information requested in this section. NCSC</p> <p><b>SB</b> Connecticut adheres to the additional evidence provided in the unified submission by the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium to satisfy the additional information requested in this section.</p> <p><b>SAT</b> Connecticut adheres to the evidence provided in the unified submission by the College Board for the Connecticut SAT School Day.</p>	<p>N/A – not reviewed</p>
<p><b>(note: 2016 reviews for smarter balanced and msaa had consortium evidence requested for this critical element-consortium panels will review)</b></p>		
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>_x_ No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b></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><b>NCSC</b> Connecticut adheres to the additional evidence provided in the unified submission by the NCSC/MSAA Consortium to satisfy the additional information requested in this section.</p> <p><b>SAT</b> Connecticut adheres to the evidence provided in the unified submission by the College Board for the Connecticut SAT School Day.</p>	<p><b>N/A – not reviewed</b></p>
<p><b>(note: 2016 reviews for msaa had consortium evidence requested for this critical element-consortium panel will review)</b></p>		
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></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 Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<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"> <li>• Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>• Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC</b> Connecticut adheres to the additional evidence provided in the unified submission by the NCSC/MSAA Consortium to satisfy the additional information requested in this section.</p> <p><b>SB</b> Connecticut adheres to the additional evidence provided in the unified submission by the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium to satisfy the additional information requested in this section.</p> <p><b>SAT</b> Connecticut adheres to the evidence provided in the unified submission by the College Board for the Connecticut SAT School Day.</p>	<p>N/A – not reviewed</p>
<p><b>(note: 2016 reviews for smarter balanced and msaa had consortium evidence requested for this critical element-consortium panels will review)</b></p>		
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></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 Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></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><b>NCSC Evidence</b>                      Connecticut adheres to the additional evidence provided in the unified submission by the NCSC/MSAA Consortium to satisfy the additional information requested in this section.                      Starting from the 2016 operational test, CSDE worked with the test vendor to conduct “Item parameter stability checking” to compare the item statistics with those provided by NCSC. Details of this analysis can be found in Section 2.5.4 and 2.5.5 of <b>NCSC - 3.3 – additional - CTAA Sp16 Technical Report</b>. This process evaluates items for scoring, evaluates if the current forms are parallel to those in the previous year, and also monitors if any items need further improvement. NCSC</p> <p><b>SAT</b>                      Connecticut adheres to the evidence provided in the unified submission by the College Board for the Connecticut SAT School Day.</p> <p><b>Connecticut Specific Evidence</b>  <b>Evidence #4.7.1:</b> Technical Advisory Committee Membership  <b>Evidence #4.7.2:</b> TAC Meeting 2015 Dec Agenda  <b>Evidence #4.7.3:</b> TAC Meeting 2016 June Agenda  <b>Evidence #4.7.4:</b> TAC Meeting 2016 Dec Agenda  <b>Evidence #4.7.5:</b> Technical Advisory Committee Meeting 2017 November Agenda</p>	<p>While the TAC agendas demonstrate the kinds of topics and discussions that the state is having with its advisors, in and of themselves the agendas do not provide evidence of a system of monitoring and improving their assessment system.</p>
<p><b>(note: 2016 reviews for msaa had consortium evidence requested for this critical element-consortium panel will review)</b></p>		
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut

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><b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b></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"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC Evidence:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CSDE continues to provide resources, training and guidance to ensure all students are participating in the most appropriate assessments. <b>NCSC - 5.1 – additional – Frequently Asked Questions and Answers about the Connecticut Alternate Assessment System</b> was created to provide educators and families with information about Connecticut’s Alternate Assessment system eligibility and the intent of the alternate assessments. The additional evidence in the <b>NCSC - 5.1 – additional - Connecticut Alternate Assessment System Participation Guidance for Planning and Placement Teams</b> was developed by the Performance Office in collaboration with the Bureau of Special Education to provide guidance to planning and placement teams (PPT) to prepare for assessment discussions.</li> <li>• The required test administration training described in the <b>NCSC - 5.1 – additional - 2015-16_sb_ctaa_cmt_capt_training_letter</b>, the <b>NCSC - 5.1 – additional - Learner Characteristics Inventory</b>, and the <b>NCSC - 5.1 – additional - Guidance About Students Who Qualify For The Connecticut Alternate Assessment Early Stopping Rule</b> create opportunities to engage with teachers providing assurance that students have access to the general education curriculum and are participating in the appropriate assessments.</li> <li>• The <b>NCSC - 5.1 – additional - June 1, 2017 memo with counts for Participation in Alternate Assessments</b>, the <b>NCSC - 5.1</b></li> </ul>	<p>The documents presented do not directly present evidence germane to this critical element</p> <p>For SB and NCSC, peers were unable to locate evidence that directly addressed the issues that had been identified in the previous peer review.</p> <p>The evidence for SAT is only indirect. CT has not provided clear policy statements and guidelines as evidence for this critical element.</p> <p>Connecticut must provide evidence of the State’s process for ensuring that students with disabilities are included in the SAT with clear guidelines for accommodations.</p> <p>Peers could not find evidence of communication to parents of the implications for students who take the alternate assessment.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>disabilities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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;</li> <li>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);</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<p><b>additional – November 27, 2017 Memo Connecticut Alternate Assessments- Participation Requirements, the NCSC - 5.1 – additional - Alternate Assessment Counts! Training description, the NCSC - 5.1 – additional</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Alternate Assessment Counts! Training session 2, and the NCSC - 5.1 – additional - 2017-18 Assessment Guidelines</b> (pages 10-13 and page 30), provide guidance for educators about supporting students who participate in Alternate Assessments.</li> <li><b>NCSC - 5.1 – additional - CTAA Parent Overview</b> provides guidance for parents and ideas for practice for students.</li> </ul> <p><b>Connecticut adheres to the evidence provided in the unified submission by the College Board for the Connecticut SAT School Day.</b></p> <p><b>Connecticut Specific Evidence</b>  <b>Evidence #1.4.1:</b> Assessment Guidelines  <b>Evidence #1.4.2:</b> Connecticut State Department of Education IEP Manual and Forms  <b>Evidence #1.4.4:</b> Connecticut Alternate Assessment (CTAA) Webpage  <b>Evidence #5.1.1:</b> The IEP Guide Page-by-Page  <b>Evidence #5.1.2:</b> Connecticut State Department of Education Focused Monitoring  <b>Evidence #2.1.1:</b> PowerPoint Presentation  <b>Evidence #5.1.3:</b> 2017-18 Accommodations and Alternate Assessment System Training Letter 8-9-17</p>	
<b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of the State’s process for ensuring that students with disabilities are included in the SAT with clear guidelines for accommodations.</li> <li>Evidence of communication to parents of the implications for a student taking the alternate assessment.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<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"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC Evidence:</b> Eligibility for the NCSC alternate assessment is based on disability status and a comprehensive local review of learner characteristics, and not based solely on EL status. The NCSC alternate assessment is specifically designed for students with significant cognitive disabilities. The eligibility requirements and accommodations available to NCSC participants were already submitted with our original submission (see evidence <b>NCSC - 1.4.1 – From Original Submission and 1.4.9 – From Original Submission</b>). All accommodations on the NCSC are available to all eligible participants, including ELs who are also identified as special education students.</p> <p><b>SB Evidence:</b> Subsequent to Connecticut’s peer review submission, the CSDE revised its guidance for districts around the selection of the Spanish version of the Smarter Balanced Mathematics assessment based on guidance received from Smarter Balanced. This language is contained on page 23 of the <b>SB - 5.2 – additional - Assessment Guidelines for 2016-17</b>. Additionally, in <b>SB - 5.1.3 – From Original Submission</b> developed by the CSDE, this resource provides an overview of allowable accommodations and designated supports (both embedded and non-embedded) available on the Smarter Balanced summative assessments for mathematics and English language arts (ELA). This includes Designated Supports available to ELs who may require language supports, including a Spanish version of the mathematics assessment. In this resource, a recommendation is made to conduct a meeting with parents of EL students to discuss any language supports needed.</p> <p>Connecticut adheres to the additional evidence provided in the unified submission by the Smarter</p>	<p>The documents presented do not directly present evidence germane to this critical element.</p> <p>The SB and NCSC evidence submitted did not appear to directly address the issues that had been identified in the previous peer review.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>Balanced Assessment Consortium to satisfy the additional information requested in this section.  <b>Connecticut adheres to the evidence provided in the unified submission by the College Board for the Connecticut SAT School Day.</b>  <b>Connecticut Specific Evidence</b>  <b>Evidence #1.4.1:</b> Assessment Guidelines  <b>Evidence #1.4.4:</b> Connecticut Alternate Assessment (CTAA) Webpage  <b>Evidence #1.4.10:</b> New Flexibility for English Learners District Test Coordinator and Administrator Information  <b>Evidence #1.4.11:</b> New Flexibility for English Learners Information for Teachers  <b>Evidence #1.4.6:</b> Connecticut SAT School Day Translated Directions  <b>Evidence#1.4.9:</b> Connecticut (CT) English Learner Exit Criteria Grades K-12</p>	
<p><b>from 2016 review</b>            For the R/LA and mathematics alternate assessments based on AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (NCSC/MSAA), CSDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the NCSC/MSAA provides test-taking accommodations for those students taking the NCSC that are English learners.</li> <li>• For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), CSDE must provide: Evidence of guidance regarding selection of the Spanish version of the Smarter Balanced assessments for English learners, and evidence of procedures for communication of this guidance to districts, schools, teachers and parents.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the NCSC/MSAA provides test-taking accommodations for those students taking the NCSC that are English learners.</li> <li>• For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), CSDE must provide: Evidence of guidance regarding selection of the Spanish version of the Smarter Balanced assessments for English learners, and evidence of procedures for communication of this guidance to districts, schools, teachers and parents.</li> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s) for the SAT.</li> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners for the SAT.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut

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"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC Evidence:</b>  Eligibility for the NCSC alternate assessment is based on disability status and a comprehensive local review of learner characteristics, and not based solely on EL status. The NCSC alternate assessment is specifically designed for students with significant cognitive disabilities. The eligibility requirements and accommodations available to NCSC participants were already submitted with our original submission (see evidence <b>NCSC - 1.4.1 – From Original Submission</b> and <b>NCSC - 1.4.9 – From Original Submission</b>). All accommodations on the NCSC are available to all eligible participants, including ELs</p> <p>See Page 41 of the <b>NCSC - 5.1 – additional - 2017-18 Assessment Guidelines</b> for information about students who may need to request a special accommodation beyond those routinely provided.</p> <p><b>Connecticut adheres to the evidence provided in the unified submission by the College Board for the Connecticut SAT School Day.</b></p> <p><b>Connecticut Specific Evidence</b>  <b>Evidence #1.4.1:</b> Assessment Guidelines  <b>Evidence #2.1.1:</b> PowerPoint Presentation  <b>Evidence #1.4.7:</b> College Board-Approved Word-to-Word Glossaries for the SAT Suite of Assessments  · This document lists the permitted word-to-word glossaries for EL students for the Connecticut SAT School Day.  <b>Evidence #5.3.1:</b> Special Accommodation Process  · This document outlines the process for districts to</p>	<p>Peers were not able to locate evidence for all assessments, that the accommodations provided (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</p> <p>Evidence addressing the issues identified in the 2016 review on NCSC was not located.</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 Connecticut**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	apply for special accommodations that may be required in some cases for some students.	
<p><b>from 2016 review</b>                      For the NCSC/MSAA, CSDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the accommodations provided (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.</li> <li>• Evidence that appropriate accommodations for English learners are available.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For all assessments, that the accommodations provided (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.</li> </ul>		

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></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"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC Evidence:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CSDE continues to implement and refine its protocols for monitoring the administration of the alternate assessment. The CSDE actively engages with districts regarding administration of the alternate assessments. On September 7, 2017, Connecticut conducted a meeting of our Alternate Assessment Advisory Workgroup as evidenced in the <b>NCSC - 5.4 – additional - Final Internal Agenda Alternate Assessment Advisory Workgroup</b> to gather feedback about the assessment and processes. The <b>NCSC - 5.1 – additional - June 1, 2017 memo with counts for Participation in Alternate Assessments</b> and the <b>NCSC - 5.1 – additional - November 27, 2017 Memo Connecticut Alternate Assessments- Participation Requirements</b> clarify the monitoring processes and expectations for districts. <b>NCSC - 5.1 – additional - Alternate Assessment Counts! Training description</b> and the <b>NCSC - 5.1 – additional - Alternate Assessment Counts! Training session 2</b> articulate continuing efforts to appropriately identify and provide supports for examining district and individual student data, to review actual IEPs and to educate teachers and administrators about alternate assessments, accommodations and enhancing communication for students with significant cognitive disabilities. These communications and training sessions, combined with the changes in procedures for the Learner Characteristics submissions, and adjustments in the Desk Audit procedures, will facilitate monitoring of the Alternate Assessments.</li> </ul>	<p>The State provided numerous pieces of evidence, including State policies, for this critical element, but no evidence of monitoring by the State was found in the submission.</p> <p>Evidence 5.1.2 included some references to monitoring, but the evidence was outdated and insufficient. Some suggested pieces of evidence might include a monitoring form and a monitoring report to document monitoring efforts in the districts.</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 Connecticut**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connecticut’s Alternate Assessments require eligible students to have an active Individualized Education Program. If they are dually identified as an English Learner they may participate in the Alternate Assessment when they meet eligibility criteria. Students with a section 504 plan may participate if they also have an active IEP. This eligibility criteria is included in the <b>NCSC - 5.1 – additional - Learner Characteristics Inventory</b> and described in <b>NCSC - 5.1 – additional 2017-18 Assessment Guidelines</b> (page 30 Section F).</li> <li>• As described in <b>NCSC - 5.4 – additional - CTAA Test Administration Manual 2017 - 18</b> (Optimal Testing Conditions pages 16-22), the Connecticut Alternate Assessment provides embedded and non-embedded accessibility features to all participants including Text-to-Speech or Read Aloud because these are components of the test design. The Connecticut Alternate Assessment Test Administration manual describes accommodations included in the students Individualized Education Program that should be provided to create an optimal testing environment.</li> </ul> <p><b>SB Evidence:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CSDE also offers yearly workshops both live and online on selecting appropriate accommodations. This was included in our original submission as evidence <b>SB - 5.1.3 – From Original Submission</b>. The CSDE maintains an appeals system during testing to address any irregularities with testing, which includes whether accommodations were appropriately given. This was included in our</li> </ul>	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>original submission as evidence <b>SB - 2.3.1 – From Original Submission</b> (page 29).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subsequent to Connecticut’s peer review submission, the CSDE developed and disseminated the <b>SB - 5.4 – additional - Text-to-Speech and Read Aloud Decision Guidelines 2015-2016 Form</b>. The CSDE collects these data electronically and monitors the selection and use of this accommodation. Additionally, the CSDE records all accommodations used during assessment using the <b>SB - 5.4 – additional - 2017-2018 Testing Designated Supports Accommodation form</b>. This is recorded at the school level through their IEP/Section 504 system and transferred to the CSDE through an online submission. The use of accommodation during testing and during instruction is captured on <b>SB - 5.4 – additional - Page 8 of the Individualized Education Plan</b>. SB</li> <li>• Additionally, to further enhance monitoring, the CSDE implemented the following procedure during the 2016 - 17 and 2017 - 18 test administration. Students who require accommodations now must be indicated in the Test Delivery System as Special Education or Disabled Under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act. Students who are not indicated as one of the two, will not be eligible to receive accommodations. See page 4 of the <b>SB - 2.5 additional - March 9 Student Assessment News</b> for communication about this policy to districts. SB</li> </ul> <p><b>Connecticut adheres to the evidence provided in the unified submission by the College Board for</b></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 Connecticut**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>the Connecticut SAT School Day.</b></p> <p><b>Connecticut Specific Evidence SAT</b>  <b>Evidence #1.4.1:</b> Assessment Guidelines  <b>Evidence #1.4.10:</b> New Flexibility for English Learners District Test Coordinator and Administrator Information  <b>Evidence #1.4.11:</b> New Flexibility for English Learners Information for Teachers  <b>Evidence #5.1.1:</b> The IEP Guide Page-by-Page  <b>Evidence #5.4.1:</b> Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) Planning and Placement Team (PPT) and Individualized Education Program (IEP) Forms Webpage  <b>Evidence #5.4.2:</b> Language and Communication Plan and  <b>Evidence #5.4.3:</b> Annotated Language and Communication Plan  <b>Evidence #5.4.4:</b> Language and Communication Plan FAQs  <b>Evidence #5.4.5:</b> Letter Re Public Act 12-173  <b>Evidence #5.4.6:</b> Parents Guide to Special Education in Connecticut and  <b>Evidence #5.4.7:</b> Parents Guide to Special Education in Connecticut [Spanish]  <b>Evidence #5.4.8:</b> Least Restrictive Environment  <b>Evidence #5.4.9:</b> PPT 101  <b>Evidence #5.4.10:</b> PPT Process  <b>Evidence #5.4.11:</b> PPT Checklist  <b>Evidence #5.4.12:</b> A Seven-Step Process to Creating Standards-based IEPs  <b>Evidence #5.4.13:</b> Web Modules Writing Standards-based IEP Goals and Objectives</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 Connecticut**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>from 2016 review</b>		
State was asked to provide evidence to address this entire critical element for the smarter balanced and msaa tests		
<b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To address this entire critical element for all assessments.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut**

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b></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"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p><b>SB Evidence:</b> Connecticut formally adopted the Smarter Balanced academic achievement standards when the Commissioner voted, as part of the Consortium vote on November 14, 2014, to approve the achievement levels cut scores and the standards on which those cut scores were based. The <b>SB - 6.1 – additional - Press Release from November 17, 2014</b>, is presented as additional evidence. SB</p> <p><b>Connecticut Specific Evidence</b>  <b>Evidence #1.1.11:</b> Connecticut (CT) State Board of Education Meeting Minutes: July 7, 2010  <b>Evidence #2.1.5:</b> SAT Alignment E-mail Invite Message  <b>Evidence #2.1.6:</b> List of Participants in Connecticut SAT School Day Alignment Study Report  <b>Evidence #2.1.8:</b> College Board Independent Alignment Study  <b>Evidence #2.2.1:</b> E-mail Invite for SAT Standard Setting Message          · State Standard Setting held in June 2016.  <b>Evidence #2.2.2:</b> List of Connecticut Participants for SAT Standard Setting  <b>Evidence #2.2.3:</b> SAT Multi-State Standard Setting Report  <b>Evidence #6.1.1:</b> Report Notes for CT School Day SAT on EdSight  <b>Evidence #6.1.2:</b> Connecticut SAT School Day Reporting-Level Descriptors  <b>Evidence #4.7.3:</b> TAC Meeting 2016 June Agenda          · This document shows the resources and questions</p>	<p>Evidence 4.7.3 - while the TAC may have engaged in discussion about the academic achievement standards, the document does not indicate anything about adoption. Evidence of adoption of the academic achievement standards needs to be submitted (e.g., State Board Minutes).</p> <p>For SB, the press release (SB 6.1 additional) indicates that the academic achievement standards were adopted by the consortium. No evidence regarding adoption by Connecticut is presented. It seems that the state would need to take some action to indicate approval of the SB standards for use in the state.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	discussed at the June 2016 Technical Advisory Committee meeting. There was discussion about adopting academic achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics.	
<b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adoption of the academic achievement standards for Smarter Balance and SAT by the State.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b></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><b>Connecticut Specific Evidence</b>  <b>Evidence #1.1.11:</b> Connecticut (CT) State Board of Education Meeting Minutes: July 7, 2010  <b>Evidence #2.1.5:</b> SAT Alignment E-mail Invite Message  <b>Evidence #2.1.6:</b> List of Participants in Connecticut SAT School Day Alignment Study  <b>Evidence #2.1.7:</b> Connecticut SAT School Day Alignment Study Report  <b>Evidence #2.1.8:</b> College Board Independent Alignment Study  <b>Evidence #2.2.1:</b> E-mail Invite for SAT Standard Setting Message  <b>Evidence #2.2.2:</b> List of Connecticut Participants for SAT Standard Setting  <b>Evidence #2.2.3:</b> SAT Multi-State Standard Setting Report  <b>Evidence #6.1.1:</b> Report Notes for CT School Day SAT on EdSight  <b>Evidence #6.1.2:</b> The Connecticut SAT School Day Reporting-Level Descriptors  <b>Evidence #4.7.3:</b> TAC Meeting 2016 June Agenda                      · This document shows the resources and questions discussed at the June 2016 Technical Advisory Committee meeting. There was discussion about adopting academic achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics.</p>	<p>There is evidence that the standard-setting process used by the SAT consortium was technically sound and that the team included Connecticut.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></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 Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b></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><b>Connecticut Specific Evidence</b>  <b>Evidence #1.1.11:</b> Connecticut (CT) State Board of Education Meeting Minutes: July 7, 2010  <b>Evidence #2.1.5:</b> SAT Alignment E-mail Invite Message  <b>Evidence #2.1.6:</b> List of Participants in Connecticut SAT School Day Alignment Study  <b>Evidence #2.1.7:</b> Connecticut SAT School Day Alignment Study Report  <b>Evidence #2.1.8:</b> College Board Independent Alignment Study  <b>Evidence #2.2.1:</b> E-mail Invite for SAT Standard Setting Message  <b>Evidence #2.2.2:</b> List of Connecticut Participants for SAT Standard Setting  <b>Evidence #2.2.3:</b> SAT Multi-State Standard Setting Report  <b>Evidence #6.1.1:</b> Report Notes for CT School Day SAT on EdSight  <b>Evidence #6.1.2:</b> Connecticut SAT School Day Reporting-Level Descriptors  <b>Evidence #4.7.3:</b> TAC Meeting 2016 June Agenda                      · This document shows the resources and questions discussed at the June 2016 Technical Advisory Committee meeting. There was discussion about adopting academic achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics.</p>	<p>The state has not presented evidence to address this critical element. While 2.1.8 is indicative of alignment of the SAT to CT academic content standards, the reviewer could locate no evidence that the academic achievement standards had been reviewed to ensure alignment with high school performance expectations at the proficient or above level. The academic achievement standards are extremely generic and do not provide clear guidance for students and parents of the knowledge and skills required at each performance level.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The process used to develop the academic achievement standards (See SAT peer notes.).</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></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"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g.,</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC Evidence:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In <b>NCSC - 6.4 – additional - Report Distribution Timeline for 2015–16</b>, there are specific dates as it pertains to the distribution of reports to constituents in Connecticut. In addition, in <b>NCSC - 6.4 - additional - General Project Schedule</b> from 2016 – 17, is a specific project schedule/timeline for release of results.</li> <li>• In the future, the CSDE is planning to produce a Spanish version of the ISR for the alternate assessment similar to the Smarter Balanced ISR shown in <b>NCSC - 6.4 - additional - Spanish Sample Report</b>.</li> <li>• It should be noted that to date, the CSDE has not received a request for an alternate version (including Spanish) of the student report for the alternate assessment.</li> </ul> <p><b>SB Evidence:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A general project schedule/timeline for release of results was already submitted with the original peer review submission that can be viewed at <b>SB - 6.4.15 – From Original Submission</b>.</li> <li>• In addition, in <b>SB - 6.4 – additional - Report Distribution Timeline for 2015–16</b> there are some specific dates as it pertains to the distribution of reports to constituents in Connecticut. Subsequent to Connecticut’s peer review submission, the CSDE has created Spanish versions of the Individual Student Report. They were made available to parents starting with the 2015-16 results release. These changes are shown on this <b>SB - 6.4 – additional - Spanish Sample Report</b>.</li> </ul> <p><b>Connecticut adheres to the evidence provided in</b></p>	<p>For NCSC, the state provided evidence of a timeline and reports in Spanish, although other alternate formats were not addressed, the state reported that they have received no requests for alternate format reports.</p> <p>For SB, the state provided evidence of a timeline and reports in Spanish, although other alternate formats were not addressed; the state offered that they have received no requests for alternate format reports.</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 Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<p><b>the unified submission by the College Board for the Connecticut SAT School Day.</b>  <b>Connecticut Specific Evidence</b>  <b>Evidence #6.4.1:</b> CT SAT School Day Report on EdSight Secure Screenshot  <b>Evidence #6.4.2:</b> EdSight Public Reporting Screenshot  <b>Evidence #6.4.3:</b> Connecticut SAT School Day Public Summary Results File  <b>Evidence #6.4.4:</b> PowerPoint for Release of Results to be used by Districts/Schools  <b>Evidence #6.4.5:</b> Sample Parent Letter for Results Release – Score Sends  <b>Evidence #6.4.6:</b> District Notification of Results Release  <b>Evidence #6.4.7:</b> Results Release Press Release  <b>Evidence #6.4.8:</b> Notification of Results Release to Test Center Supervisors  <b>Evidence #6.4.9:</b> Connecticut SAT School Day Reporting  <b>Evidence #6.4.10:</b> Sample Online Student Report  <b>Evidence #6.4.11:</b> Sample Paper Student Report</p>	
<p><b>from 2016 review</b>            For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), and for AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA) CSDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> <li>Evidence that individual student reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent with limited English proficiency, be orally translated for such parent.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That 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 for schools and districts to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</li> <li>That the State provides information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Connecticut**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That individual student reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent with limited English proficiency, be orally translated for such parent.</li> </ul>		

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