UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Hanseul Kang
Superintendent
Office of the State Superintendent of Education
810 1st Street NE, Ninth Floor
Washington, D.C. 20002

January 6, 2017

Dear Superintendent Kang:

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

On October 6, 2016, the Department sent a letter to chief State school officers outlining the outcomes for States related to the assessment peer review. I am writing to provide you feedback on the District of Columbia Office of the State Superintendent's (OSSE) recent submission of evidence. External peer reviewers and Department staff evaluated OSSE's submission and found, based on the evidence received, that the components of your assessment system meet some, but not all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- Reading and language arts (R/LA) and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (PARCC): **Substantially meets requirements**
- R/LA and mathematics general assessments in high school (PARCC): **Substantially meets requirements**
- R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and high school: **Partially meets requirements**

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

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

The specific list of items required for OSSE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because several of the State's components have partially met the requirements, the Department is placing a condition on the State's Title I grant award related to those components of the assessment system. To satisfy this condition, OSSE must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. OSSE must submit a plan and timeline within 30 days for when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. The Department will also host regular (e.g., quarterly) progress calls with the State to discuss the State's progress on its timeline. If, following the peer review of the additional evidence, adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action. Additionally, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) will monitor progress on matters pertaining to requirements in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) related to the participation of students with disabilities in Title I assessments. Insufficient progress to address such matters may lead OSERS to place a condition on OSSE's Federal fiscal year 2017 IDEA Part B grant award.

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

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

Sincerely,

/s/

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

Enclosures

cc: Amy Maisterra, Assistant Superintendent of Elementary, Secondary, and Specialized Education
Danielle Griswold, Assessment Director

Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed to Meet the Requirements for the District of Columbia's Standards and Assessment System

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments	For the entire assessment system, the District of Columbia Office of the State Superintendent (OSSE) must provide: • Evidence that, if the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading and language/arts (R/LA) in English if they have been enrolled in United States 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.
2.1 – Test Design and Development	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC), OSSE must provide: • Evidence that the assessment design measures the full breadth and depth of the State's academic content standards, including the speaking and listening aspect of the standards. For the R/LA and mathematics alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) (National Center and State Collaborative/Multi-State Alternate Assessment (NCSC/MSAA)) in grades 3-8 and high school, OSSE must provide: • Evidence to support the NCSC/MSAA test design criteria for the writing portion of the R/LA AA-AAAS. This will also impact evidence for related critical elements in sections 3 and 4 support the test design criteria for the writing portion of the R/LA assessment.
2.2 – Item Development	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), OSSE must provide: • Information about the composition and credentials of content and bias/sensitivity reviewers for the PARCC assessment. Specifically, OSSE should provide information about the subject area specializations of content and bias/sensitivity reviewers on these panels (grade level, general or special education specialization, English learner specialization).

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed

2.3 – Test Administration	For the R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and high school, OSSE must provide:
	• Evidence that it has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the NCSC/MSAA assessments that include:
	  o Evidence of a troubleshooting guide to address technology-related contingency plans.
	  o 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.
	  o Evidence of training to ensure consistency of administration across districts and schools.

3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), OSSE must provide: • Additional alignment evidence that addresses all remaining grades (grades 3, 4, 6, and 7) in both R/LA and mathematics content areas. • Alignment evidence that supports a test design that assesses the full range of the State's academic content standards is needed for all tested grades (including speaking and listening as previously noted in 2.1). For the R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and high school, OSSE must provide: • As noted in element 2.1, evidence that demonstrates its assessments measure the full breadth and depth of the State's R/LA content standards (writing domain). 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 affect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4.
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), OSSE must provide: • Additional cognitive lab studies that address the cognitive processes and cognitive complexity required by the standards across grades and content areas. For the R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and high school, OSSE must provide: • See evidence note for writing items in 3.1.
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure.	For the R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and high school, OSSE must provide: • Additional evidence that supports the internal structure of the tests, specifically how the test meets IRT assumptions of test unidimensionality.
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables.	For the R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and high school, OSSE must provide: • See evidence note for writing items in 3.1.
4.1 – Reliability	For the R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	high school, OSSE must provide: • See evidence note for writing items in 3.1.
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), OSSE must provide: • Cumulative frequency distributions across raw score/scale scores, that include the number and percentage of students scored at each raw/scale score point. For the R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and high school, OSSE must provide: • See evidence note for writing items in 3.1.

4.4 – Scoring	For the R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and high school, OSSE must provide:
	• Evidence of documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for constructed-response items in R/LA and mathematics and also operational writing items. Specifically:
	  o Adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability;
	  o Clear scoring rubrics, comprehensive instructions for raters, adequate training of raters, evaluation of inter-rater reliability; and
	  o Documentation that the model-data fit issue described in Critical Element 3.3 has been resolved.

4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	For the R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and high school, OSSE must provide: • See evidence note for writing items in 3.1.
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), OSSE must provide: • Evidence of continued mode comparability studies. For the R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and high school, OSSE must provide: • Evidence either that paper versions of the assessments are provided as 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.
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	For the R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and high school, OSSE must provide: • Evidence of a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of the assessments for future years.
5.2 – Procedures for including English Learners (ELs)	For the R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and high school, OSSE must provide: • 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: o Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); and

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	o Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.
5.3 – Accommodations	For the R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and high school, OSSE must provide: • 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. • Evidence that appropriate accommodations for English learners are available. • 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.
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	For the entire assessment system, OSSE must provide: • Evidence that it monitors test administrations for special populations for consistency among individualized education programs, classroom instruction, and accommodations. • Evidence of the way in which test administration monitoring results are documented and the results of monitoring used.
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), OSSE must provide: • Evidence that OSSE formally adopted the achievement standards indicated in the submission. For the R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and high school, OSSE must provide: • Evidence of the formal adoption of the NCSC/MSAA achievement standards by OSSE.
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), OSSE must provide: • Additional detailed information about areas of educational specialization for members of each achievement standards setting panel, especially the specialty areas of special education and English learners.
6.4 – Reporting	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), OSSE must provide: • Evidence that all information elements in the OSSE reports of PARCC assessments support the same interpretations as those in the PARCC produced reports. For the R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and high school, OSSE must provide: • Evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. • 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.

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

June 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes

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

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

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS . 3
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students 3
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards 4
1.3 – Required Assessments(Reviewed by Department staff only) 5
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments(Reviewed by Department staff only)..... 6
1.5 – Participation Data(Reviewed by Department staff only) 8

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 9
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 9
2.2 – Item Development..... 10
2.3 – Test Administration 11
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (Reviewed by Department staff only)13
2.5 – Test Security 14
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 16

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

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

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 28
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 28
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 31
5.3 – Accommodations..... 33
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 35

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 36
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 36
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 38
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 39
6.4 – Reporting..... 40

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

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element	Evidence **(Record document and page # for future reference)**	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students 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.	Evaluate for all subjects **General assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics** Evidence for the Common Core State Standards was submitted on this State's behalf by Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE). (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) ***State-specific evidence both the general and AA-AAAS assessments*** **Folder 1, 1.1.2a** D.C. State Board of Education Meeting Transcript 07-21-10 • Labeled p. 73-75 for resolution; labeled p. 158-159 for approval vote **Folder 1, 1.1.2b** D.C. State Board of Education Meeting SBOE Meeting Transcript 12-18-13 • Labeled p. 113-118 for resolution; labeled p. 118-119 for approval vote **Folder 1, 1.1** Common Core Standard Crosswalk	Did the Board officially adopt the Core Content Connectors and Essential Understandings for the AA-AAAS?

Section 1.1 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Evidence is needed to show that the Board officially adopted the Core Content Connectors and Essential Understandings for the AA-AAAS.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards 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.	Evaluate for all three subjects 1.2- **Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards** Evidence for the Common Core State Standards was submitted on this State's behalf by MSDE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) ***State-specific evidence both the general and AA-AAAS assessments*** **Folder 1, 1.1** Common Core Standard Crosswalk **Folder 1, 1.2** NCSC Resources-OSSE Website **Folder 1, 1.2** Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS)- OSSE Website **Folder 6, 6.1.2** PARCC Overview • Slide 6: What are DC's standards? **Folder 5, 5.1.2** DC NCSC Participation Guidance Page 2: Assessment Design	The crosswalk resource is unavailable through the document provided – the link is not a live link because the document is a pdf. By virtue of using the CCSS and NGSS, DC has met this element.

Section 1.2 Summary Statement

_X_ No additional evidence is required.

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

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
1.3 – Required Assessments 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: • Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).	DC mentions that state-wide assessments shall be administered each school year in conformance with guidelines established by the State Superintendent to include, at a minimum, the testing and reporting of results for all students enrolled in the District of Columbia Public Schools system and public charter schools who participated in the state-wide assessment program that year. All students enrolled in grades three (3) through eight (8) shall participate in the state-wide mathematics and English language arts assessments. All students enrolled in grades five (5) and eight (8) shall participate in the state-wide science assessment. All students enrolled in grades nine (9) through twelve (12) shall participate in the state-wide mathematics assessment and English language arts assessment at least once in high school, as appropriate to the student's curricula and course progression or as determined by OSSE. All students enrolled in grades nine (9) through twelve (12) shall participate in the state-wide science assessment. Students shall take the assessment at least once in high school, as appropriate to their curricula and course progression or as determined by OSSE.	DC provides an individualized education program (IEP) content guide that refers to IEPs for children with disabilities. IEPs for such children shall include "a description of [each] child's present levels of academic achievement and functional performance, including how the child's disability affects the child's involvement and progress in the general education curriculum (the same curriculum as for non-disabled children), and for children with disabilities who take alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards. However, this section does not provide enough specific evidence to suggest that annual alternate assessments are made available in reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 3-8 and once in high school, nor does it provide enough evidence for alternate science assessments in the grade bands. Additional review by staff identified required assessments.
Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
X . No additional 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.

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
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments 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. • For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For English learners (EL): o 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; o 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.	- PARCC accommodations for English language learners - District of Columbia Testing Accommodations Manuel - District of Columbia Testing Accommodations Manuel for Students with Disabilities - District of Columbia Testing Accommodations Manuel for English Language Learners - Non-public Schools and Programs (Authority and Purpose)	Citing laws that require that all students with disabilities be administered State assessments intended to hold schools accountable for the academic performance of students, with or without accommodations, DC maintains that IEP team members must actively engage in a planning process that addresses: - assurance of the provision of accommodations to facilitate student access to grade-level instruction and state assessments; and - use of alternate assessments to assess the achievement of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. DC also maintains that "all students, including ELLs, must participate in the District of Columbia Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS) in grades 3-9 and 10 for Mathematics and Reading assessments; grades 5, 8, and 10 for the Science and Health assessment, and grades 4, 7, and 10 for the Composition assessment." Additionally, there is an exemption option: in accordance with ESEA guidance, ELLs who have enrolled in United States schools for the first time within 12 months from the last day of the previous year's test window are not required to participate in the reading or writing portion of the state assessment regardless of ELP level. However, no specific evidence could be found that addresses the requirement that, 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

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

Critical Element—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
		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.

Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

If the State administers native language assessments, there should be evidence that 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.

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

Critical Element—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
1.5 – Participation Data 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.	Prompts for Reviewers: --data disaggregated by student group: ELA/Math/Science --Shows students tested and students enrolled for each breakout --for end-of-course HS, procedures to ensure each student is tested and counted in participation rate along with data --includes grade level tests and AA-AAAS	Participation rates at the high school level were below 95%.
Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
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.

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.1 – Test Design and Development 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: • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State's grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State's academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **2.1-Test Design and Development** Evidence for the Test Design and Development element was submitted on this State's behalf by MSDE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) **Alternative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics** **2.1 – Test Design and Development** Evidence for the Test Design and Development element was submitted on this State's behalf by Arizona Department of Education (ADE). (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet)	
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
See PARCC and NCSC/MSAA notes		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.2 – Item Development 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **2.2 PARCC Item Development** Evidence for the Item Development element was submitted on this State's behalf by MSDE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) **Alternative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics** **2.2 – Item Development** Evidence for the Item Development element was submitted on this State's behalf by ADE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet)	
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
See PARCC and NCSC/MSAA notes		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.3 – Test Administration The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State: • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State's general and alternate assessments receive training on the State's established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet 2.3-**Test Administration** Evidence for the Test Administration (2.3.1 and 2.3.2) element was submitted on this State's behalf by MSDE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) **Alternative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics** **2.3 – Test Administration** Evidence for the Test Administration element was submitted on this State's behalf by ADE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) ***State-specific evidence*** **Folder 2, 2.3.1** 2015 DC PARCC Administrative Guidance Timing, interruptions and cell phones **Folder 2, 2.3.1** Post-Test Focus Group Training **Folder 2, 2.3.1** Medical Emergency Testing Exemption Form **Folder 2, 2.5** Test Integrity (TI) Act of 2013 • Page 2, Sec. 102. LEA administration of Districtwide assessments • Page 2, Sec. 103. Authorized personnel; responsibilities **Folder 2, 2.3.2** PARCC On-site Training **Folder 2, 2.3.2** Intro to PARCC Training **Folder 2, 2.3a.1** PARCC Administrative Bulletins • 32 Bulletins from12/16/14-06/23/15 **Folder 2, 2.3a.1** Computer-Paper Mode Memo Policy **Folder 2, 2.3**PARCC FAQs from LEAs • Page 1, Technology Readiness and • Page 1,Test Administration & Test	The Power Outage Protocol is a good resource. The review panels are recommending that each consortium provide a troubleshooting guide for TAs for handling technology issues that arise during testing that can be handled on the spot without having to make a phone call (e.g., computer freezes, screen goes black, etc.) Peers recommend that all students participate in taking a practice test prior to the operational online test, and that this is a clear expectation to all districts from the state level, rather than being a local decision. Peers found evidence indicating this is a recommendation, thereby leaving it up to individual schools or districts, which could create inequities across students.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Readiness **Folder 2, 2.3.3** Infrastructure Trial Guidance **Folder 2, 2.3.3** Network Outage Protocol	
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
_x No additional evidence is required.—see PARCC and NCSC/MSAA notes		

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

Critical Element—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
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration 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.	X policies and procedures apply to all grade-level and AA-AAAS in all subjects	If all kids take a practice test, it should be part of the monitoring. DC's Test Integrity Act of 2013, amended in 2015, requires OSSE to establish standards for monitoring administration of Districtwide (Statewide) assessments and monitor Districtwide assessment administration procedures in randomly selected and targeted schools. OSSE monitors attend training and use a General Observation Checklist as a standardized protocol for collecting information on schools during testing. OSSE also uses vendor supplied data forensics after testing to review irregularities during testing and determine if a test security investigation is warranted. Are there results from the review of this data forensics?
Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.5 – Test Security 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: • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State's assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS **General assessment** 2.5- **Test Security** Evidence for the Test Administration Security element was submitted on this State's behalf by MSDE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) **Alternative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics** **2.5 – Test Security** Evidence for the Test Security element was submitted on this State's behalf by ADE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) ***State-specific evidence*** **Folder 2, 2.5** Test Integrity (TI) Act of 2013 • Page 2, Sec. 102. LEA administration of Districtwide assessments • Page 2, Sec. 103. Authorized personnel; responsibilities • Page 3, Sec. 104. Test integrity sanctions. • **Folder 2, 2.5** Test Integrity (TI) Act Amendment Policy Review **Folder 2, 2.5** Test Security Guideline • Page 13, Post-Assessment Audit, Test Security Violations, Sanctions • Page 14, Reporting and Investigating Allegations of Test Security Violations, LEA Investigation • Page 15, State Investigation • Page 16, Consequences for Violations, Invalidation of Test Scores	All requirements are met.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Folder 2, 2.5 Test Security Incident Reporting Form **Folder 2, 2.5.1** Test Security Affidavit **Folder 2, 2.3**PARCC FAQs from LEAs • Page 2, Test Integrity & Test Security **Folder 2, 2.3.1** Post-Test Focus Group Training • Slides 18: 2015 PARCC Reported Irregularities Slide 19: Common 2015 Irregularities Defined	
Section 2.5 Summary Statement		
_X_ No additional evidence is required.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy 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: • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS **General assessment** 2.6- **Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy** Evidence for the Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy element was submitted on this State's behalf by MSDE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) **Alternative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics** **2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy** Evidence for the Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy element was submitted on this State's behalf by ADE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) ***State-specific evidence*** **Folder 2, 2.6.2** OSSE Data Access Policy **Folder 2, 2.6.3** Accountability Workbook • Page 28: (5.5) State reporting suppression rules and n-size for accountability • Page 29: (5.6) State has strategies to protect the privacy of individual students in reporting (2.6.2 also) **Folder 2, 2.6.3** Assessment Participation **Folder 2, 2.6.3** Rules for FAY and Participation Rate	Requirements are met.
Section 2.6 Summary Statement		
_x_ No additional evidence is required.		

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

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State's validity evidence includes evidence that the State's assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State's academic content standards, including: • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State's assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State's academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State's academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **General assessment** 3.1 – **Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content** Evidence for the Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content element was submitted on this State's behalf by MSDE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) **Alternative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics** 3.1 – **Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content** Evidence for the Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content element was submitted on this State's behalf by ADE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet)	
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
• See PARCC and NCSC/MSAA notes		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **General assessment** 3.2 – **Validity Based on Cognitive Processes** Evidence for the Validity Based on Cognitive Processes element was submitted on this State's behalf by MSDE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) **Alternative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics** **3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes** Evidence for the Validity Based on Cognitive Processes element was submitted on this State's behalf by ADE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet	
Section 3.2 Summary Statement		
See PARCC and NCSC/MSAA notes		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **General assessment** 3.3 – **Validity Based on Internal Structure** Evidence for the Validity Based on Internal Structure element was submitted on this State's behalf by MSDE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) **Alternative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics** **3.3 Validity Based on Internal Structure** Evidence for the Validity Based on Internal Structure element was submitted on this State's behalf by ADE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet	
Section 3.3 Summary Statement		
See PARCC and NCSC/MSAA notes.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **General assessment** 3.4 – **Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables** Evidence for the Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables element was submitted on this State's behalf by MSDE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) **Alternative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics** **3.4 Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables** Evidence for the Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables element was submitted on this State's behalf by ADE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet	
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		
See PARCC and NCSC/MSAA notes.		

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

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.1 – Reliability The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State's student population overall and each student group and, if the State's assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including: • Test reliability of the State's assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State's assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student's achievement.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **General assessment** 4.1 – **Reliability** Evidence for the Reliability element was submitted on this State's behalf by MSDE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) **Alternative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics** **4.1 Reliability** Evidence for the Reliability element was submitted on this State's behalf by ADE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet	
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
See PARCC and NCSC/MSAA notes		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **General assessment** 4.2 – **Fairness and Accessibility** Evidence for the Fairness and Accessibility element was submitted on this State's behalf by MSDE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) **Alternative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics** **4.2 Fairness and Accessibility** Evidence for the Fairness and Accessibility element was submitted on this State's behalf by ADE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet	
Section 4.2 Summary Statement		
See PARCC and NCSC/MSAA notes.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **General assessment** 4.3 – **Full Performance Continuum** Evidence for the Full Performance Continuum element was submitted on this State's behalf by MSDE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) **Alternative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics** **4.3 Full Performance Continuum** Evidence for the Full Performance Continuum element was submitted on this State's behalf by ADE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet	
Section 4.3 Summary Statement		
See PARCC and NCSC/MSAA notes.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.4 – Scoring 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **General assessment** 4.4 – **Scoring** Evidence for the Scoring element was submitted on this State's behalf by MSDE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) **Alternative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics** **4.4 Scoring** Evidence for the Scoring element was submitted on this State's behalf by ADE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet	
Section 4.4 Summary Statement		
See PARCC and NCSC/MSAA notes.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **General assessment** 4.5 – **Multiple Assessment Forms** Evidence for the Multiple Assessment Forms element was submitted on this State's behalf by MSDE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) **Alternative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics** **4.5 Multiple Assessment Forms** Evidence for the Multiple Assessment Forms element was submitted on this State's behalf by ADE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet	
Section 4.5 Summary Statement		
See PARCC and NCSC/MSAA notes.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State: • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **General assessment** 4.6 – **Multiple Versions of an Assessment** Evidence for the Multiple Versions of an Assessment element was submitted on this State's behalf by MSDE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) **Alternative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics** **4.6 Multiple Versions of an Assessment** Evidence for the Multiple Versions of an Assessment element was submitted on this State's behalf by ADE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet	

Section 4.6 Summary Statement
See PARCC and NCSC/MSAA notes.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 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).	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **General assessment** 4.7 – **Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance** Evidence for the Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance element was submitted on this State's behalf by MSDE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) **Alternative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics** **4.7- Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance** Evidence for the Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance element was submitted on this State's behalf by ADE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet	

Section 4.7 Summary Statement
See PARCC and NCSC/MSAA notes.

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

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
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 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: • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student's IEP Team based on each student's individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS **General assessment** 5.1 – **Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities** Evidence for the Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities element was submitted on this State's behalf by MSDE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) **Alternative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics** **5.1- Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities** Evidence for the Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities element was submitted on this State's behalf by ADE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) ***State-specific evidence*** **Folder 1, 1.3.1** 5-A23 State-Wide Academic Assessments • Page 2, 2301.7 Participation in State-wide Academic Assessment **Folder 5, 5.1** Alternate Assessment-OSSE website **Folder 5, 5.1** DC Overview of NCSC AA-AAS **Folder 5, 5.1.1** DC 2015 NCSC Test Administration Support Webinar **Folder 5, 5.1.2** DC Alternate Participation Criteria Form **Folder 5, 5.1.2** DC NCSC Participation Guidance **Folder 1, 1.4** Testing Accommodations Manual: Part 1 SWD	All requirements are met.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA; • Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student's achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State's general assessments); • The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.	• Page 3: The Decision-Making Process (5.1.2) **Folder 2, 2.5** Test Security Guideline • Page 5, LEA Responsibilities (b) • Page 9, Testing Students in Alternative Settings, Students with IEPs in Non-Public Settings • Page 11, Special Education Coordinator and Alternate Assessment Coordinator Roles **Folder 5, 5.1.2** PARCC Accommodations Webinar • Slide 12: Administration Considerations for All Students **Folder 5, 5.1.2** The Basic Guide to SEDS • Page 93-96, Section 6.10: Classroom Accommodations and Testing Participation (Note on page 96) **Folder 5, 5.1.3** Significant Cognitive Disability Guidance ***Evidence for 5.1.4*** ***Folder 5, 5.1.4*** PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations **Folder 5, 5.1.2** PARCC Accommodations Webinar • Slide 8-10: PARCC Accessibility Features ***Evidence for 5.1.5*** **Folder 1, 1.4** OSSE Testing Accommodations Manual Final_14 • Page 3, Accommodations and Accommodations and Universal Design • Page 12, Step 2: Learn About Accommodations for Instruction and Assessment • Page 14, Step 3: Select Accommodations	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	for Instruction and Assessment for Individual Students • Page 15, The Decision-Making Process ***Evidence for 5.1.6*** **Folder 1, 1.4** OSSE Testing Accommodations Manual Final_14 • Page 6, Appendix A. Quick Reference Chart of Approved Accommodations ***Evidence for 5.1.7*** **Folder 5, 5.1.7** Communication with Parents about NCSC **Folder 5, 5.1.7** Parent and Community Conversations **Folder 5, 5.1.2** DC Alternate Participation Criteria Form ***Evidence for 5.1.8*** **Folder 5, 5.1.8** DSE TTA Unit CCSS Trainings	

Section 5.1 Summary Statement
_X_ No additional evidence is required.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs 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: • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS **General assessment** 5.2 – **Procedures for including ELs** Evidence for the Procedures for including ELs element was submitted on this State's behalf by MSDE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) **Alternative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics** **5.2- Procedures for including ELs** Evidence for the Procedures for including ELs element was submitted on this State's behalf by ADE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet ***State-specific evidence*** **Folder 5, 5.2** OSSE Identification and Placement Process ELs **Folder 5, 5.2** OSSE Guidance on Approved EL Proficiency Assessments ***Evidence for 5.2.1*** **Folder 1, 1.4.2.a** OSSE Testing Accommodations Manual: Part 2 English Language Learners • Page 3-6 **Folder 1, 1.4.2.a** PARCC Accommodations for English Language Learners **Folder 2, 2.5** Test Security Guideline • Page 5, LEA Responsibilities (b) **Folder 5, 5.1.2** PARCC Accommodations Webinar • Slide 14-18: PARCC Accommodations for	NCSC will be receiving feedback that indicates the need to give guidance regarding ELs inclusion in the alternate assessment and selection of appropriate accommodations for ELs.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	English Learners ***Evidence for 5.2.2*** **Folder 5, 5.1.2** PARCC Accommodations Webinar • Slide 8-10: PARCC Accessibility Features ***Evidence for 5.2.3*** **Folder 1, 1.4.2.a** OSSE Testing Accommodations Manual: Part 2 English Language Learners Page 7	

Section 5.2 Summary Statement
_X_ No additional evidence is required from DC.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.3 – Accommodations The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State: • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student's need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS; **General assessment** 5.3 – **Accommodations** Evidence for the Accommodations element was submitted on this State's behalf by MSDE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) **Alternative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics** **5.3- Accommodations** Evidence for the Accommodations element was submitted on this State's behalf by ADE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet **Folder 5, 5.3** PARCC Personal Needs Profile for Special Populations ***Evidence for 5.3.1*** **Folder 1, 1.4** Testing Accommodations Manual: Part 1 SWD ***Evidence for 5.3.2*** **Folder 1, 1.4.2.a** OSSE Testing Accommodations Manual: Part 2 English Language Learners **Folder 1, 1.4.2.a** PARCC Accommodations for English Language Learners ***Evidence for both 5.3.1 and 5.3.2*** **Folder 5, 5.3** Accommodations CAS vs PARCC (Crosswalk) ***Evidence for 5.3.3***	All requirements are met.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Folder 5, 5.1.2 The Basic Guide to SEDS • Page 93-96, Section 6.10: Classroom Accommodations and Testing Participation ***Evidence for 5.3.4*** **Folder 5, 5.3.4** DC Statewide Assessments Unique Accommodations Request Form	

Section 5.3 Summary Statement
_X_ No additional evidence is required—see PARCC and NCSC/MSAA notes

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 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: • Consistent with the State's policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student's disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student's IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS; **5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations** Evidence for the Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations element was submitted on this State's behalf by MSDE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) ***State-specific evidence for both the general and alternate assessments*** ***Evidence for 5.4*** **Folder 2, 2.4** 2015 Monitoring training **Folder 2, 2.4** Monitoring Forms Packet **Folder 2, 2.4** Monitor NDA **Folder 2, 2.4** Monitoring Test Admin-Intro Letter **Folder 2, 2.4** State Monitor Schedule **Folder 2, 2.4** General Observation Report **Folder 5, 5.4** Monitoring Test Administration for Special Population	What does OSSE check for in the Test Plans that are submitted to them? Peers could not find evidence that DC monitors for consistency among IEPs, classroom instruction, and accommodations. How are the results of the monitoring being recorded or documented? How are the results of the monitoring being used?

Section 5.4 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Evidence documenting that there is an alignment between test accommodations, IEPs or other student plans, and classroom instruction.

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

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
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically: • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State's academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **General assessment** 6.1 – **State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students** Evidence for the – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students element was submitted on this State's behalf by MSDE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) **Alternative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics** **6.1– State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students** Evidence for the – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students element was submitted on this State's behalf by ADE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet ***State-specific evidence*** ***Evidence for 6.1.1*** **Folder 1, 1.1.2a** SBOE Meeting Transcript 07-21-10 (labeled p. 73-75 for resolution; labeled p. 158-159 for approval vote) **Folder 1, 1.1.2b** SBOE Meeting Transcript 12-18-13 (labeled p. 113-118 for resolution; labeled p. 118-119 for approval vote) ***Evidence for 6.1.2 and 6.1.3*** **Folder 6, 6.1.2** PARCC Overview • Slide 7: How are we measuring the new	Requirements are met.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	standards? • Slide 8: How are the tests scored? • Slide 9: How were performance levels determined? **Folder 6, 6.1.3** PARCC Resolution (SBOE Resolution to Approve the Definition of Proficiency) **Folder 6, 6.4.4** PARCC Communications LEA Leaders Meeting Slide 12-29: Setting Student Performance Levels for PARCC	

Section 6.1 Summary Statement
_X No additional evidence is required.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **General assessment** 6.2 – **Achievement Standards-Setting** Evidence for the Achievement Standards-Setting element was submitted on this State's behalf by MSDE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) **Alternative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics** **6.2- Achievement Standards-Setting** Evidence for the Achievement Standards-Setting element was submitted on this State's behalf by ADE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet	

Section 6.2 Summary Statement
See PARCC and NCSC/MSAA notes.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 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. 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **General assessment** 6.3 – **Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards** Evidence for the Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards element was submitted on this State's behalf by MSDE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet) **Alternative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics** **6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards** Evidence for the Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards element was submitted on this State's behalf by ADE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet	
Section 6.3 Summary Statement		
See PARCC and NCSC/MSAA notes.		

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

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

6.4 – Reporting
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:
• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;
• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;
• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:
  o Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student's achievement;
  o Report the student's achievement in terms of the State's grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);
  o Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;
  o Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to
	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet
	
	General assessment
	6.4 – **Reporting**
	Evidence for the Reporting element was submitted on this State's behalf by MSDE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet)
	
	Alternative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics
	6.4 – Reporting
	Evidence for the Reporting element was submitted on this State's behalf by ADE. (See State Assessment Peer Review Submission Cover Sheet
	
	State-specific evidence
	Evidence for 6.4.1
	Folder 6, 6.4.1 Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) 2014-15 School Year Results (Grades 3-8 and High School)- (*screen shot of public web page*)
	Folder 6, 6.4.1 National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) 2014-2015 School Year Results (Grade 3 sample)- (*screen shot of public web page*)
	Folder 6, 6.4.1 DC Next Generation Assessment (*screen shot of public web page*)
	Folder 6, 6.4.1 DC Next Generation Assessment-Introduction (*screen shot of public web page*)
	Evidence for 6.4.2
	Folder 6, 6.1.2 PARCC Overview
	• Slide 11: What will new score reports look like?
	
	Folder 6, 6.4.3.2 2015 District of Columbia
		The evidence for the public reports for NCSC include only the percentage of students in each performance level for all students, but does not show the proficiency levels for each of the sub-groups, or by grade level, or by grade level and sub-group. A link is embedded in an email in the evidence that would take the panel members to a website with these data.
		
		For results reported publicly, how does DC figure the precent proficient – is it the percentage out of the total students tested, or is it the percentage out of the total number of students who were supposed to be tested? In other words, how are "absent" and "refused" dealt with in terms of determining the denominator for reporting the percentage of students proficient? This information should be noted wherever public results are posted.
		
		PARCC will receive feedback asking how PARCC will be addressing the requirement to provide 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.
		
		NCSC will receive feedback regarding the lack of itemized score analyses at any reporting level. Scores are only presented at the test level, no domain or "subtest" scores. Efforts should be made to generate reports at finer content/process grain sizes (e.g., reporting reading and writing).
		
		The PARCC Individual Student Report (ISR) meets the requirements. The DC version, however, provides a very short description under each

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand; • 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.	PARCC High School Results **Folder 6, 6.4.3.2** 2015 District of Columbia PARCC 3-8 Results **Folder 6, 6.4.3.3** Individual Student Report Interpretive Guide **Folder 6, 6.4.3.3** PARCC Individual Student Report **Folder 6, 6.4.3.3** DC Student Score Reports NCSC ELA **Folder 6, 6.4.3.3** DC Student Score Reports NCSC Math **Folder 6, 6.4.3.3** Assessment Resources **Folder 6, 6.4.3.3.d** OSSE PARCC Parent Letter **Folder 6, 6.4.4** PARCC Data Guidance and Timeline **Folder 6, 6.4.4** PARCC Resources Timeline **Folder 6, 6.4.4** PARCC Communications LEA Leaders Meeting • Slide 2: Timeline	student's performance level that actually describes what a proficient student can do no matter the actual performance level of the child. This could easily mislead the parent into thinking this descriptor describes the performance of their child even when it does not. Peers recommend that DC either uses the PARCC ISR or ensures that all elements in the DC report have the same meaning as those in the PARCC report. The Interpretive Guide does not adequately address this potentially misleading information. NCSC will receive feedback about the lack of evidence regarding the availability of reports in multiple formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand. Peers understand why the 2015 results were so late due to PARCC standard setting in August. However, now that standard setting has been done, it would be highly preferable to get results back to schools before the end of the school year in which the test was given, and to the parents prior to the start of the next school year.

Section 6.4 Summary Statement (also see PARCC and NCSC/MSAA notes)

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

The PARCC Individual Student Report (ISR) meets the requirements. The DC version, however, provides a very short description under each student's performance level that actually describes what a proficient student can do no matter the actual performance level of the child. This could easily mislead the parent into thinking this descriptor describes the performance of their child even when it does not. Peers recommend that DC either uses the PARCC ISR or ensures that all elements in the DC report have the same meaning as those in the PARCC report. The Interpretive Guide does not adequately address this potentially misleading information.

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

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

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Contents

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

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 6
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 6
2.2 – Item Development..... 8
2.3 – Test Administration 9
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)10
2.5 – Test Security 11
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 13

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 14
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 14
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 16
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 17
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables..... 18

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 20
4.1 – Reliability..... 20
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 21
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 25
4.4 – Scoring 26
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 28
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 29
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... 31

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 32
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 32
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 34
5.3 – Accommodations..... 35
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 37

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 38
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 38
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 39
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 40
6.4 – Reporting..... 41

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

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element	Evidence **(Record document and page # for future reference)**	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students 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.	1.1.1 Common Core State Standards a. Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts & Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Studies b. Common Core State Standards for Mathematics Science standards not included	
Section 1.1 Summary Statement		
See State 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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards 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.	1.2.4 Reaching Higher: The Common Core State Standards Validation Committee a. Findings, pp. 2-3 1.2.5 The Common Core State Standards: Insight into Their Development and Purpose NA for Science	
Section 1.2 Summary Statement		
See State 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.

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

1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments
 	
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.
• For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;
• For English learners (EL):
  ○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment;
  ○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.
	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column-SWD and EL
	
	*PARCC Accessibility/Accommodations Manual
		Several policy-like statements (Sections 3 and 4) support inclusions of all students, including those with disabilities and EL in statewide assessments
		
		Same sections also support inclusion of English Learners in statewide assessments.
		
		The PARCC manual submitted clearly outlines an approach for instructional staff to consider when considering accessibility features for all students.
		
		The manual also clearly outlines an approach for IEP teams to use when considering and selecting assessment accommodations.
		
		This manual also clearly outlines an approach for instructional staff to use when considering and selecting allowable accommodations for EL students.

Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
This summary feedback for "No Additional Evidence Needed", or "Additional Evidence Needed" is most appropriately limited to the context of a specific state		

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

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
submission. This consortium submission, however, provides very good evidence and support for element 1.4 criteria, for any state that implements the PARCC assessment system.		

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.1 – Test Design and Development 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: • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State's grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State's academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.	• Purpose 2.1.1.1 About PARCC Assessments; Intended Interpretation and uses of results 2.1.1.2 – 2.1.1.7 • Test blueprints and item specifications provide detailed guidance to item development that addresses coverage and support for interpretation and use of results 2.2.1a-2.1.2.6 • ECD, Claims Structure, and Descriptions provide information about content challenge and required complexity of items and tasks 2.1.2.7a-2.1.2.9 and 2.1.3.4a-2.1.3.14 • The PARCC Cognitive Complexity Study 2.1.3.1evaluation was intended to guide selection of items for test forms to meet challenge and complexity requirements. • The NNSTOY 2.1.3.3, Fordham 2.1.3.2a (intended to evaluate grades 5 and 8 for alignment and comparisons of challenge and rigor with other measures) and HumRRO 2.1.3.2b (intended to evaluate HS assessments for alignment and comparison to challenge and rigor of other measures) studies address issues of cognitive complexity. • Technology-based = Usability of accessibility tools 2.2.5 and 2.2.6 • NA-not computer-adaptive	More than adequate evidence is provided for the intended interpretation and uses of results both in an overarching statement and as communicated in score reports and interpretation guides to support score reports. Several documents provide guidance for item development to ensure appropriate content challenge and complexity. Pre-item development documentation supported item development that addressed a variety of complexity levels consistent with the intent of the full range of the grade-level academic content standards. PARCC Cognitive Complexity Study investigators evaluated item content for cognitive complexity for the purpose of assembling operational test forms to align with the content standards.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
__X__ No additional evidence is needed		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.2 – Item Development 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.	• Content challenge and cognitive complexity are defined for use in item and task development in 2.2.12 and 2.2.21, 2.2.13-2.2.14, 2.2.21 • Item development processes 2.2.1-2.2.4, 2.2.9-2.2.10, 2.2.12, 2.2.15-2.2.16, 2.2.17-2.2.19 • Item research and reviews 2.2.5-2.2.8, 2.2.11, 2.2.20	Peers could not locate information about the composition (e.g., racial and geographic diversity) and credentials (e.g., certification, grade levels, special population, etc.) of those participating in the Content and Bias/Sensitivity. Peers could not locate information about the most common reasons for item rejections that should be useful in future item development.

Section 2.2 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Composition and credentials of Content and Bias/Sensitivity Reviewers

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

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

2.3 – Test Administration
 	
The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:
• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;
• Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State's general and alternate assessments receive training on the State's established procedures for the administration of its assessments;
• If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.
	Administration policies and procedures include:
	• Communicate admin procedures:
	  ○ Standardized 2.3.1.1Admin Bulletin, 2.3.1.1 Technology Bulletin, TCM & TAMs 2.3.1.7
	  ○ Accommodations: Manual 2.3.1.8, TCM 2.3.1.6 pp 54-60
	• Training:
	  ○ Practice tests 2.3.1.2
	  ○ Sample items 2.3.1.3
	  ○ Tutorials 2.3.1.4
	  ○ Online Training Modules 2.3.1.5
	  ○ Test Admin study 2.3.2.1
	• Technology:
	  ○ Technology Bulletin 2.3.1.1
	  ○ Customer Support 2.3.1.9
	  ○ Technology Set-up Tools 2.3.3.1
	  ○ Contingency TCM 2.3.1.6 pp.33, Early Warning System 2.3.3.2, Error Codes 2.3.3.3, Escalation Protocol 2.3.3.4
	
	NA-AA-AAS
		In the HumRRO report, reviewers found that accommodations offered were valid and appropriate based on current research, However, reviewers were unable to locate information regarding research regarding whether the accessibility features and accommodations alter the constructs measured.
		
		It is not clear who is and whether personnel are required to complete all training prior to administration. PARCC says they provide data to states on who has viewed which modules and completed the end-of-training quiz.
		• Do States decide who takes the training?
		• Are States individually making policies concerning training requirements since format of training varies from state-to-state?
		• If so, how does this variation affect accuracy of results? (See Test Admin Study)
		
		PARCC States should document fidelity of implementation of training materials provided by PARCC through the States' monitoring processes.
		
		Use of a common test platform ensures consistency for delivery for training and test administration and a common experience for students. It also minimizes test administration problems that are introduced by the use of multiple platforms.

Section 2.3 Summary Statement

__X_ No additional evidence is required for PARCC.

___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
- [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.5 – Test Security 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: • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State's assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.	2.5.1.1 TCM and TAMs 2.5.1.2 Security Agreement 2.5.1.3 Post-Test Certification Forms 2.5.1.4 Form to Report Testing Irregularities and Security Breaches 2.5.1.5 Form to Report Contaminated, Damaged, Missing Materials 2.5.1.6 Chain-of-Custody Requirements in 2016 Spring Test Coordinator Manual a. Section 2.1, pp. 3-5: Maintaining The Security of Test Materials and Content b. Section 3.3.2, p. 16: Security Plan c. Chain-of-Custody Forms 1. Computer-Based Testing Form 2. School-Level Paper-Based Testing Form 3. LEA/District-Level Paper-Based Testing Form 2.5.1.7 TestNav Security Highlights 2.5.1.8 DDoS Migration AWS-Pearson SECURE DOCUMENT 2.5.1.9 Troubleshooting Guide for Online Testing 2.5.1.10 TestNav Early Warning System 2.5.1.11 PearsonAccessNext Operational Reports 2.5.2.1 Data Forensics Study Plan SECURE DOCUMENT 2.5.2.2 PARCC Handscoring Alert Process SECURE DOCUMENT 2.5.3.1 PARCC State Alert/Escalation Protocol SECURE DOCUMENT	PARCC Evidence of recommended Test Security procedures to create a secure environment and to protect PII is more than adequate. States need to demonstrate full use and application of these procedures and protections.

Section 2.5 Summary Statement

_X__ No additional evidence is required or

___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy 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: • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.	2.6.1.1 Chain-of-Custody Requirements in 2016 Spring Test Coordinator Manual 2.6.1.2 Paper-Based Testing Materials Security Procedures in 2016 Spring Test Coordinator Manual 2.6.1.3 PARCC State Alert/Escalation Protocol SECURE DOCUMENT 2.6.1.4 Data Forensics Study Plan SECURE DOCUMENT 2.6.1.5 Student Registration/Personal Needs Profile Field Definitions 2.6.1.6 Non-Disclosure Agreements for all item reviewers, forms reviewers, etc. 2.6.1.7 PARCC Data Privacy and Security Policy 2.6.2.1 Pearson Privacy Policy 2.6.2.2 Pearson Terms and Conditions 2.6.2.3 User Role Matrix for Pearson Access Next 2.6.2.4 Score Report Interpretation Guide a. Section 1.3, p. 1: Confidentiality of Reporting Results 2.6.2.5 Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 2.6.3.1 Protection of Student Privacy: Aggregate Reports SECURE DOCUMENT	Minimum cell sizes for reporting for PARCC is Performance View-16 students; Growth View-25.students. State member minimum cell sizes range from 10 to 25. Policies and procedures for reporting conform to industry standards. (PARCC honors the minimum *n* sizes and suppression rules for the respective states.)

Section 2.6 Summary Statement

_X__ No additional evidence is required or

___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]

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

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content
 	
The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State's validity evidence includes evidence that the State's assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State's academic content standards, including:
• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State's assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State's academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;
• If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State's academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.
	3.1.1.1 2015 PARCC Technical Report
	
	3.1.1.2 Evidence of PARCC Validity
	
	3.1.1.3 Quality of Items, Tasks, and Stimuli Study
	
	3.1.1.16 Cognitive Complexity Study
	
	Evidence cited elsewhere relevant to this CE:
	Thomas B. Fordham Institute, "Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation Assessments," and HumRRO, "Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation High School Assessments"
	
	• Alignment
	  ○ Content (knowledge and process) 3.1.1.3 Quality of Items, Tasks, and Stimuli Study a. pp. 1-4, 8-17, 72-73, 79-80
	  ○ Range Fordham p.7 and 54
	  ○ Balance HumRRO p.25, 36, and 38
	  ○ Cognitive Complexity 3.1.1.16 Cognitive Complexity Study
	
	NA for AA-AAA
		NNSTOY, Fordham, and HumRRO reports evaluated alignment only for grades 5, 8, and High School in ELA/L and Mathematics. These investigators noted that more PLD Level 1 items are needed, particularly at grade 8 and High School Mathematics. PARCC has indicated they are adding items to address this concern. In addition, Fordham investigators were unable to summarize results for balanced emphasis as regards concepts, procedures, and applications.
		
		PARCC evidence of coverage of the full range of the grade-level academic content standards was lacking in both ELA and Mathematics particularly at grades 5 and 8. Future alignment studies that include multiple forms per grade for all grades tested may find that coverage is not an issue across forms. Further evidence is needed.
		
		PARCC Technical Report indicates that alignment studies found excellent alignment for both content and depth. However, the HumRRO study of the High School assessments found that the ELA/L assessment was limited overall for Depth. This finding contrasts with the Fordham study findings for ELA/L grades 5 and 8, where a good to excellent match was found for Depth. Both studies found a weak match at all levels for Speaking and Listening.
		
		Alignment study findings for Mathematics at all levels for most aspects of alignment were good to excellent, although Fordham found that the distribution of items for grade 8 was weak at DOK1. Fordham also experienced difficulty in

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		ascertaining balance of emphasis across the key concepts of the domains. No summary result was provided for this dimension of alignment. Balance of emphasis is an essential dimension of alignment. As adjustments are made to address the DOK1 issue, PARCC needs to verify all aspects of alignment for adjusted forms.

Section 3.1 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Peers were unable to find that grades other than grades 5, 8, and High School were included in alignment studies. It was also not clear how many forms were evaluated. PARCC should perform alignment studies to cover multiple operational forms that will be used in future administrations for every grade tested in both content areas.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes 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.	3.2.1 PARCC Item Development Research: Cognitive Labs 3.2.2 Quality of Items, Tasks, and Stimuli Study 3.2.3 Cognitive Complexity Study	PARCC evidence from 3.1 that applies to this critical element: 3.1.1.5a-3.1.1.7l documents provide additional evidence for cognitive processes in the design of items in ELA/L and Mathematics to meet the requirement. The recommendation was made in the Cognitive Complexity Study that this study be repeated based on 2015 operational data. What is PARCC's plan to address this? PARCC cognitive labs that explore student performance on items to show the items require complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skill would more clearly support the validity of the assessment in eliciting the intended cognitive processes. See Peer Review Guidance 3.2. Examples page 36.

Section 3.2 Summary Statement

__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Conduct cognitive labs based on cognitive processes across grades and content areas, or
- Conduct follow-up Cognitive Complexity Studies that focus on cognitive processes across grades and content areas.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 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.	3.3.1 2015 PARCC Technical Report Section 9.3: Evidence Based on Internal Structure (pp. 115-147) 3.3.2 PARCC 2014 Field Test Technical Report Section 9: Dimensionality Analyses (pp. 115-209)	PARCC's internal structure evidence and Dimensionality analyses provide strong evidence for validity. PARCC's descriptive information for subclaim reporting as opposed to numerical scores was a useful approach for this critical element for users and sound approach for test developers. PARCC's *DIF* Analyses were conducted and used as one piece of evidence to determine exclusion of items. Flagged items are designated as DNU (Do Not Use) or recommended to be re-field tested.
Section 3.3 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.	2015 PARCC Technical Report a. Section 9: Validity (pp. 115-147) b. Addendum 9: Validity (pp. 563-566) Postsecondary Educators' Judgment Study Benchmarking Study Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation Assessments: The Right Trajectory: State Teachers of the Year Compare Former and New State Assessments Quality of Test Administration Study Predictive Validity of MCAS and PARCC Study Evidence found elsewhere relevant to this Critical Element: PARCC College- and Career-Ready Determination Policy	PARCC's convergent and divergent validity analysis results were reported. PARCC's preliminary studies considering the relationship between the high school tests and post-secondary outcomes are reported. The PARCC Benchmarking Study 3.4.3 provides validity evidence for comparisons to other highly respected assessments. PARCC's plans for future investigations of consequential validity are also reported. PARCC should continue to provide the results of these studies and actions taken based on the recommendations of these studies to USED. In the PARCC College- and Career-Ready Determination Policy, PARCC sets forth an agenda for empirical investigation of consequential validity: "The following statement will be used to conduct validation studies of the efficacy of PARCC's College- and Career-Ready Determinations in the future. Students who earn a College- and Career-Ready Determination by performing at level 4 in grade 11 ELA/literacy and enroll in College English Composition, Literature, and technical courses requiring college-level reading and writing have approximately a 0.75 probability of earning college credit by attaining at least a grade of C or its equivalent in those courses. Students who earn a PARCC College- and Career-Ready Determination by performing at level 4 in Algebra II or Mathematics III

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		and enroll in College Algebra, Introductory College Statistics, and technical courses requiring an equivalent level of mathematics have approximately a 0.75 probability of earning college credit by attaining at least a grade of C or its equivalent in those courses. In the statement above, a 0.75 probability of earning a C is used as a *benchmark* against which the CCR cut score on the PARCC assessments will be validated through empirical research." The Peers look forward to examining the results of future validity studies as outlined in the PARCC evidence documents.
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		
__X_ No additional evidence is required		

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

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.1 – Reliability The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State's student population overall and each student group and, if the State's assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including: • Test reliability of the State's assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State's assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student's achievement.	4.1.1 2015 PARCC Technical Report a. Section 8: Reliability (pp. 76-114)	All reliabilities reported by PARCC met industry standards except for certain subjects, accommodations, and subgroups, e.g., American Indians/Alaska Natives, Students with Disabilities, and English learners. Overall SEMs and conditional SEMs (Addendum 7) are better than most state results, probably due to the much larger sample size, a benefit of consortium test participation. These are more than acceptable for a new assessment program. The Livingston Lewis procedures and the results were also acceptable at all cut score levels and achievement levels and when the proficiency levels were collapsed into pass/fail decisions for both accuracy and consistency, they were even higher. (Tables 8.27 and 8.29) NA-CAT
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
__X_ No additional evidence is required.		

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

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

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	American Sign Language GAAP Guidelines Accommodated Test Form Validation Checklists by Accommodation Type PARCC Human Reader Script Guidelines PARCC 2015 Operational Equating Plan and Procedures, pages 18-25 Sample Data Review Item Card Templates • Sample ELA constructed response or technology-enhanced 2-point item card • Sample math constructed response 6-point item card • Sample PCR Task Try Out item card • Sample EBSR and TECR Task Try Out item card • Sample math constructed response 4-point item card • Sample math multiple choice item card • Sample math constructed response 3-point item card TestNav Item Evaluation Iteration 1 – Students with Visual Impairments Usability Study Summary Findings from the PARCC Accommodations and Accessibility Studies Report Findings from the Quality of Items/Tasks/Stimuli Investigations: PARCC Field Tests PARCC Item Development Research: Cognitive Labs for Students with Disabilities and English Learners Product Review Board September Quarterly	

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum 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.	2015 PARCC Technical Report a. Section 12: Scale Scores (pp. 193-219)	Technical Report Section 12 pp 204-215 data appears to support the findings of the Fordham and HumRRO studies regarding a lack of Level 1 items in certain grades and courses. Appendix 12.3 pp 383-384 (Grade 3 ELA/L) indicates that the top 20 achievable score points all round down to 850. This is pattern across grades. What did the TAC think of the impact on IRT calibrations? Peers would be interested in viewing the cumulative frequency distributions across raw score/scale scores – What number and percent of students scored at each raw/scale score point? NNSTOY, Fordham, and HumRRO reports evaluated alignment only for grades 5, 8, and High School in ELA/L and Mathematics. These investigators note that more PLD Level 1 items are needed, particularly at grade 8 and High School Mathematics. Further evidence was noted in the SEM findings from the operational test. Additional item development is reportedly planned to remedy this situation so that the performance of low-achieving students can be more precisely measured.

Section 4.3 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Reference questions in right hand column.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.4 – Scoring 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.	2015 PARCC Technical Report a. Section 4: Item Scoring, pp. 40-49 b. Section 10: IRT Calibration and Scaling in Operational Year One, pp. 148-186 c. Section 12: Scale Scores, pp. 193-219 Handscoring Specifications: Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 Operational Assessments a. pp. 13-67 Final Report: 2015 PARCC Operational Assessment: Psychometric Evaluation PARCC Spring 2015 Test Coordinator Manual, pp. 11-15	Evidence provided conforms to industry standards. Peers noted that "two separate vendors independently conducted the calibration and scaling of the Fall and Spring administrations with a third vendor conducting an external evaluation of these procedures." Recommendations and suggestions noted on page 41 of the 2015 PARCC Operational Assessment: Psychometric Evaluation (4.4.3) should be incorporated by PARCC in future years. For human or hand-scored items (Tech Manual, Section 4.2), "the first score is the score to be reported, while the second, resolution, and adjudication scores are used to monitor scorer performance only." Approximately 90% of the responses were scored only once. A random selection of ten percent of responses were scored a second time by human scorers.. Pearson backread approximately five percent of the hand-scored responses. Backreading scores were used to monitor scorer performance. The first score was always used for both second reads and back reads. Inter-rater agreement in PARCC Technical Report p. 49 for perfect agreement range in mathematics was 92% and in ELA/L was 65%; within one point for mathematics was 99% and for ELA/L was 98%. The inter-rater reliability for ELA/L at the 65% exact agreement expectation should be monitored closely in future years (Technical Report, page 49). Peers noted that this seems a low threshold for exact agreement and should be expected to improve as the assessment matures. PARCC should continue to work toward a more ideal perfect agreement rate on ELA/L scoring.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		To strengthen the credibility of results and precision of scoring, Peers recommend a deeper examination of ELA/L inter-rater exact agreement at the grade for specific areas of concern. Results of this examination could be used to reflect on the precision of rubrics and the adequacy of training for all scorers. Peers' concern is for the implications of the exact agreement rate for the 90% of scores not examined by a second reader for reliability. In Table 4.4 page 49 of the Technical Report, Peers recommend increasing exact agreement expectations for the future for Mathematics to maintain the high mark they have established in the actual results.

Section 4.4 Summary Statement

__X_ No additional evidence is required at this early stage in the assessment.

___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 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.	2015 PARCC Technical Report Operational Equating Plan and Procedures for the 2015 Spring and 2014 Fall Block Administrations ELA/Literacy Blueprints a. ELA Blueprints, 2016 versions for: b. ELA Common Form Specifications for: c. Task Generation Models for: d. Item Guidelines for ELA/Literacy Mathematics Blueprints a. PARCC Mathematics High Level Blueprints b. PARCC Mathematics Assessment Unit Structure c. Mathematics Claim Structure Documents d. Math Subclaim Points Document	Form to form equating: ETS provided a more than adequate model for scaling, equating, etc. that was clearly described in the Technical Report. Peers recommend that PARCC have an independent third party replicate calibrating, scaling, and equating. Peers understand that for the first administration, Pearson attempted to replicate these procedures and the results were checked somewhat independently by Measured Progress. Peers feel a full replication by an independent third party would increase confidence of the final raw score to scale score tables that are used for reporting. Across years – not yet available.

Section 4.5 Summary Statement

__X_ No additional evidence is required at this early stage of the assessment.

___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State: • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.	**1. Design and Development Process** • 2015 PARCC Technical Report • ELA/Literacy Blueprints • Math Blueprints **2. Comparability Studies** • Mode Comparability Study based on Spring 2015 operational test • Spring 2014 Digital Devices Comparability Research Study • Spring 2015 Digital Devices Comparability Research Study • PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, 4th Edition	Multiple Versions: PBT v CBT =The Mode Comparability Study found significant mode differences between PBT and CBT versions of the test. A small number of items for English Language Arts/Literacy (i.e., 0 to 7 items per grade) and a slightly higher number of items for Mathematics (i.e., 2 to 17 items per grade) possessed either positive or negative C-level differential item functioning (DIF) across modes. CBT and PBT items were calibrated separately for each grade/subject. PARCC excluded items flagged for positive and negative C-DIF from the linking sets. Common items that behave differently across modes will have two sets of item parameter estimates: one set for online conversions and one set for paper. Technical Report pp.143-144. Because mode differences were found, Peers noted that PARCC, in the Technical Report referenced calibrating the PBT and CBT separately and post-equating them. This approach will allow for a strong interpretation and compensation for the mode difference. However, Peers were unable to ascertain whether the process was applied prior to reporting scores for the 2014-15 school year or was it done only within the Mode Comparability Study. Did PARCC apply this procedure prior to reporting the 2014-15 test scores? Mode Comparability Study leaders noted, "The current study was not conducted on all PARCC tests but on selected forms of certain grade levels and subjects from one state [sic]. The results varied across grade levels and subjects, which suggests that any preliminary and descriptive conclusions based on these selected tests cannot be generalized to the tests that were not included in this study."

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		What are PARCC's plans for further comparability studies between computer and paper tests? What are the plans to address the issues raised by the study or further investigation given the limitations of this study? What is PARCC doing in the future to ensure score comparability across modes? When scores are reported, PARCC should ensure that adjustments are made across modes so that scores have the same meaning for all students.

Section 4.6 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Plans for applying findings/proposed methodology from the Mode Comparability Study to ensure scores in future years have the same meaning for all students, given possible mode comparability issues.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 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).	2015 PARCC Technical Report Section 13: Quality Control Procedures, pp. 220-229 PARCC Program Quality Plan Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Agendas TAC White Papers commissioned by PARCC	Extensive evidence is provided for the examination and implementation of quality controls during the development of the assessment. TAC Agendas were interesting but excerpts from minutes or summaries of key TAC recommendations would have been more useful. Technical Report page 17 describes the process for evaluating the sufficiency of the item bank for ongoing maintenance of the assessment program, including replenishing items and passages. Peers also noted that field test items were embedded in the Spring 2015 forms.

Section 4.7 Summary Statement
__X_ No additional evidence is required or

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

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
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 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: • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student's IEP Team based on each student's individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;	PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, Fourth Edition Online Professional Development Module on the PARCC Accessibility System Training Module for PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations PARCC Assistive Technology Guidelines	Guidance is extensive and detailed and assumes compliance with IDEA. Training is also provided. In PARCC's Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, Fourth Edition, IEP information is consistent with federal law and regulations. PARCC has provided a series of steps to guide schools in decision-making regarding accessibility and accommodations. However, it is up to PARCC states to develop and adopt policies for educators and ensure that policies are carried out to ensure fairness. PARCC States need to document fidelity of appropriate PNP registration to ensure student access to appropriate accessibility features provided by PARCC. NA per AA-AAS.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA; • Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student's achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State's general assessments); • The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.		

Section 5.1 Summary Statement

- PARCC evidence can be used by the States to support the inclusion of all students in the general assessment. However, each State is ultimately responsible for implementing practices such as those contained in the PARCC materials to ensure that all students have a fair and equitable assessment experience.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs 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: • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.	5.2.0.1 Informational brochures for students, parents, and educators in English and Spanish that pertain to EL participation in PARCC were developed and are available online: Parent PARCC Accessibility Brochure Training Module for PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Initial Draft Development of ELL Section of PARCC Accommodation Manual PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, Fourth Edition Appendix K Bilingual Dictionaries and Glossaries Authorized for Use by English Language Learners on MCAS and PARCC	Guidance is extensive and detailed. Training is also provided. PARCC offers Spanish forms of all math assessments. Use of translated versions is a state option. A list of bilingual dictionaries is provided. Accessibility tools and features are available to all students including ELs. Future translations into other languages is planned as an option for States. Accommodations specific to ELs are also provided. PARCC has provided a series of steps to guide schools in decision-making regarding inclusion of and accommodations for EL students. However, it is up to PARCC states to develop and adopt policies for educators and ensure that policies are carried out to ensure fairness. PARCC States need to document fidelity of appropriate PNP registration to ensure student access to appropriate accessibility features provided by PARCC.

Section 5.2 Summary Statement

- PARCC evidence can be used by the States to support the inclusion of EL students in the general assessment. However, each State is ultimately responsible for implementing the recommended practices contained in the PARCC materials to ensure that all students have a fair and equitable assessment experience.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.3 – Accommodations The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State: • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student's need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.	PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, Fourth Edition PARCC Translation Policy 2015 PARCC Technical Report Findings from the Quality of Items/Tasks/Stimuli Investigations: PARCC Field Tests PARCC Item Development Research: Cognitive Labs (for Students with Disabilities and English Learners) Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation Assessments: 5.3.4.2 PARCC Unique Accommodation Summary Request SECURE DOCUMENT Additional evidence found elsewhere: Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation High School Assessments Quality of Test Administration Investigation	A wide array of accommodations are available for SWD, EL, and students covered under section 504. PARCC evidence describes an array of accessibility features and accommodations provided. However, it is up to PARCC states to ensure they are made available to students with disabilities (IDEA), students covered by Section 504, and English learners. PARCC States need to document fidelity of appropriate PNP registration to ensure student access to appropriate accessibility features provided by PARCC. PARCC has conducted Cognitive Labs to gather initial information about the interaction of students with disabilities and English learners with items and accessibility tools. The HumRRO investigators note in *Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation High School Assessments* that "The Center's forthcoming test characteristics methodology, that considers data from administered tests, will support a fuller examination of accessibility." Findings from the PARCC *Quality of Test Administration Investigations* provide some initial findings from Year 1 operational test for the effectiveness of training and fidelity of use of accessibility features and accommodations. The observational sample was very small for this study. Most data was self-report via survey. Are further studies planned on exactly how well the accessibility tools and features, accommodations, and

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		assistive technology worked in actual use during testing? PARCC provides procedures for exceptional requests to be reviewed and approved in addition to those routinely allowed. (5.3.4.2) During the first operational administration, there were twenty-five exceptional requests of which 17 were approved and 8 were denied. PARCC added one of those 17 approved were added to the fourth edition of the Accessibility and Accommodations Manual. NA per AA-AAS.

Section 5.3 Summary Statement

_X__ No additional evidence is required for PARCC at this early stage of the assessment program.

- Each State is ultimately responsible for implementing the accommodations provided by PARCC to ensure that all students have a fair and equitable assessment experience.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 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: • Consistent with the State's policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student's disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student's IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.	Findings from the PARCC Quality of Test Administration Investigations: Year I of the Operational Assessments Technical Report Additional evidence cited elsewhere: Test Administration Manual 2.6.1.1. Test Coordinator Manual	PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual provides guidance for policies for accommodations and describes their availability in the PARCC assessment. The TAM contains recommendations for test administration practices to support fidelity of test administration procedures. Because PARCC makes available data concerning individual accessibility features and accommodations for download by Test Coordinators, this information should be used by the states for monitoring. States are responsible for monitoring test administration of all assessments in the system.

Section 5.4 Summary Statement

_X__ No additional evidence is required for PARCC at this early stage of the assessment program.

Each State is ultimately responsible for monitoring test administration of all assessments within the State system.

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

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
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically: • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State's academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.	Performance Level Setting Technical Report Performance Level Descriptors 2015 PARCC Technical Report Section 12: Scale Scores, pp. 193-219	PARCC followed an established standard setting process. Cut scores were set for each grade in each content area and for each EOY assessment. PARCC developed achievement level descriptors at each grade level for each content area. Mathematics PLDs are more clearly differentiated and aligned with subclaims from grade to grade than ELA/L PLDs for reading. These were reviewed and confirmed as part of Standard Setting. NA for AA-AAS. State evidence is required to substantiate adoption.

Section 6.1 Summary Statement

_X__ No additional evidence is required from PARCC.

States must provide evidence of formal adoption of academic achievement levels and performance levels.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting 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.	Performance Level Setting Technical Report Performance Level Descriptors	Achievement standards were developed using an industry standard methodology. In Appendix 5 of the Performance Level Setting Technical Report, general descriptive tables of panel participants are provided, but lack sufficient detail to understand the real composition of the panels. PLDs are grade and content specific and were reviewed. Standard setting panels are only described in general terms. Special education and EL participants are not specifically noted.

Section 6.2 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- More descriptive information about the composition of each panel including certification, particularly for special education and English learners

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 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. 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.	Postsecondary Educators' Judgment Study PARCC Benchmarking Study Performance Level Setting Technical Report PARCC Pioneers Information Predictive Validity of MCAS and PARCC Study	Substantial effort has been made to validate the college and career readiness aspect of their PARCC academic achievement standards. NA-AA-AAS

Section 6.3 Summary Statement
_X__ No additional evidence is required

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

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

6.4 – Reporting
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:
• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;
• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;
• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:
  o Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student's achievement;
  o Report the student's achievement in terms of the State's grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);
  o Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;
  o Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to
	2014-2015 Tables of Cross-State and State-Specific PARCC Results
	
	Score Report Interpretation Guide
	
	PARCC 2014-15 Published Report Guidance
	
	Score Report Interpretation Guide (for educators)
	
	Score Report Interpretation Guide For Parents
	
	Summative Record File, field definitions
	
	Parent Score Report Guides in English and Spanish
	
	Setting a New Baseline in English and Spanish
	
	Translated Individual Student Report shells, available in 10 languages
	
	Translated Score Report Interpretation Guide for Parents, available in 10 languages
	
	Report shipment memos (Memos were tailored for each state). Examples from 3 states
	
	PARCC 2014-15 Published Report Guidance
	
	Pearson key dates document: Overview of PARCC reports release dates. Each state had individual release dates within the PARCC window.
		Public Reporting: States are responsible for this item.
		
		Educator Reporting: An Interpretation Guide is provided for educators for all reports available to them. Information is reported in the form of student rosters at the overall content area level and for subclaims for each school and district.
		
		How will teachers receive information about classroom performance? How are classroom results generated? What do they look like?
		
		Peers were unable to locate itemized score analyses. Are they available?
		
		Parent Reporting: PARCC score reports to parents are provide in multiple languages. The reports provide score information in the context of achievement levels and abbreviated subclaim PLDs at the proficient level. The reports are clear and supported by an Interpretation Guide that directs those interested to the location of complete PLDs available on-line.
		
		How will States calculate the percentage of students not tested? No enrollment data are indicated in consortium and State tables. 6.4.1.1. It is unlikely that PARCC has this information. If this is the case, then States will need to calculate and report the percentages of students not tested.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand; • The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.		

Section 6.4 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- What mechanism does PARCC have in place to assist States to provide classroom level reports for teachers?

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

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

April 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes for the NCSC Assessment Consortium

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.

Contents

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 3
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 3
2.2 – Item Development..... 5
2.5 – Test Security 9
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 10

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 11
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 11
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 12
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 13
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables..... 14

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 15
4.1 – Reliability..... 15
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 16
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 17
4.4 – Scoring 18
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 19
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 20
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... 21

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 22
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 22
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 25
5.3 – Accommodations..... 26
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations..... 28

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 29
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 29
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 30
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 31
6.4 – Reporting..... 32

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

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.1 – Test Design and Development 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: • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State's grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 2.1 Purpose **NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015);** p. 8. **NCSC 10: NCSC AA-AAS 2015 Guide for Score Report Interpretation;** p. 1. **NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual,** Chapter 1 Introduction to the NCSC System; p. 8. Intended Interpretation and uses of results **NCSC 10: NCSC AA-AAS 2015 Guide for Score Report Interpretation;** pp. 9-12. **NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual,** Chapter 9 Reporting Interpretation and Use; pp. 184-189. Description of the structure of the assessment **NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015);** pp. 8-13. **NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual,** Chapter 2 Test Development; see especially pp. 9-24. Test blueprints **NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual,** Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 62-65, and Appendices 2K and 2L.	On page 8 of the test administration manual and page 1 of the Score Guide, the purpose listed as to participation in an assessment that is a measure of what they know and can do in relation to the CCSS. **NCSC 15:** Matrix by Users by Report displays the overall reporting structure. NCSC15, pg. 184. It is not clear to what extent the interdisciplinary team that developed the report design template included teachers and other school personnel working directly with students. **NCSC10** pg.12. When reviewing scores by another person, it may be helpful to communicate with the TA that gave the test to gain information that is useful in interpreting the scores. **NCSC 15** (Appendix 2-M): item selection methods - referred to tiers: Items were presented as a series of items tapping progressively higher levels of a construct based on increasing tier and difficulty information from Pilot Phase 1. It would be helpful to explain the tier development process and what this means -is it related to DOK? NCSC15. NCSC partners approved 10 math targets per grade level, 7-9 reading targets per grade level, and 3 writing targets per grade level. (pp.21) How did the development partner go about selecting passages for grade level and complexity of the tests. More specificity of the process and how this was reviewed by teachers is needed.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• 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);	**NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual,** Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 9-59. **NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual,** Appendix 2-M **NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual,** Chapter 3 Alignment and System Coherence; pp. 80-82. Appendix 3B. **NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual,** Chapter 7 Standard Setting; pp. 136-137. **NCSC 8: NCSC Assessment System User Guide for Test Administrators,** Description of interface and assessment features; pp. 58	
• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.	The consortium does not administer computer adaptive assessments. Not applicable to NCSC AA-AAS	
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
_X_ No additional evidence is required		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.2 – Item Development 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-AAorder thinking skills.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 2.2 **NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual,** Approach to test design and defining the construct Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 10-22 Developing the item model Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 22-28 Item Review Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 31-24 Item data reviews Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 52-57 Technical platform and assessment features Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 35-36 Form assembly procedures and specifications Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 65-59 Operational blueprints Chapter 2 Test Development; Appendices 2K, 2L, and 2M. Item specifications reflected in exemplar design pattern and task template Chapter 2 Test Development; Appendix 2-z	NCSC 15: Test blueprints reflect the development and emphasis of content in the college and career ready standards. Perhaps the blueprints should also include level(s) of cognition which are operationally defined. In the document referenced, it is not clear how the tiers relate to DOK.
Section 2.2 Summary Statement _X_No additional evidence is required.		

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

2.3 – Test Administration The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State: 2.3.a Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;	The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 2.2 Standardized procedures for assessment administration; accessibility tools, features, and accommodations NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015) Standardized procedures for assessment administration pp. 9, 10, 12-28 Accessibility tools and features, including use of reader pp. 9, 15, 21-23 Instructions for accommodations, including use of scribe pp. 9, 15-16, 21-24, 36-37 Expectations for training and test security regarding test administration with readers and scribes NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators • Module 2: Overview of NCSC AA-AAS (Test) and Testing Integrity • Module 3: Optimal Testing Conditions and Assessment Features • Module 4: Test Accommodations and Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test Administration Standardized procedures for assessment administration, (continued) NCSC 3: Directions for Test Administration: Tables of Contents and Front Matter for Mathematics and English Language Arts - Reading Grades 3 – 8 and 11	In the training modules for test administration: • Quizzes would be stronger if they have at least four questions; some modules had only 2 questions. • Quizzes would provide more useful information if the test taker needed to complete the training to answer all the questions. Invalidation is not defined. As a part of training, it would help users to have • Examples of situations that warrant invalidation. • Clarification of the invalidation decision-making process. Training would be stronger if it reflected a policy requirement that all students take sample items to learn functionality and format for both online and paper versions of the test.

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

2.3.b 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;	NCSC coordinated evidence for all States Expectations for NCSC Online Test Administration Training Requirements for Test Administrators and Test Coordinators NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015); pp. 17, 19 NCSC 7: Directions for Test Administration of Mathematics Sample Items Grades 3, 6, 11 and Directions for Test Administration of English Language Arts - Reading Sample Items Grades 4, 8, 11 NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators Module 1: Training Requirements and Responsibilities of Test Administrators Module 2: Overview of NCSC AA-AAS (Test) and Testing Integrity Module 3: Optimal Testing Conditions and Assessment Features Module 4: Test Accommodations and Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test Administration Module 5: Navigate the Assessment System Module 6: Before Test: Complete Demographics, LCI, and Accommodations Module 7: Student Response Check Module 8: Student Experience in the NCSC Assessment System Module 9: Mathematics DTA – Administer the Test Module 10: ELA DTA – Administer the Test Module 13: Submitting or Closing a Test, Accommodations- After Test, and End of Test Survey NCSC 6: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Coordinators Module 1: Responsibilities of Test Coordinators Module 2: Overview of NCSC AA-AAS (Test) and Testing Integrity Module 3: Navigate the NCSC Assessment System Documentation of procedures to ensure that test administrators and coordinators access and complete	NCSC 5. The submission for peer review does not include the field test constructed response items in the ELA Writing assessment. Therefore, Modules 11 and 12, which pertain to the field test constructed response ELA Writing items are expected to be included with the training modules in NCSC 5. It is not clear in situations in which a TC is also a TA, whether he/she is required to also complete the required training for TAs as well as pass the required quiz prior to having access to the test.

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

2.3.c If the State administers technology-based assessments, (i) the State has defined technology and other related requirements, (ii) included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and (iii) established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.	NCSC coordinated evidence for all States Defined technology and related requirements NCSC 8: NCSC Assessment System User Guide for Test Administrators; pp. 66-67 NCSC 9: NCSC Assessment System User Guide for Test Coordinators; pp. 72-73 Technology-based standardized test administration procedures NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015); pp. 9- 18, and 21-34 Contingency plans that outline strategies for managing possible challenges or disruptions during test administration NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015); pp. 16, 19, 35 NCSC 8: NCSC Assessment System User Guide for Test Administrator; p. 2 NCSC 9: NCSC Assessment System User Guide for Test Coordinator; p. 6	In its current form, the only contingency plan is to directly call the help desk. • A troubleshooting guide would provide valuable support to users for addressing technology-related issues (e.g., loss of connectivity, power failure) before calling the contractor. • It is not clear whether there is redundancy in the system that saves and restores student responses in the event of tech problems.

Section 2.3 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

Evidence of consistent standardized procedures that address (unless determined to be State-specific evidence)

- Test administration instructions and training that address rules for invalidating test results when necessary
- Ensuring that all students are familiar with the item format and online functionality including sample items before test administration

Evidence of contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.5 – Test Security 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: • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State's assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 2.5 Test security procedures before, during and after test administration **NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015);** pp. 15-16,18-19**,** 25-28, and 36-37 Incident-reporting procedures and consequences **NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015);** p. 28 Requirements for annual test security training for Test Administrators and Test Coordinators **NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015);** pp. 17, 19, 25 **NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators** • Module 2: Overview of NCSC AA-AAS (Test) and Testing Integrity **NCSC 6: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Coordinators** • Module 2: Overview of NCSC AA-AAS (Test) and Testing Integrity	The process for refreshing items and test forms is not clear which has implications for test security, especially when parts of the test are printed. NCSC should have processes and procedures for preventing, detecting, reporting, investigating, and remediating assessment irregularities or clarification of which aspects should be addressed by state-specific evidence.
Section 2.5 Summary Statement		
__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence that NCSC has processes and procedures for preventing, detecting, reporting, investigating, and remediating assessment irregularities or clarification of which aspects should be addressed by state-specific evidence (unless determined to be State-specific 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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy 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: • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.	The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 2.6 Integrity and confidentially of test materials, test-related data, and PII **NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual, Appendix 2-C: Design for Technical Platform for NCSC Assessment System,** p. 15 of 25 (in page navigation) "System Security Layers"	The consortium indicated that the Vendor contracts with States had security requirements for data handling and redress options were not provided to verify. Appropriately redacted test contracts may be needed. The Amazon Web Services (AWS) secure global infrastructure and services are subject to regular third-party compliance audits (NCSC 15 p.13). Most of the cited evidence is a NCSC Glossary. It is unclear how "System Security Layers" protect the integrity of test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results.
Section 2.6 Summary Statement		
__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence that the NSCS has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information or clarification of which aspects should be addressed by state-specific evidence (unless determined to be State-specific 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.

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State's validity evidence includes evidence that the State's assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State's academic content standards, including: • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State's assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State's academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State's academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 3.1 **NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual,** Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 9-69. **NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual,** <u>Relationship of the Core Content Connectors (CCCs) to grade level academic content standards</u> Chapter 3 Alignment and System Coherence; pp. 72-75 and Appendix 3-B, Study 1. **NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual,** <u>Alignment of the tasks and items to grade-level CCSS</u> Chapter 3 Alignment and System Coherence; pp. 77-80 and Appendix 3-B, Study 3. <u>Alignment of NCSC items to the performance level descriptors (PLDs)</u> Chapter 3 Alignment and System Coherence; pp. 80-82 and Appendix 3-B, Study 4.	The consortium provided a range of studies that was clear and well documented of the iterative process used to address this area. As part of this process, the consortium demonstrated the breadth of content and cognitive complexity as appropriate.
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence for 3.1-3.4 is required once writing items are part of the operational test.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 3.2 **NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual,** Chapter 2 Test Development <u>Interaction Studies</u> - Student and teacher interaction with task templates pp. 57-58 - Student interaction with and teacher perception of mathematics and reading items pp. 58-59 End of test survey: data collection and analyses; pp. 59-60, and 62 Writing evaluation study; p. 61 <u>Item specifications reflected in exemplar design pattern and task template</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; Appendix 2-A	It is unclear how the end of test survey questions informed test administration.
Section 3.2 Summary Statement		
__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence for 3.1-3.4 is required once writing items are part of the operational test.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 3.3 **NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual** <u>DIF analyses</u> Chapter 8 Studies of Reliability and construct-Related Validity; summarized pp. 177-179 and detailed in appendix 8-C <u>Analyses of item statistics by tier</u> Chapter 6 Psychometric Analyses Classical statistics; pp. 120-121, and IRT parameters; pp. 136-127 <u>Classical Statics and Reliability</u> Chapter 8 Studies of Reliability and construct-Related Validity; Appendix 8-A <u>Dimensionality analyses</u> Chapter 8 Studies of Reliability and construct-Related Validity; pp. 179-183	DIMTEST and DETECT analyses were applied to all grades and content areas. All the DETECT values for 2014-15 indicated moderate to strong and very strong multidimensionality (p.182). It appears that a major IRT assumption is violated. NCSC has identified multidimensionality as a critical issue to be addressed with their TAC and member states.
Section 3.3 Summary Statement		
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence that documents how apparent violations of the IRT assumption of test unidimensionality have been sufficiently addressed and remediated for future test administrations. Evidence for 3.1-3.4 is required once writing items are part of the operational test.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.	The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 3.4 **NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual** Alignment between knowledge, skills, and abilities in assessment to student learning expectations for instruction Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 75-76 and Appendix 3-B, Study 2. Vertical coherence study Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 82-84 and Appendix 3-B, Study 5.	
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		
__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence for 3.1-3.4 is required once writing items are part of the operational test.		

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

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.1 – Reliability The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State's student population overall and each student group and, if the State's assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including: • Test reliability of the State's assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State's assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student's achievement.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.1 **NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual** Test form reliability coefficients and standard error of measurement for all grades and content areas Chapter 8 Studies of Reliability and Construct-Related Validity; pp. 171-174. Reliability coefficients and standard error of measurement for subgroups and disability categories Chapter 8 Studies of Reliability and Construct-Related Validity; Appendix 8-A. **NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual** Overall SEM by grade, content, and form Chapter 8 Studies of Reliability and Construct-Related Validity; pp. 171-174. Test Characteristic Curves (TCCs), Test Information Function (TIFs) and Conditional Standard Error Measurement (CSEM) by grade, content, and form Chapter 6 Psychometric Analyses; Appendix 6-F. • NCSC is not computer-adaptive.	Writing is missing because it was field tested; however, the coefficient reliability results will be required at a later date as well as the ELA results that include writing.
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence for 4.1,4.3, and 4.4 for the ELA test is required once writing items are part of the operational test.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility 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.	The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.2 **Technical Manual** Principled approach to assessment development and developing the item model Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 12-16 and pp. 22-24. Item Specifications Reflected in Example Annotated Design Pattern and Task Template Chapter 2 Test Development; Appendix 2-A. Appendix 2-B- Accessibility by Design – Accommodations Committee Work Chapter 2 Test Development; Appendix 2-B. Item review procedures Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 31-34 Item data reviews Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 54-57 Technical platform and assessment features Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 36-38 DIF analyses Chapter 8 Studies of Reliability and Construct-Related Validity; summarized pp. 177-179 and detailed in appendix 8-C	
Section 4.2 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum 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.	The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.3 **CSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual** Alignment of the tasks and items to grade-level CCSS Chapter 3 Alignment and System Coherence; pp. 77-80 and Appendix 3-B. Alignment of NCSC items to the performance level descriptors (PLDs) Chapter 3 Alignment and System Coherence; pp. 80-82 and Appendix 3-B, Study 4. Test Map for Core Items Chapter 6 Psychometric Analysis; Appendix 6-B (p.35). Performance level and scale score distributions Chapter 6 Psychometric Analysis; pp. 130-131 and Appendix 6-I. Test Characteristic Curves and Test Information Functions for all grade/ content tests Chapter 6 Psychometric Analysis; Appendix 6-F.	Evidence for 4.3 is required once writing items are part of the operational test. Math panelists reported focus KSAs provided full support for some but not all four math claims, writing panelists indicated some but fell short of providing full evidence in support of the claim (pg. 82) TCC, TIF and CSEM curves generally appear as expected. Model-data fit for the "combined" items were problematic. Especially for the grade 11 Tier 1 WP item, the estimated *a*-parameter equaled 11.34, an extremely abnormal value, with a huge standard error of .61, indicating that the model does not adequately fit the data (p.7). What was done to remedy the fit issue?
Section 4.3 Summary Statement		
__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence for 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4 for the ELA test is required once writing items are part of the operational test.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.4 – Scoring 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.4 **NCSC 1: Test Administration Manual** pp. 12-13, pp. 29-33, and pp. 36-42. **NCSC 5: Training Modules for Test Administrators** See modules 9-12 and pp. 193-336. **NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual** Chapter 4 Test Administration; pp. 86-99. <u>Detailed Description of Scoring Procedures</u> Chapter 5 Scoring; pp. 100-114. <u>Procedures, rationale, and results for IRT-based scaling</u> Chapter 6 Psychometric Analyses; pp. 121-129 and Appendix 6-C. <u>NCSC Scoring Decisions</u> Chapter 6 Psychometric Analyses; Appendix 6-D.	Evidence for 4.4 for the ELA test is required once writing items are part of the operational test, including standardized scoring procedures designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations. o Interrater reliability o Scoring Math CR items o Instructions for ELA o Scoring of Reading Words CR o Fit issue resolution 2014-15 was the first year of test administration. How will between year equating be conducted for 2014-15 and 2015-16? Appendix 6 D, page 7. Model fit for combined items problematic, 11.34 is high value; high 0.61 indicating the model does not fit the data. How has this fit issue been resolved?

Section 4.4 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
Evidence for 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4 for the ELA test is required once writing items are part of the operational test to include:

- Evidence of standardized scoring procedures designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for ELA, including writing after it is added, and math, including:
  - Interrater reliability
  - Procedures for scoring math and reading word constructed-response items and writing items
  - Instructions for scorers of ELA constructed-response items, including writing
  - Documentation that Fit issue has been resolved
- Evidence of impact on scoring based on rules for invalidating test results

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.5 **NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual** IRT Calibration, Scaling, and Equating Process Chapter 6 Psychometric Analyses; pp. 121-130. Stability of form variance and difficulty Chapter 6 Psychometric Analyses; pp. 124-125 (Tables 6-10 and 6-11). Test Characteristic Curves (TCC) and Test Information Functions (TIF) for all forms for all grades and content areas Chapter 6 Psychometric Analyses; Appendix 6-F	Equating across years is not pertinent because 2014-15 is the first administration. How will between-year equating be conducted for 2014-15 and 2015-16? It would be helpful if there was a reference back to whether the forms match the blueprint to address this section.
Section 4.5 Summary Statement		
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The consortium must provide evidence to address comparability across years, including addressing the inclusion of writing in 2015-16 years.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State: • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.	The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.6 **NCSC 1: Test Administration Manual** pp. 12-13, pp. 29-33, and pp. 36-42. **NCSC 5: Training Modules for Test Administrators** See modules 9-12 and pp. 193-336. **NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual** Chapter 4 Test Administration; pp. 86-99. **NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual** Item Specifications Reflected in Example Annotated Design Pattern and Task Template Chapter 2 Test Development; Appendix 2-A. Alignment and System Coherence Chapter 3 Alignment and System Coherence; Appendix 3-B.	Clarify choice for paper version use. Is this based on technical support, availability of computers, teacher preference or is it only as an accommodation by the IEP team? If it is not an accommodation only, evidence must be provided to support comparability.

Section 4.6 Summary Statement

__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale
Evidence either that paper versions of the assessments are an accommodation or documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results across the technology and paper-based version of the assessments.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 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).	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.7 **NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual** Chapter 2, Test development Chapter 3, Alignment and System Coherence **NCSC 16: TAC membership and agendas** **NCSC 17: Post-Administration Research Studies**	Post administration studies are listed in NCSC 17 but there is no plan, timeline, or evidence that any will be completed. NCSC 16 does not provide information on TAC recommendations; there are agendas but no decision points or meeting summaries. Evidence of an ongoing system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving the quality of its assessment system for future years.

Section 4.7 Summary Statement
__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence of an ongoing system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving the quality of its assessment system for future years.

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

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
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 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: • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student's IEP Team based on each student's individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 5.1 **NCSC 2: Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions for the NCSC Alternate Assessment of English Language Arts and Mathematics and Training** <u>Guidance for IEP Team decisions</u> **NCSC 2: Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions for the NCSC Alternate Assessment of English Language Arts and Mathematics and Training;** pp. 3-18. **NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015)** Student Participation Criteria; p. 20. **NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators** • Module 2: Overview of NCSC AA-AAS (Test) and Testing Integrity <u>Guidelines to determine assessment using an alternate assessment</u> **NCSC 2: Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions for the NCSC Alternate Assessment of English Language Arts and Mathematics and Training**; pp. 3-18. <u>Accessibility tools, features, and accommodations</u> **NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration**	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; • Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA; • Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student's achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State	**Manual (2015);** pp. 9, 23-25, and 36-37. **NCSC 4: Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, of Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test Administration** **NCSC 8: User Guide for Test Administrators;** pp. 18, 26-28, and 55-65. **NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators** • Module 3: Optimal Testing Conditions and Assessment Features • Module 4: Test Accommodations and Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test Administration • Module 6: Before Test: Complete Demographics, LCI, and Accommodations **NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015);** pp. 9, 23-25. **NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators** • Module 4: Test Accommodations and Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test Administration <u>IDEA disability categories and assessment decisions</u> **NCSC 2: Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions for the NCSC Alternate Assessment of English Language Arts and**	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State's general assessments); • The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.	**Mathematics and Training;** pp. 5, 6-7 (#2). Promote access to general curriculum **NCSC 2: Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions for the NCSC Alternate Assessment of English Language Arts and Mathematics and Training**; p. 7 (#4). **NCSC 11: Parent Overview of the NCSC Assessment System: Grades 3 – 8 and 11** **NCSC 12: NCSC Brief 1: AA-AAS: Standards That Are the "Same but Different"** **NCSC 13: NCSC Brief 5: Standards-based Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) for Students Who Participate in AA-AAS** **NCSC 14: NCSC Brief 7: NCSC's Content Model for Grade-Aligned Instruction and Assessment: "The Same Curriculum for All Students"**	

Section 5.1 Summary Statement
__X_ No additional evidence is required

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs 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: • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.	The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 5.2 English learners and accommodations **NCSC 2: Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions for the NCSC Alternate Assessment of English Language Arts and Mathematics and Training**; p. 7 (#3). Accessibility tools, features, and accommodations for English learners **NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015);** pp. 9, 23-25. **NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators** • Module 4: Test Accommodations and Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test Administration **NCSC 8: User Guide for Test Administrators;** pp. 55-65 Guidance for selection of accommodations for English learners **NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015);** pp. 9, 24, and 36-37. **NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators** • Module 4: Test Accommodations and Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test	The evidence does not address 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.

Section 5.2 Summary Statement

__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Provide procedures to ensure the inclusion of English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the assessments and clearly communicates this information or clarification that these components should be addressed by state-specific evidence (unless determined to be State-specific 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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.3 – Accommodations The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State: • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student's need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 5.3 <u>Availability of accommodations for students with disabilities</u> **NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015);** pp. 9, 24, 36-37. **NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators** • Module 4: Test Accommodations and Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test Administration **NCSC 8: User Guide for Test Administrator;** pp. 18, 26-28. <u>Accommodations for English learners</u> **NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015);** pp. 9, 24, 36-37. **NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators** • Module 4: Test Accommodations and Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test Administration **NCSC 8: User Guide for Test Administrator;** pp. 18, 26-28. **Technical Manual**	While there is a training module and user guide to identify accommodations, there is no discussion of whether 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. Are there additional accommodations that NCSC suggests as part of procedures for EL and if so, what direction is given to the state? NCSC evidence does not address EL procedures for inclusion of all EL students in the state assessment. NCSC is silent on providing any direction to the states around • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learner.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Principled approach to assessment development and developing the item model Chapter 2 Test Development. Item Specifications Reflected in Example Annotated Design Pattern and Task Template Chapter 2 Test Development; Appendix 2-A. Accessibility by Design – Accommodations Committee Work Chapter 2 Test Development; Appendix 2-B. Chapter 4 Test Administration; pp. 88-90. Documentation of accommodations, Student response check, Accessibility Features Chapter 4 Test Administration; p. 96. Accommodations Frequencies Chapter 6 Psychometric Analyses; Appendix 6-L. **NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators** • Module 4: Test Accommodations and Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test Administration; pp. 62-84.	

Section 5.3 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- 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.
- Evidence that appropriate accommodations for English learners (EL) are available.
- Evidence of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 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: • Consistent with the State's policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student's disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student's IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.		**The Consortium did not provide a response to Critical Element 5.4. It was indicated that this will be state specific evidence.**

Section 5.4 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

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

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
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically: • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State's academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 6.1 **NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual** Development of Grade Level Performance Level Descriptors Chapter 7 Standard Setting; Appendix 7-A. **NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual** Performance Level Descriptor Front Matter and Performance Level Descriptors Chapter 7 Standard Setting; Appendix 7-B. **NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual** Performance level and scale score distributions Chapter 6 Psychometric Analyses; pp. 130-131 and Appendix 6-I.	

Section 6.1 Summary Statement
_X__ No additional evidence is required

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS **NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual** Rationale for selection of method Chapter 7 Standard Setting; p. 132. Selection and characteristics of panelists Chapter 7 Standard Setting; pp.144-146. Detailed description of procedures Chapter 7 Standard Setting; pp. 146-157. Results, evaluation, and policy adjustments Chapter 7 Standard Setting; pp. 158-168. External evaluation • Chapter 7 Standard Setting; pp. 169-170. • Synopsis of Validity Evidence for the Cut scores Derived from the Grades 3 - 8 and 11 Standard Setting a. Chapter 7 Standard Setting; Appendix 7-O. • Review of the Standard Setting Report a. Chapter 7 Standard Setting; Appendix 7-P. • Plake validity evidence memo a. Chapter 7 Standard Setting; Appendix 7-Q.	

Section 6.2 Summary Statement
__X_ No additional evidence is required

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 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. 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 6.3 **NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual** Chapter 7 Standard Setting; Appendix 7-A. <u>Alignment between knowledge, skills, and abilities in assessment to student learning expectations for instruction.</u> Chapter 3 Alignment and System coherence; pp. 75-76, Appendix 3-B, Study 2. <u>Vertical coherence study</u> Chapter 3 Alignment and System coherence; pp. 82-84, Appendix 3-B, Study 5.	Evidence provided shows that the alternate academic achievement standards demonstrate adequate linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

Section 6.3 Summary Statement
__X_ No additional evidence is required

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

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

6.4 – Reporting
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:
• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;
• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;
• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:
  o Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student's achievement;
  o Report the student's achievement in terms of the State's grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);
  o Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;
  o Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to
	The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 6.4
	
	<u>Interpretive guidance for use with State report</u>
	NCSC 10: NCSC AA-AAS 2015 Guide for Score Report Interpretation
	
	<u>Examples of reports of assessment results</u>
	NCSC 10: NCSC AA-AAS 2015 Guide for Score Report Interpretation; pp. 17-23.
	
	<u>Interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of assessment results</u>
	NCSC 10: NCSC AA-AAS 2015 Guide for Score Report Interpretation; pp. 1-8, 9 – 12, 27 – 41 (performance level descriptors).
	
	<u>Individual student reports for each content area and grade level</u>
	
	NCSC 10: NCSC AA-AAS 2015 Guide for Score Report Interpretation, Appendix A. Individual Student Report;
	pp. 23, 25-26.
	
	<u>Interpretive guidance that accompanies individual student reports</u>
	NCSC 10: NCSC AA-AAS 2015 Guide for Score Report Interpretation;
	pp. 25-26.
	
	NCSC 11: Parent Overview of the NCSC Assessment System: Grades 3 – 8 and 11
		There are no itemized score analyses at any reporting level. Scores are only presented at the test level, no domain or "subtest" scores. Efforts should be made to generate reports at finer content/process grain sizes (e.g., reporting reading and writing).
		
		The evidence does not indicate that 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.
		
		NCSC10, Page 14 test status: lists several different test statuses, but it is not clear how each status impacts scores and reporting. Specifically the "did not test, DNT" status is not defined as to what is included, such as parent refusal, ESR/ESM, and invalid.
		
		There is no information on timeliness of reporting results to parents, educators, and principals.
		
		There is no indication that descriptive assessment reports are available in alternate format (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.
		
		No consortium report at the content level test provided detailed information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand; • The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.		

Section 6.4 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Evidence that individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic assessment 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 (unless determined to be State-specific evidence).
- Evidence must be provided 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 (unless determined to be State-specific evidence).
- data element definitions (e.g., do not test category include and how is it reflected in reports) in reports to clarify how each student is counted and reported.

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