



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, DC 20002

August 28, 2018

Dear Superintendent Kang:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (the Department) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), which governed State assessments through the 2016-2017 school year. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), which governs State assessments beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, maintains the essential requirements from NCLB that each State annually administer high-quality assessments in at least reading/language arts, mathematics and science that meet nationally recognized professional and technical standards with a few additional requirements. I appreciate the efforts of the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) to prepare for the review, which occurred in February 2018, and which was a follow up to a review that occurred in 2016.

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

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated OSSE's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the general assessments for reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 3-8 and high school (Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC)) meet all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB.

Congratulations on this significant accomplishment. Assessments that produce valid and reliable results are fundamental to a State's accountability system. In regard to the other assessments that OSSE submitted for the February 2018 peer review, peer reviewers and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the components of OSSE's assessment system meet most, but not all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB.

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

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

Based on the recommendations from this peer review and the Department's analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- General assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts for grades 3-8 (PARCC): **Meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**
- General assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts for high school (PARCC): **Meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**
- Alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for grades 3-8 and high school in reading/language arts and mathematics (National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC)/Multi-State Alternative Assessment (MSAA)): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB.**

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.

Please note that the assessment requirements for ESEA, as amended by the NCLB, were in effect through the end of the 2016-2017 school year. The OSSE peer review was conducted under the requirements of this statute. Beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, the assessment requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, will apply to State assessments. Department staff carefully reviewed the evidence and peer review recommendations in light of the updated requirements for State assessments under the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. As a result of this additional review, I have determined that the OSSE administration of the MSAA assessments needs to meet one additional requirement related to alternate academic achievement standards. This requirement is listed under critical element 6.3. Under the orderly transition authority in section 4(b) of the ESSA, I am granting OSSE until December 15, 2020, to submit evidence of an AA-AAAS that meets this ESSA requirement.

The specific list of items required for OSSE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because the AA-AAAS for grades 3-8 and high school in reading/language arts and mathematics have yet to meet all of the requirements stemming from the 2016 and 2018 peer reviews, 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 2019 IDEA Part B grant award.

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

Please be aware that approval of OSSE’s use of PARCC assessments is not a determination that the system complies with Federal civil rights requirements, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, and requirements under IDEA. Also, please remember that, if OSSE makes significant changes in its assessments, the State must submit information about those changes to the Department for review and approval.

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 Millie Bentley-Memon of my staff at: OSS.DC@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank Brogan
Assistant Secretary for
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Danielle Branson, Director of Assessments

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
2.3 – Test Administration	For the National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC)/Multi-State Alternative Assessment (MSAA): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the MSAA assessments that include evidence of a policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration in writing (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing.
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	For the NCSC/MSAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence that item response theory assumptions of test unidimensionality are met.
4.1 – Reliability	For the NCSC/MSAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When MSAA implements constructed response operational writing items, appropriate studies must be conducted to determine reliability.
4.4 – Scoring	For the NCSC/MSAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for constructed-response items in reading/language arts and mathematics and also operational writing items. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability; and ○ Clear scoring rubrics, comprehensive instructions for raters, adequate training of raters, and evaluation of inter-rater reliability.
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards (additional requirement under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA)	For the NCSC/MSAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act. The State educational agency should provide this evidence by December 15, 2020.
6.4 – Reporting	For the NCSC/MSAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

February-March 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes State PARRC+MSAA Resubmission



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

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment; ○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1.4 - 2016-17 OSSE Districtwide Assessments Participation Policy final (PDF) ○ 1.4 - 2016-17 Testing Accommodations Guide Part 2 (English Learners) (PDF) – pages 1-8 ○ 1.4 - PARCC AF&A Manual – Sixth Edition (PDF) – pages 41 – 48; 49-64 ○ 1.4 - 2017 MSAA Test Administration Manual (PDF) – pages 18-25 <p>(See State’s Index document for more details)</p>	<p>ED required DC OSSE to submit evidence that, if the State administers native language assessments, the State requires ELs to be assessed in R/LA in English if they have been enrolled in US schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.</p> <p>DC OSSE wrote on its index page (p. 2) that the State does <u>not</u> provide native language versions of assessments in R/LA (PARCC), and that the State does provide accommodations for its math assessments (PARCC). Therefore, the 3-5 year time limit under the ESEA for ELs to be assessed in R/LA in the native language is not applicable.</p> <p>In the PARCC A&F Manual, the SEA presents a table of linguistic and non-linguistic accommodations for ELs on achievement assessments. Some of the linguistic accommodations listed include word-word dictionaries and read aloud and clarification of instructions using the</p>

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>native language, as well as the transadaptation of the PARCC math and DC science assessments in Spanish, which the SEA considers its native language version of an assessment. (See PARCC A & F Manual – (accommodations Table 7 beginning on p. 42.) Further in the EL Accommodations Manual Document, the SEA lists this transadaptation, which is presentation of test content in Spanish, as being only offered for math (and not for R/LA and science.) (p. 4)</p> <p>Based on the evidence provided, it appears that OSSE has met this critical element.</p> <p>During review of this evidence; however, a question regarding the SEA’s policy for assessment of recently arrived ELs emerged. Specifically, in OSSE’s Districtwide Participation Policy document, the SEA writes that, “...recently arrived EL students first enrolled in U.S. schools within 12 months from the first day of the previous year’s test window are...exempt from taking the PARCC ELA or MSAA ELA assessment.” (p. 5) The SEA does not explicitly state, as required in the assessment regulations, that this exemption is a one-time exemption. As the testing window may</p>

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		shift from year-year, ED strongly recommends that DC OSSE add language to its policy clearly limiting this exemption to one time. (For example, if the testing window began on 4/1/18 for SY 2017-18 and on 3/28/19 for SY2018-19, an EL could have been enrolled fewer than 12 months at the time of the second window, and according to the policy as written, be exempted a second time.)
Section 1.4 Summary Statement (2016 Review)		
<p><input type="checkbox"/>_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: For the entire assessment system, the District of Columbia Office of the State Superintendent (OSSE) must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 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. 		
Section 1.4 Summary Statement (2018 Review)		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>_X_ No additional evidence is required; however, see comment above regarding the SEA's policy on assessment of recently arrived ELs.</p>		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>District of Columbia Additional State-Specific Evidence for NCSC/MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence for 2.3.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 2.3.1 – 2017-18 MSAA System User Guide for Test Coordinators (PDF) – pages 1-48 o 2.3.1 – MSAA Technology Support (web) o 2.3.1 – 2016-17 MSAA System Registration Guidance (PPT) – slides 1- 17 • Evidence for 2.3.2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 2.3.2 – MSAA Practice Opportunities for Students in DC o 2.3.2 – MSAA Sample ELA Items – Gr4_test (PDF) o 2.3.2 – MSAA Sample ELA Items – Gr8_test (PDF) o 2.3.2 – MSAA Sample ELA Items – Gr11_test (PDF) o 2.3.2 – MSAA Sample Math Items – Gr3_test (PDF) o 2.3.2 – MSAA Sample Math Items – Gr6_test (PDF) o 2.3.2 – MSAA Sample Math Items – Gr11_test (PDF) • Evidence for 2.3.3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 2.3.3 – 2016-17 DC MSAA Test Administrator Training (PPT) – slides 2-114 o 2.3.3 – 2016-17 MSAA Test 	<p>ED required DC OSSE to submit the following additional evidence for the R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA) assessments in grades 3-8 and high school, OSSE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 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

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As 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
	<p>Administration Manual (PDF) – pages 1-56</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 2.3.3 – 2017-18 MSAA Test Administration Manual (PDF) – pages 1-56 o 2.3.3 – 2016-17 OSSE Assessment Training Schedule (PDF) o Sample selection of communications sent to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) regarding MSAA test administration: ♣ 2.3.3 – NGA Bulletin 1 24 17 ♣ 2.3.3 – NGA Bulletin 1 31 17 ♣ 2.3.3 – NGA Bulletin 2 22 17 ♣ 2.3.3 – NGA Bulletin 3 15 17 ♣ 2.3.3 – NGA Bulletin 3 29 17 ♣ 2.3.3 – NGA Bulletin 5 9 17 ♣ 2.3.3 – NGA Bulletin 5 16 17 ♣ 2.3.3 – NGA Bulletin 7 12 17 ♣ 2.3.3 – NGA Bulletin 7 26 17 ♣ 2.3.3 – NGA Bulletin 10 21 16 ♣ 2.3.3 – NGA Bulletin 12 2 16 ♣ 2.3.3 – NGA Bulletin 12 20 16 <p>(See State’s Index document for more details)</p>	<p>administration across districts and schools.</p> <p>DC OSSE provided numerous documents that substantiate that the SEA has established and communicated standardized procedures for test administration of the NCSC/MSAA assessments. A summary of these documents and relevant information is shown below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MSAA online assessment user guide – 2018 – This user guide provides an end-end summary of how to access, use, and close the system, and includes instructions regarding accessibility features and assistive technology (see Appendixes.) ▪ MSAA testing system – operational support overview – This document outlines the technology components needed to utilize the system. ▪ 2017-2018 MSAA test administration manual – This document outlines all stages of MSAA test administration, 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
		<p>addresses training, directions for test administration, how to address test irregularities, and related topics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MSAA practice opportunities for students in DC – This document shows the websites where sample items are available for practice. The SEA also provided several files with practice items for different ELA and math. <p>Based on the evidence provided, it appears that OSSE has met this critical element.</p>
Section 2.3 Summary Statement (2016 Review)		
<p><u>_x_</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>For the R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and high school, OSSE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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: ○ Evidence of a troubleshooting guide to address technology-related contingency plans. ○ 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. ○ Evidence of training to ensure consistency of administration across districts and schools. 		
Section 2.3 Summary Statement (2018 Review)		
<u>_X_</u> No additional evidence is required – See comments above.		

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; <p>Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</p>	<p>5.2 – 2016-17 OSSE Districtwide Assessments Participation Policy_final (PDF)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 5.2 - DC English Learner Guidebook 2.0 (PDF) o 5.2 - DC English Learner Guidebook (PDF) o 5.2 – 2017-18 OSSE Testing Accommodations Guide Part 2 (English Learners) - draft (PDF) – pages 1-10 o 5.2 – 2017 Unique Accommodations Form_final (PDF) <p>(See State’s Index document for more details)</p>	<p>ED required that for the R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and high school, OSSE provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); and • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. <p>DC OSSE provided numerous documents to address this element. A summary of these documents and relevant information is shown below.</p> <p>Districtwide Assessments Participation Policy for 2016-17: This document lists the ESEA assessment requirements for RLA and math and states that the MSAA is one of the assessments offered under these requirements (p. 1). The document further</p>

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>states that students with significant cognitive disabilities who are eligible for the alternate assessment will take the MSAA in grades 3-8 and grade 11 (p. 2).</p> <p>2017-18 Testing Accommodations Guide Part II – English Learners: This guide contains an overview of each accommodation for ELs and eligibility criteria, along with accessibility features specific to each DC statewide assessment (pages 2-10). This guide explains how ELs who are also SWDs could be eligible to receive accommodations to address both language and disability needs (p. 4). The guide also contains criteria for selecting accommodations, with examples</p> <p>Unique Accommodations Request Form: This form may be used by a school to request a unique accommodation for an EL or SWD as long as that accommodation does not change the construct being measured by the assessment.</p> <p>DC ELs Guidebooks – These guidebooks are for use by teachers and administrators and outline identification, services, and assessment of ELs. Both versions of the guidebook note that ELs who are students with significant cognitive disabilities are</p>

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		eligible to participate in the MSAA. . Based on the evidence provided, it appears that OSSE has met this critical element.
Section 5.2 Summary Statement (2016 Review)		
<p><u> </u>x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: For the R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and high school, OSSE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); and • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 		
Section 5.2 Summary Statement (2018 Review)		
<u> </u> 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
------------------	--	--

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As 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
<p style="text-align: center;">5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence for 5.3.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 5.2 – 2017-18 OSSE Testing Accommodations Guide Part 2 (English Learners) (PDF) – pages 1-10 o 5.3.1 – 2016-17 MSAA Test Administration Manual (PDF) – pages 18-25 o 5.3.1 – 2017-17 MSAA Test Administration Manual (PDF) – pages 18-24 • Evidence for 5.3.2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 5.3.2 – 2017 Unique Accommodation Form_final (PDF) o 5.3.2 – 2017 Emergency Accommodation Form_final (PDF) o 5.3.2 – OSSE Website Unique Accommodations Request Form (web) <p>(See State’s Index document for more details)</p>	<p>ED required that, for the R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and high school, OSSE provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>DC OSSE provided numerous documents to address this element. A summary of these documents and relevant information is shown below.</p> <p><i>Evidence that appropriate accommodations for ELs are available:</i></p> <p>MSAA Test Administration Manual: This document states that individuals administering the MSAA must complete MSAA test administration training, which includes six modules. This document provides an example of the accommodation selection process using sample items.</p>

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>2017-18 Testing Accommodations Guide Part II – English Learners: This guide contains an overview of each accommodation for ELs and eligibility criteria, along with accessibility features specific to each DC statewide assessment (pages 2-10). This guide explains how ELs who are also SWDs could be eligible to receive accommodations to address both language and disability needs (p. 4). The guide also contains criteria for selecting accommodations, with examples.</p> <p><i>Evidence of individual review and exceptional requests:</i></p> <p>Unique Accommodations Request Form and copy of webpage where this form is available online: This form may be used by a school to request a unique accommodation for an EL or SWD as long as that accommodation does not change the construct being measured by the assessment.</p> <p>DC Assessments Emergency Accommodations Request Form: This form may be used when a student needs a new accommodation immediately prior to the assessment due to unforeseen circumstances. The examples provided</p>

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>include recent physical injuries, broken glasses, or a student returning from a serious or prolonged illness or injury. This form would be used by any student, including ELs or SWDs, and for any assessment.</p> <p>Based on the evidence provided, it appears that OSSE has met this critical element.</p>
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement (2016 Review)</p>		
<p><u>_x_</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: For the R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS (NCSC/MCAA) in grades 3-8 and high school, OSSE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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. 		
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement (2018 Review)</p>		
<p><u>_X_</u> No additional evidence is required .</p>		

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">5.4 – Monitoring Testing of Special Populations</p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 5.4 – 2016-17 Assessment Auditor Training (PDF) o slides 4-10 (legal requirements) o slides 16, 17, 24, 26 (accommodations) o slide 41 (completing form) o 5.4 – 2017 Statewide Assessment Auditor General Observation Checklist (PDF) o 5.4 – 2017 Test Security Plan to Improve School Policies and Procedures(PDF) o 5.4 – 2017 Test Security Guidelines (PDF) o pages 16-19 (Monitoring and Auditing Test Security; Investigations) o 5.4 – DC Testing Integrity Act of 2013 (PDF) – pages 5-7 o 5.4 – PARCC SR PNP (PDF) o 5.4 – PARCC Spring 2017 Accommodated Form Usage – State Report – DC (Excel) o 5.4 – OSSE Website Assessment Monitoring (PDF/web) <p>District of Columbia Additional State-Specific Evidence for NCSC/MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o See evidence above for both PARCC and MSAA. o 5.4 – 2017 Statewide Assessment Auditor Observation Supplement for MSAA 	<p>ED required that, for the entire assessment system, OSSE provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>OSSE provided numerous documents to address this element. A summary of the most relevant documents is shown below:</p> <p><i>Evidence that the SEA monitors test administrations:</i></p> <p>2016-17 Assessment Auditor Training - This document contains OSSE’s vision for test security, which is for schools and LEAs to deliver a uniform and equitable statewide assessment program. OSSE further explains that, for assessments to yield fair and accurate results the assessments must be administered in consistent and standardized conditions (slide 4). The role of the test proctor, special coordinator, and technology coordinator in test administration are</p>

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	(See State’s Index document for more details)	<p>described.</p> <p>2017 Statewide Assessment Auditor General Observation Checklist – This checklist is used by auditors to carry out observations and interviews to ensure that assessment administrations, including for SWDs, are carried out according to procedures set by the SEA, including the use of accommodations.</p> <p>OSSE Website Assessment Monitoring (PDF/web) – This webpage shows test security and incident forms and protocols for 2017-18 assessment administrations.</p> <p>2017 Statewide Assessment Auditor Observation Supplement for MSAA – This observation rubric is used to observe the testing environment and pose questions to assessment administrators regarding how the MSAA was administered to SWDs, including accommodations used and how the student responded to test conditions.</p> <p>Although the evidence provided by OSSE demonstrates the SEA’s general test security procedures and processes for auditing assessment administration, this evidence did not specifically demonstrate that the SEA monitors test administrations</p>

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>for special populations for consistency among individualized education programs, classroom instruction, and accommodations.</p> <p><i>Evidence of documentation and use of monitoring results:</i></p> <p>PARCC Spring 2017 Accommodated Form Usage – State Report – DC – This excel sheet is a log showing the number and type of accommodations used by assessment for the spring 2017 PARCC administration.</p> <p>Although the evidence provided by OSSE demonstrates the way in which test administration monitoring results are documented, this evidence did not specifically demonstrate how the results of this monitoring are used.</p>
Section 5.4 Summary Statement (2016 Review)		
<p><input type="checkbox"/>_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: For the entire assessment system, OSSE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 		
Section 5.4 Summary Statement (2018 Review)		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that it monitors test administrations for special populations for consistency among individualized education 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As 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
	<p>programs, classroom instruction, and accommodations.</p> <p>Although the evidence provided by OSSE demonstrates the SEA’s general test security procedures and processes for auditing assessment administration, this evidence did not specifically demonstrate that the SEA monitors test administrations for special populations for consistency among individualized education programs, classroom instruction, and accommodations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the way in which test administration monitoring results are used. <p>Although the evidence provided by OSSE demonstrates the way in which test administration monitoring results are documented, this evidence did not specifically demonstrate how the results of this monitoring are used.</p>	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 6.1 - SBOE Resolution on Achievement Standards for PARCC and NCSC o 6.1 – SBOE Minutes 10-7 Board Meeting – Final Draft o 6.1 - DC State Board of Education Public Meeting 10-21-2015.mini – pages 9 – 13; 20-28 <p>(See State’s Index document for more details)</p>	<p>ED required that OSSE provide –</p> <p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), evidence that OSSE formally adopted the achievement standards indicated in the submission.</p> <p>For the R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and high school, evidence of the formal adoption of the NCSC/MSAA achievement standards by OSSE</p> <p>OSSE provided the following evidence to address these areas:</p> <p>Signed October 21, 2015 SBOE Resolution on Achievement Standards for PARCC and NCSC formally adopting achievement standards for both PARCC and NCSC/MSAA.</p> <p>SBOE meeting minutes when adoption of achievement standards for these assessments was discussed.</p> <p>Based on the evidence provided, it appears that OSSE has met this critical element.</p>

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 6.1 Summary Statement (2016 Review)		
<p><input type="checkbox"/>_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), OSSE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence that OSSE formally adopted the achievement standards indicated in the submission. <p style="padding-left: 40px;">For the R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and high school, OSSE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of the formal adoption of the NCSC/MSAA achievement standards by OSSE. 		
Section 6.1 Summary Statement (2018 Review)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _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
------------------	--	--

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As 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
<p style="text-align: center;">6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., 	<p>6.4.1 – PARCC Individual Student Report Sub-Claim Comparison Chart District of Columbia Additional State-Specific Evidence for NCSC/MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6.4.2 – EMBARGOED 2016-17 LEA-Level PARCC & MSAA Performance Results (email) • 6.4.2 – Results OSSE Website Live with 2017 PARCC Results (email) • 6.4.2 – NGA Bulletin 8 24 17 (email) • 6.4.3 – OSSE Website_Results and Resources for Parents (PDF/web) – page 2 <p>(See State’s Index document for more details)</p>	<p>For this element, ED required that OSSE provide:</p> <p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), evidence that all information elements in the OSSE reports of PARCC assessments support the same interpretations as those in the PARCC produced reports.</p> <p>For the R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and high school, evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>OSSE provided the following evidence to address these elements:</p> <p><i>Evidence to address reporting:</i></p> <p>PARCC Individual Student Report Sub-Claim Comparison Chart District of</p>

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 		<p>Columbia Additional State-Specific Evidence for NCSC/MSAA: This document shows a side-side comparison of each component of the DC PARCC report and the PARCC consortium reports.</p> <p><i>Evidence to address process and timeline for delivering individual student reports:</i></p> <p>Email to LEAs with individual score reports and timeline for release of results for 2016-17.</p> <p>Email to LEAs with website links for PARCC and MSAA results for 2016-17, including links to documents for the public regarding results and assessments.</p> <p>NGA Bulletin announcing OSSE release of PARCC and MSAA results for 2016-2017.</p> <p><i>Evidence to address availability of individual student reports in alternate formats and in a native language:</i></p> <p>OSSE website detailing information on individual student reports. This website provides links to numerous resources for parents and the public, including reports available in other languages. This website does not specifically provide evidence that</p>

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		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; however. The native language resources are only offered in specific language, and the SEA does not state on this website, which is the only piece of evidence provided for this element, that student reports are available, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.
Section 6.4 Summary Statement (2016 Review)		
<p><u>_x_</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), OSSE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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. 		
Section 6.4 Summary Statement (2018 Review)		
<p><u>_X_</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and high school, OSSE must provide: <p>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.</p>		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>OSSE provided a copy of a website to address this element. This website provides links to numerous resources for parents and the public, including reports available in other languages. This website does not specifically provide 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; however. The native language resources are only offered in specific language, and the SEA does not state on this website, which is the only piece of evidence provided for this element, that student reports are available, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT
CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

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

(follow up on evidence requested from 2016 Peer Review)



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

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

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

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

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	3
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	3
2.2 – Item Development.....	5
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....	6
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	6
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	8
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	9
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	10
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	11
6.4 – Reporting.....	13

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<p><i>State-specific evidence. Individual states will respond as necessary.</i></p>	<p>The PARCC assessment does not currently assess speaking and listening. While it is the case that States currently have waivers, there is no assurance that the Department will continue to grant waivers for speaking and listening.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “Evidence that the assessment design measures the full breadth and depth of the State’s academic content standards, including the speaking and listening aspect of the standards.” NOTE—States must individually request a waiver from the requirement of testing the speaking and listening standards.</p>		
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a plan and timeline for addressing the speaking and listening aspect of the standards such that appropriate assessments will be available to the 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
PARCC States when their waivers expire.		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.2 – Item Development</p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p>Document 2.2_PARCC Item Review Committees_9 4 12</p> <p>lists available information about PARCC’s initial groups of item reviewers, including self-reported job title, organization, years of teaching experience, experience with special populations of students, geographic settings, and reviewer demographic information.</p>	<p>Document 2.2 provided evidence of representation on Item Review Committees.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “Information about the composition and credentials of content and bias/sensitivity reviewers for the PARCC assessment. Specifically, information about the subject area specialization of content and bias/sensitivity reviewers on this panel (grade level, general or special education specialization, English learner (EL) specialization).”</p>		
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. 	<p>HumRRO, <u>Evaluating the Quality and Alignment of PARCC ELA/Literacy and Mathematics Assessments: Grades 3,4,6, and 7</u></p>	<p>The alignment study report notes that Speaking and Listening were not considered in the findings for ELA alignment. See 2.1.</p> <p>Per Recommendations on pages 28-30, PARCC needs a plan for addressing the recommendations resulting from the HumRRO alignment study. However, the report provided to the peers appears to have limited usefulness for improving the assessment. Peers are uncertain why the information is not provided in more detail. For example, item alignment to each standard rather than domain or cluster may be more helpful for developing plans for improving the assessment. PARCC may need to ask the contractors to provide more explicit findings.</p> <p>Peers were unable to find specific information regarding the composition and expertise of the 19 alignment study panel members.</p> <p>Will the PARCC program seek advice from the PARCC Technical Advisory Committee related to the study?</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “Additional alignment evidence that addresses all remaining grades (grades 3, 4, 6, and 7) in both content areas, and Alignment evidence that supports a test design that assesses the full range of the State’s academic content standards, including speaking and listening, is needed for all tested grades.”</p>		
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As the plan for speaking and listening is developed, ensure that independent alignment studies will be completed. • Plan and timeline for how PARCC will address the alignment study recommendations for improving the assessments. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>Documents 4.3.1, 4.3.2, and 4.3.3 include scale score cumulative frequency distributions for each assessment administered in spring 2015, fall 2015, and spring 2016.</p>	<p>Peers appreciate the cumulative distribution of scale scores to numbers of students. The omission of raw scores is noted.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “Cumulative frequency distributions across raw score/scale scores, that include the number and percent of students scored at each raw/scale score point.”</p>		
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>Document 4.6_PARCC Mode and Device Comparability Study Plan outlines PARCC’s plans to study mode and device comparability in spring 2017.</p>	<p>The Table of PARCC Research Studies 2016 on page 15 show dates in the past. What additional milestones and timelines have been added since November 2016?</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “A plan and timeline for the State/PARCC to continue studying the issue of mode comparability.”</p>		
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An updated timeline and milestones and any completed study reports to document adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results among modes and devices. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>Document 6.2.1 PARCC Standard Setting Panels includes available information about standard setting panelists, including self-reported job title, organization, years of teaching experience, experience with special populations of students, geographic settings, and reviewer demographic information.</p> <p>Document 6.2.2 PARCC Standard Setting Panel Summary Information includes summary information of the self-reported information contained in Document 6.2.1.</p>	<p>Documents 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 provide evidence the standard-setting panels included members experienced in the areas of special education and EL.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “Additional detailed information about areas of educational specialization for members of each achievement standards-setting panel, especially the specialty areas of special education and ELs.”</p>		
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 		
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “Evidence that MSDE and PARCC provide reports that enable itemized score analyses to local educational agencies and schools”</p>		
<p>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT
CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

February 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes for the NCSC/MSAA Assessment Consortium **RESUBMISSION**

(follow up on evidence requested from 2016 and 2017 Peer Reviews)



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

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

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

Contents—NOTE—The items shown below represent areas from the 2017 consortium peer review where additional evidence was requested

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	3
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	4
2.3 – Test Administration	7
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	10
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	15
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	16
4.1 – Reliability.....	16
4.4 – Scoring	18
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	21
5.3 – Accommodations.....	24
6.4 – Reporting.....	27

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAА ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<p>The State did not provide evidence in the February 2018 submission for this critical element.</p>	<p>No relevant evidence located.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: State must provide evidence to support the NCSC/MSAA test design criteria for the writing portion of the reading/language arts AA-AAAS. This will also impact evidence for related critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</p> <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review: State must provide evidence to support the MSAA/NCSC test design criteria for the operational writing portion of the reading/language arts AA-AAAS. This will also impact evidence for related critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State must provide evidence to support the MSAA/NCSC test design criteria for the operational writing portion of the reading/language arts AA-AAAS. This will also impact evidence for related critical elements in sections 3 and 4. 		

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>MSAA Timeline for adding in writing item samples to the MSAA PowerPoint by February 2018 and Practice site by June 2018.</p>	<p>Final slide on PowerPoint: Display new sample writing items to practice site June 2018.</p> <p>Evidence is not sufficient to the outstanding requirement.</p> <p>After the sample writing items are added to the practice test, MSAA should provide evidence that this work was done, and describe how the sample items reflect the different components of the writing assessment.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the NCSC/MSAA assessments that include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence of a troubleshooting guide for the NCSC/MSAA to address technology-related contingency plans. ○ 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. <p>Evidence of training to ensure consistency of administration across districts and schools.</p> <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the MSAA/NCSC assessments that include evidence of a policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration in writing (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools 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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing.		
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the MSAA/NCSC assessments that include evidence of a policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration in writing (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. 	<p>The State did not provide evidence in the February 2018 submission for this critical element.</p>	<p>No relevant evidence located.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the NCSC/MSAA, as noted in element 2.1, evidence that demonstrates its assessments measure the full breadth and depth of the State’s content standards (writing). Following that, the State will need to document adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, including evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards. This will also effect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</p> <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As noted in element 2.1, evidence that demonstrates its assessments measure the full breadth and depth of the State’s writing (ELA) content standards. Following that, the State will need to document adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		including evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards for writing. This will also affect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4.
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As noted in element 2.1, evidence that demonstrates its assessments measure the full breadth and depth of the State’s writing (ELA) content standards. Following that, the State will need to document adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, including evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards for writing. This will also affect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>The State did not provide evidence in the February 2018 submission for this critical element.</p>	<p>No relevant evidence located.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p> <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review: For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p>		
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>MSAA Graphics Resizing Change Order 2017</p>	<p>MSAA scrolling issue evidence (validity based on internal structure)--change orders and an amendment to the MSAA contract with Measured Progress were created to address the scrolling issue. The peers noted how timely this issue was addressed by the MSAA.</p> <p>The change order generally indicates how the MSAA addressed answer choice presentation and impact of scrolling, but no evidence details the impact(s) of the implemented change orders.</p> <p>The MSAA may wish to consider pilot studies to address impact before full consortium implementation.</p> <p>While the change order was submitted, it is not clear exactly how this will impact dimensionality. Evidence must be provided that illustrates and provides data regarding the impacts after the change order has been implemented. The MSAA must submit evidence that item response theory (IRT) assumptions of test unidimensionality are met.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the NCSC/MSAA, additional evidence that supports the internal structure of the tests, specifically a plan and timeline for documenting how the test meets item response theory (IRT) assumptions of test unidimensionality.</p> <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence of how NCSC will address answer choice presentation and impact of scrolling in the administration of the test as evidenced by NCSC 104 and MSAA11. 		
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence that item response theory (IRT) assumptions of test unidimensionality 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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>The State did not provide evidence in the February 2018 submission for this critical element.</p>	<p>No relevant evidence located.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p> <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review: For the MSAA/ NCSC, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p>		
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the MSAA/ NCSC, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 	<p>The State did not provide evidence in the February 2018 submission for this critical element.</p>	<p>No relevant evidence located.</p> <p>It is unclear if the MSAA implemented constructed response operational writing items.</p> <p>When MSAA implements constructed response operational writing items, appropriate studies must be conducted to determine reliability.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p> <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If MSAA implements constructed response operational writing items, appropriate studies must be conducted to determine reliability. 		
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When MSAA implements constructed response operational writing items, appropriate studies must be conducted to determine reliability. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>The State did not provide evidence in the February 2018 submission for this critical element.</p>	<p>No relevant evidence located.</p> <p><i>Arizona Specific Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) Policies – this document mentions training, but does not specify if the training includes training for scoring.</i></p> <p>It is unclear if these policies are just for AZ or for all MSAA states.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence of documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for constructed-response items in reading/language arts and mathematics and also operational writing items. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability; ○ Clear scoring rubrics, comprehensive instructions for raters, adequate training of raters, evaluation of inter-rater reliability; and ○ Documentation that the model-data fit issue identified in item 3.3 has been resolved. <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence of documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for constructed-response items in reading/language arts and mathematics and also operational writing items. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability; ○ Clear scoring rubrics, comprehensive instructions for raters, adequate training of raters, and evaluation of inter-rater reliability. 		
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence of documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for constructed-response items in reading/language arts and mathematics and also operational writing items. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability; ○ Clear scoring rubrics, comprehensive instructions for raters, adequate training of raters, and evaluation of inter-rater reliability. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 	<p>Arizona Specific Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) Policies</p> <p>Arizona – Multi State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) State Specific Guidance</p> <p>Accommodation Guidelines: <i>Selecting, Administering, and Evaluating Accommodations for Instruction and Assessment</i> July, 2017</p>	<p>EL Accommodations for MSAA--Any student that meets eligibility for the MSAA participation criteria will have access to the embedded accessibility tools including, Assessment Features, and Accommodations. If there is an additional tool or accommodation need, the Alternate Assessment Test Coordinator must contact the MSAA State Lead. This above section was also added into the MSAA State Specific Guidance Page for 2017.</p> <p>The procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s) and guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners should be expanded and strengthened, specifically with the addition of examples of accommodations decisions for sample profiles of students who are EL with disabilities that require them to take the MSAA.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</p> <p>For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that the State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); and Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); and • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 5.2 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or		
<input type="checkbox"/> 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 NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<p>Accommodation Guidelines: <i>Selecting, Administering, and Evaluating Accommodations for Instruction and Assessment</i> July, 2017</p> <p>C.E. 5.3 MSAA AZ Accommodation Reliability from 2017</p>	<p>The Accommodations Guidelines provide discussion about the importance of accommodations not altering the construct being tested (p. 8) and about the difference between accommodations and modifications (p. 10-11).</p> <p>ADE provided a table of reliability based on all students, those using assistive response, scribe, and sign for each grade level. There was no discussion provided how this data ensures that the accommodations used do not alter the construct being assessed, and allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations. However, the peers evaluated the data and determined that this data addressed this critical element.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For both the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that the accommodations provided (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations. • Evidence that appropriate accommodations for English learners are available. • For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that the State has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the accommodations provided do not alter the construct being assessed, and allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations. 		
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language 	<p>C.E. 6.4 MSAA Student Report 2017_2018 New Message 101617. See mock-up of last sentence. The letter will now state “If you require this letter or child’s report in a different format, please contact your child’s teacher or school”.</p> <p>C.E. 6.4 MSAA 2017 MSAA Test Administration Manual (TAM)3.3.17 (with Alternate Format Updates 101617)</p>	<p>There was no evidence located related to the process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</p> <p>Evidence was provided to verify 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.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 		
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the NCSC/MSAA evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that individual student reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand. <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. No new relevant information was presented. 		
<p>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration 		

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