



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Pam Stewart  
Commissioner of Education  
Florida Department of Education  
Turlington Building, Suite 1514  
325 West Gaines Street  
Tallahassee, FL 32399

January 6, 2017

Dear Commissioner Stewart:

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

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

- Reading/ language arts (R/LA) and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA): **Partially meets requirements**
- R/LA and mathematics general assessments in high school FSA end of course (EOC): **Substantially meets requirements**
- Science general assessments in grade bands 3-5 and 6-8 Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) 2.0: **Substantially meets requirements**

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

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

- Science general assessments in high school FCAT 2.0 Biology 1 EOC Biology EOC: **Substantially meets requirements**

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

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

The specific list of items required for Florida to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because one of the State's components has partially met the requirements, the Department is placing a condition on the State's Title I grant award related to those components of the assessment system. To satisfy this condition, Florida must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. Florida 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 FLDOE's 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 the Department's determination. Please note that the peers' recommendations may differ from the Department's feedback; we encourage you to read the full peer notes for additional suggestions and recommendations for improving your assessment system beyond what is noted in the Department's feedback. Department staff will reach out to your assessment director in the next few days to discuss the peer notes and the Department's determination and to answer any questions you have.

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

Sincerely,

/s/

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

Enclosures

cc: Vince Verges

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Additional Evidence Needed</b>
<b>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</b>	<p>FLDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all students with disabilities who are publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education are included in the assessment system.</li> </ul>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b>	<p>For the R/LA general assessments in grades 3-8 (FSA) and high school (FSA-EOC), FLDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the assessment design measures the full breadth and depth of the State’s academic content standards in R/LA, including the speaking and listening aspect of the standards for all grades.</li> <li>• Evidence that the R/LA standards for writing are measured in the grade 3 FSA.</li> </ul>
<b>2.2 – Item Development</b>	<p>For the R/LA general assessments in grades 3-8 (FSA) and high school (FSA-EOC), FLDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on FLDOE grade 3 academic content standards for writing. This evidence should address both content and cognitive process, and higher-order thinking skills.</li> <li>• Evidence of reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on FLDOE academic content standards for speaking and listening for all grades. This evidence should address both content and cognitive process, as well as higher-order thinking skills.</li> </ul>
<b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b>	<p>For all parts of its assessment system, FLDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that it monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</li> </ul>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b>	<p>For the R/LA general assessments in grades 3-8 (FSA) and high school (FSA-EOC), FLDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of alignment of the writing assessment to standards in all grades. Evidence that all R/LA standards, including speaking and listening at all grades, are assessed.</li> </ul>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b>	<p>For the R/LA general assessments in grades 3-8 (FSA) and high school (FSA-EOC) and for the science general assessments in grade bands 3-5, 6-8 and high school EOC (FCAT 2.0 and FCAT 2.0 Biology EOC), FLDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the FLDOE academic content standards (e.g., through cognitive labs of illustrative task types, expert judgment of what cognitive skills are being measured, or empirical data that shows the relationship between item responses and other assessments that measure intended processes).</li> </ul>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b>	<p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (FSA) and high school (FSA-EOC)), FLDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Validity evidence that shows the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with criterion and other variables for all student groups (e.g., comparison of subscore relationships within content areas to those across</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	content areas; a confirmatory factor analysis of math & R/LA together; or other analyses that demonstrate positive correlations between State assessment results and external measures that assess similar constructs).
<b>4.1 – Reliability</b>	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (FSA) and high school (FSA-EOC), FLDOE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of decision consistency for all tests.</li> </ul>
<b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b>	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (FSA) and high school (FSA-EOC) and for the science general assessments in grade bands 3-5, 6-8 and high school EOC (FCAT 2.0 and FCAT 2.0 Biology EOC), FLDOE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the comparability of the FSA tests across the most frequently used platforms (e.g., computers, tablets) for at least one grade level test.</li> </ul>
<b>5.3 – Accommodations</b>	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (FSA) and high school (FSA-EOC) and for the science general assessments in grade bands 3-5, 6-8 and high school EOC (FCAT 2.0 and FCAT 2.0 Biology EOC), FLDOE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence to show that accommodations are appropriate and effective, do not alter the construct, allow meaningful interpretation of results and comparisons.</li> </ul>
<b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b>	For all parts of its assessment system, FLDOE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has procedures, policies, and resources that support districts in providing required monitoring of test administration of special populations (e.g., monitoring instructions and checklists, etc.); and</li> <li>• Evidence that FLDOE reviews/evaluates the monitoring of test administration for special populations by LEAs.</li> </ul>
<b>6.4 – Reporting</b>	For all parts of its assessment system, FLDOE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of timely delivery of student score reports to parents; and</li> <li>• Evidence that reports are available in alternate formats.</li> </ul> For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (FSA) and high school (FSA-EOC), FLDOE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of current individual student reports that shows student achievement in terms of State grade-level achievement standards.</li> </ul>

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

## June, 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes FLORIDA

Note: AA-AAS was not part of this review



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR FLORIDA

Contents

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

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS ..... 10**  
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 10  
2.2 – Item Development..... 15  
2.3 – Test Administration ..... 19  
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration(reviewed by Department staff only)23  
2.5 – Test Security ..... 25  
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 27

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 28**  
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 28  
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 30  
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure ..... 32  
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables ..... 34

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER ..... 35**  
4.1 – Reliability..... 35  
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 37  
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 39  
4.4 – Scoring ..... 40  
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms ..... 42  
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment ..... 43  
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... 45

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS ..... 47**  
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities ..... 47  
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 49  
5.3 – Accommodations..... 51  
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations ..... 52

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 53**  
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students ..... 53  
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 54  
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards ..... 56  
6.4 – Reporting..... 57

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR FLORIDA

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all subjects</p> <p><b>Requirement previously met</b></p>	
<b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b>		
No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR FLORIDA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all three subjects</p> <p><b>Requirement previously met</b></p>	
<p><b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR FLORIDA**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p>1.3 – Required Assessments</p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12);</li> <li>• Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).</li> </ul>	<p><b>General Assessments:</b>  <b>Evidence 02</b> – p. 1  <b>Evidence 05</b> Florida Statutes – p. 2  <b>Evidence 07</b> Florida Regulations – p. 1</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessments:</b>  <b>Evidence 02</b> – p. 51-53  <b>Evidence 05</b> – p. 4</p>	<p><b>General Assessments</b>            Statewide reading assessments administered in grades 3-10; statewide writing assessments administered at least once in elementary, middle, and high school. When reading/writing replaced by ELA, ELA assessments to be administered in grades 3-10 annually (but under regs, ELA doesn’t have writing in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade). <i>Question: Why doesn’t 3<sup>rd</sup> grade include writing?</i></p> <p>Math exam to be administered annually in grades 3-8; also, EOC exams for Algebra I, Geometry, and Algebra II.</p> <p>FCAT 2.0 Science exam administered annually at least once at the elementary and middle grade levels (5<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade, according to State notes). Also, Biology I EOC exam.</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessments</b></p> <p>Florida Standards Alternate Assessment, aligned to Florida Standards – Access Points (FS-AP); Next Generation Sunshine States Standards Access Points (NGSSS-AP)</p> <p>Flex request (Alternate assessment): ELA Grades 3-10, Math Grades 3-8, Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II; Science 5, 8, Biology I</p> <p>Contract with Measured Progress. First administered Spring 2016</p>
<p><b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR FLORIDA**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;</li> <li>• For English learners (EL):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment;</li> <li>○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column-SWD and EL</p> <p>Students with disabilities:</p> <p><b>Evidence 5</b> – 1008.22(3) F.S. – Student assessment program for public schools</p> <p><b>Evidence 6</b> – Rule 6A-1.0943 - Statewide Assessment for Students with disabilities</p> <p><b>Evidence 06TAP</b> – Statewide Assessment for SWDs Technical Assistance Paper</p> <p><b>Evidence 7</b> – Rule 6A-1.09422 – Statewide Standardized Assessment Program requirements</p> <p>English learners:</p> <p><b>Evidence 5</b> – 1008.22(3) F.S. – Student assessment program for public schools</p> <p><b>Evidence 06EL</b> – Rule 6A-6.0909 Exemptions Provided to English Language Learners</p>	<p>1008.22(3): Participation in the assessment program is mandatory for all school districts and all students attending public schools, including adult students seeking a standard high school diploma under s. 1003.4282 and students in Department of Juvenile Justice education programs, except as otherwise provided by law.</p> <p>Students with Disabilities:</p> <p>TAP A3: Are students who are enrolled in private schools or in home education programs required to participate in the statewide standardized assessment program?</p> <p>No. However, school districts must have a plan for including students enrolled in private schools through the McKay Scholarship program or students who are served through home education, if the parent chooses to have his/her child participate in the statewide standardized assessment program.</p> <p>Note: Independent research confirms that the McKay scholarship program provides scholarships for students with disabilities to attend private schools, but this is not apparent from the documentation provided</p> <p>Evidence 7: Rule 6A-1.09422(4)(i) Provisions shall be made by the Commissioner to permit the assessment to be administered to home school students and private school students pursuant to Sections 1002.39 and 1002.395, F.S., under conditions which preserve the security of the assessment and require the public school districts to</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 FLORIDA**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
		<p>be responsible for the test administration procedures and requirements of Rule 6A-10.042, F.A.C.</p> <p>(State did not provide Sections 1002.39 and 1002.395; 1002.39 explains McKay scholarship program).            Florida Statute - 1002.39 (5)(f) - For a student of a parent who participates in the John M. McKay Scholarship for Students with Disabilities program whose parent requests that the student take the statewide assessment under s. 1008.22, the district in which the student attends private school shall provide locations and times to take all statewide assessments</p> <p>For students with disabilities, two exemptions: Extraordinary exemption, Medical Complexity</p> <p>TAP C1/D1: “Note: It is important that all students are included in the accountability process. Students who are exempt due to extraordinary circumstances or conditions are counted as nonparticipants in the accountability process.” (Same for medical complexity)</p> <p><i>Are the exceptions acceptable? (Extraordinary exemption, medical complexity – Rule 6A-1.0943)</i></p> <p>---</p> <p>ELs:</p> <p>Florida Statute 6A-6.0909(1): (1) English Language Learners shall be assessed for academic progress</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 FLORIDA**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
		<p>using guidelines established under Section 1008.22, F.S. English Language Learners who have been enrolled in school in the United States for less than twelve (12) months may be exempted from the statewide assessment in English Language Arts and shall undertake the annual statewide English Language proficiency assessment in accordance with Rule 6A-6.0902, F.A.C.</p> <p>(2) Each school district shall administer the statewide English Language proficiency assessment to English Language Learners exempted from statewide assessment in accordance with subsection (1) of this rule.</p> <p>Remedial programming shall be provided to those students who do not meet the performance standards of the statewide assessment program.</p> <p>No evidence submitted that the state offers native language assessments.</p>
<b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
<p>The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education are included in the assessment system (based on evidence provided and separate research, it seems that inclusion in State assessments is at the discretion of parents)</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR FLORIDA**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p>1.5 – Participation Data</p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>	<p>Prompts for Reviewers:                      --data disaggregated by student group:                      ELA/Math/Science                      --Shows students tested and students enrolled for each breakout                      --for end-of-course HS, procedures to ensure each student is tested and counted in participation rate along with data                      --includes grade level tests and AA-AAAS</p> <p><b>Evidence 4 – Participation Rate Data 2014-15</b></p>	<p>State provided sufficient evidence of participation rates, but missed participation rate targets for many student groups. Also, data is organized by grades and subjects, but not separated across exams (i.e. FAA and FSA are consistently reported together).</p> <p><b>Grade 10 ELA: FSA, FAA:</b></p> <p>Can States to round up? <math>L30/L29 = 22888/24207 = 94.5512</math> percent</p> <p><b>High School Math</b></p> <p>All students: (EOCs, FAA gr 9-10) – <math>452,558/476,879 = 94.9</math> percent</p> <p>American Indian: 94 percent                      Black/African American: 93 percent                      Two or More Races: 94.7623 percent                      Economically Disadvantaged: 94 percent                      Students with disabilities: 92 percent</p> <p><b>Science:</b></p> <p>HS:                      Economically disadvantaged – 94.8059 percent                      African American/Black – 94</p> <p>7th Grade:                      African-American/Black: 92                      Asian: 82 percent</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p>No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR FLORIDA

### SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>Purpose</u></p> <p><b>ELA/Math (applies also to Science) Evidence 05:</b> FL’s K-20 Education Code 1008.22(1) and (3) (a) to (c) lists purposes and intended interpretations and use of data for ELA, Math, and <b>Science</b>.</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 14FSA Vol1:</b> The 2014-15 technical manual includes purpose and uses on pages 1 and 2.</p> <p><u>Blueprints, item specs, and other documents related to test construction</u></p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 08 ELA and 08 Math:</b> Test design summaries showing standards assessed, proportion of test for each reporting category with content area for each grade level/EOC tested. DOK target per content area are provided. No indication of number of items or number of score points is given, nor is there an indication of how items should be spread over the standards within each reporting category.</p> <p><b>ELA Evidence Series 09 Item Specifications:</b> Item specs and sample items by standard are provided in the item specifications, and an indication of the proportion of TEI items and text lengths for reading items on each ELA test is given for Grades 3-10. For reading standards, assessment limits, text types, and</p>	<p><b>ELA/Math</b></p> <p>Much of the material related to 2015-16; full information about the 2014-15 test design and development was not provided because that was a one-year temporary solution. The state claims and provides evidence that it is moving forward.</p> <p>No information about test length (n items, n points, time) or how items should be spread over the standards within each reporting category is provided in the test development material provided. (The alignment report showed the proportions of standards tested in actuality by content area and reporting category. This does not address the design principle, however.)</p> <p>The alignment report is for a 2015-16 test form, not 2014-15; the notes section explains that there would not have been any value in reviewing an old form since the test system was changing to custom-developed from using existing items from another state.</p> <p>FL notes indicate that the state plans to address recommendations found in the alignment report. No evidence was provided (the item development plan was done before the alignment study).</p> <p>Alignment study – not clear degree to which panelists represent knowledge/experience teaching ELs, SWDs. Additionally, information about how the item development plan (<b>17ME</b>) addresses the alignment results would be helpful. More importantly, writing was not included in 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.

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR FLORIDA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>response mechanisms (item types, including TEIs) are described, editing task guidelines are provided, and writing stimulus/prompt guidelines are given for grades 4-10. (Item specs do not address speaking and listening.)</p> <p><b>Math Evidence Series 09 Item Specifications:</b> Item specs and sample items by standard or standards are provided in the item specifications for grades 3-8, Algebra 1 and 2, and Geometry. Specifications include rules for calculator use and type of calculator provided, rules for the provision and content of reference sheets, and descriptions of assessment limits and item types by standard are provided.</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 14FSA Vol2:</b> The 2014-15 technical manual volume 2, pp. 3-10 describes the blueprints as including information about test length and coverage, including range of coverage, and the technical manual includes summary tables showing n items per subject area, percent for each reporting category, and other relevant information. The actual blueprints are not included, and no information about standards/range of coverage is provided.</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 13FSA:</b> The alignment report for 2015-16 indicates that, for the most part, the items are linked to the intended content standards and the range of standards are adequately covered by the assessments, although this coverage could be improved. DOK match to intended DOK specified by the blueprints was not as strong as desired, with overrepresentation of DOK 1 being prevalent. This indicates that not enough items may be</p>	<p>alignment study (p. 7).</p> <p>Evidence of usability of the technology was not provided under this CE (evidence of practice opportunities is given later, but no evidence of formal reviews/evaluations of usability).</p> <p>Item specifications provide solid descriptions of how to address the standards.</p> <p>Development of paper based test is addressed in CE 4.6.</p> <p><b>Science</b></p> <p>No additional comments</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 FLORIDA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>requiring complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills. Additionally, writing was not included in the study (p. 7).</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 17:</b> The item development plan shows that more items will be developed for the assessment. It is not clear how the item development plan relates to the alignment results.</p> <p><b>ELA/Math 14SFA Vol.2:</b> Volume 2 of the technical manual describes the test construction process for 2014-15 (Chapter 4). Department (TDC and FLDOE) and AIR content specialists and psychometricians worked together to develop test forms using primarily items from SAGE, Utah’s assessment, and item statistics (presumably associated with the Utah administration of the items). While items were selected by the teams to be aligned to FL standards, there is no independent evidence of alignment of the 2014-15 form.</p> <p><b>ELA/Math 16</b> General requirements for various committees are given. These do not list actual membership.</p> <p><b>Science Evidence 08a</b> shows 2013-14 high-level test design for Science FCAT2.0 for G5, G8, EOC Bio1.</p> <p><b>Science Evidence 08TCBio and 08TCSc</b> describes <b>2017</b> test construction specs for EOC Biology, and G5 &amp; G8 Science. Appendix C of <b>08TCBio</b> shows coverage requirements for 3 reporting categories, with standards grouped within reporting category (p. 53) and cognitive complexity requirements at the test level (p. 54).</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 FLORIDA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>Similarly structured information is found in Appendix B of <b>08TCSc</b> for G5 and G8 for 4 reporting categories, with standards grouped within reporting category (p. 54-55) and cognitive complexity requirements at the test level (p. 56).</p> <p><b>Science Evidence Series 09s Item Specifications</b> Item specs and sample items by benchmarks are provided in the item specifications for grades 3 and 5 and EOC Biology. [G5 item specs are described here; other specs are similarly structured.] Content limits and stimulus attributes (if any) are given [“response attributes” is given as a category in the specs, but none are listed]. Cognitive complexity of items is explained and illustrated (pp. 12 – 17) and test level requirements are given (p. 17), UD is described briefly (p. 17) and a description of bias/sensitivity and content reviews is given (p. 18). All items are MC.</p> <p><b>Science Evidence 15b</b> is a power point from 2014 Item Writer Training, General Session showing logistical considerations.</p> <p><b>Science Evidence 15 - Science Item Writer Training Materials 2014</b> shows that items writers were trained in bias/sensitivity (0) as well as the content specs.</p> <p><b>Science Evidence 13 - Independent Alignment Study</b>, dated August 31, 2012, is a report of a Webb-based approach to alignment, which addresses content match, breadth of content, and cognitive complexity, with a process for identifying items with potentially construct-irrelevant sources of challenge. 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.

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR FLORIDA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>tests were found to be “either acceptably aligned [G8 and Biology] or in need of slight improvement [G5]” (p. v). Recommendations for improvement are given, particularly for increasing DOK levels of items to match DOK of the benchmarks.</p> <p><b>Science Evidence 17a - Item Development Plan, Cycle 2017</b></p> <p><b>Science Evidence 14a - FCAT_2</b> shows how FDOE is addressing the recommendations to improve item to standard DOK match.</p> <p><b>Science Evidence 0_FL_EOC_2015_Technical_Report_Final</b> indicates that the Biology 1 assessment is administered online; the G 5 and 8 are PBTs.</p>	
<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of alignment of the writing assessment to standards in all grades</li> <li>• Evidence of assessment and alignment of writing standards in Grade 3</li> <li>• Evidence of assessing all ELA standards, including speaking and listening, unless a waiver request has been approved</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR FLORIDA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.2 – Item Development</p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ELA Evidence Series 09: Item Specifications</b> Item specs and sample items by standard are provided in the item specifications, and an indication of the proportion of TEI items and text lengths for reading items on each ELA test is given for Grades 3-10. For reading standards, assessment limits, text types, task demand, and response mechanisms (item types, including TEIs) are described, editing task guidelines are provided, and writing stimulus/prompt guidelines are given for grades 4-10. (Item specs do not address speaking and listening.)</li> <li>• <b>Math Evidence Series 09: Item Specifications</b> Item specs and sample items by standard or standards are provided in the item specifications for grades 3-8, Algebra 1 and 2, and Geometry. Specifications include rules for calculator use and type of calculator provided, rules for the provision and content of reference sheets, and descriptions of assessment limits, and item types by standard are provided.</li> <li>• <b>ELA/Math Evidence 15ME:</b> Note -- These are for new items, not 2014-15. Item writer training power points dated December 2015 show that writers are trained to avoid bias, insensitivity in items, DOK. In math, the materials show specific content-related issues or suggestions by standard as appropriate. In ELA, the training materials discuss the</li> </ul>	<p><b>ELA/Math</b></p> <p>Volume 2 – item development procedures relate to the FT items developed for FL.</p> <p>No evidence of complexity requirements for reporting categories or standards; DOK overall by test form is in the test design summaries. It may be that item descriptions/assessment limits in the specs provide some of this but this isn’t explicitly stated anywhere.</p> <p>No indication of training in understanding tools and features available and how they interact with standards and how the standards are measured.</p> <p>Alignment study: see CE 2.1</p> <p>Item development procedures for 2014-15 forms are not included as evidence under this CE (no description of how items were developed for SAGE and FCAT 2.0). (Procedures for developing items for 2015-16 forms are noted.) (Tech manual Volume 4, Chapter 4 describes general item selection procedures.)</p> <p>Evidence that showed that items elicit intended response processes was not provided (the SBAC cog lab focused on item interactions). We strongly suggest that that formal evidence that items elicit the intended constructs be collected to strengthen the assessment program.</p> <p>No explanation of how items being dropped affected the 2014-15 forms from a content or statistical perspective was found.</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 FLORIDA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>standards and appropriate response types as indicate in the standards as well as factors involved in text complexity. The training power points did not include information tools available to students, or how to consider how tools and accommodations might interact with items.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ELA/Math Evidence 16:</b> This general description of different committees that review or have input into aspects of FL’s testing program includes descriptions of standing content advisory committees (pp 1-2) and ad hoc bias, content, and sensitivity review committees (pp 2-3). No specific descriptions of work done on the assessments or who is on the committees is given.</li> <li>• <b>ELA/Math 14SFA Vol.2:</b> Description of item development procedures used by AIR includes incorporation of UD principles (p. 17). Item development for <b>new</b> forms (FT items) (pp. 15-17) indicate content and bias review by committees of FL teachers/content specialists for content review committee and others for bias (no specifics given). No specifics regarding committee representation or specific expertise given. Rubric validation process for machine-scored CR items used in <b>2015</b> (p. 18) includereviewed by Department staff only of student responses by a committee (committee makeup and source of student responses not specified). For <b>2014-15</b>, existing items were reviewed by FDOE technical staff and TDS and AIR</li> </ul>	<p><b>Science</b></p> <p>See evidence in CE 2.1 regarding item development procedures.</p> <p>No indication of training in understanding tools and features available for EOC Biology and how they interact with standards and how the standards are measured.</p> <p>Evidence that showed that items elicit intended response processes was not provided.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR FLORIDA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>content specialists (pp. 21-22).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ELA/Math 14SFA Vol.1:</b> Item review procedures and item flagging rules are described in Chapter 5 (pp. 19-23) and Chapter 6 (pp. 25 -28). The text and tables on pp. 41-42 indicate that some operational items were dropped before calculating the total score; no information about n items dropped per form is given. No information on the effect of item deletions on content coverage was provided.</li> <li>• <b>ELA/Math Evidence 13FSA:</b> An independent alignment study was conducted on the 2015-16 forms by HumRRO. The study examined link to content, range of coverage, and cognitive complexity. The study found that, for the most part, the items are linked to the intended content standards and the range of standards are adequately covered by the assessments, although this coverage could be improved. DOK match to intended DOK specified by the blueprints was not as strong as desired, with overrepresentation of DOK 1 being prevalent. This indicates that not enough items may be requiring complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills. For ELA, all but 2 of the 10 forms did not address the reporting categories with the same proportion of items as defined by the test blueprint. No direct evidence of the evaluation of potential construct irrelevant</li> </ul>	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR FLORIDA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p style="text-align: center;">variance was addressed in the study, although using the degree of linkage to a standard rather than a yes/no method provides some indication of potential CIV.</p> <p><b>Science</b> See CE 2.1</p>	
<b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of alignment of the writing assessment to standards in all grades</li> <li>• Evidence of assessment and alignment of writing standards in Grade 3</li> <li>• Evidence of assessing all ELA standards, including speaking and listening, unless a waiver request has been approved</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR FLORIDA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>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"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments;</li> <li>• If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>ELA/Math</u></p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 14FSA Vol5:</b> Technology issues affecting the administration are described briefly (pp. 2-4). Available accommodations and eligibility requirements are described (pp. 8-10; pp. 13-15). The report describes administrator training procedures that used a train the trainer model, with the District Administrators attending regional training and the materials available online through the FSA portal as well as in hard copy (p. 11). A description of procedures to handle irregularities is provided. (p. 17).</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 14FSA Vol7:</b> An independent review of the ramifications of the technology issues in 2014-15 is included in the report found on [pdf #] pages 339-524. Recommendations 4.1-4.3 (pp. 44-442 [103-104]) speak directly to evaluating and revising test administration procedures and materials.</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 21FSA1.</b> (Also applies to other TAMs for 2015-16. <b>Evidence 21FSA2, 3, and 5</b> are similarly structured and detailed.) The TAM for fall/winter <b>2015-16</b> EOC &amp; ELA retakes (G10 &amp; G11) contains information about setting and materials for the administration, including for paper-based (pp. 5-8). Instructions for resolving technical issues are provided and Help Desk contact information is given (p.8). Policies for administration, including how to maintain security and deal with and report irregularities and security breaches are provided (pp. 9-15). Administrators</p>	<p><b>ELA/Math</b></p> <p>Vol. 5 of the 2014-15 technical report describes test administration procedures. Instead, 2015-16 materials were provided as evidence to show that issues with the 2014-15 administration had been addressed.</p> <p>Most material is for 2015-16. The 2014-15 test had administration issues, and the materials provided for 2015-16 illustrate that FL has addressed these issues and the 2015-16 materials adequately address the requirements of this critical element. The tie between the recommendations in Vol.7 and the 2015-16 materials could have been made more apparent for the reviewer,</p> <p><b>Science</b></p> <p>No additional comments</p> <p><b>Both Tests</b></p> <p>Florida has submitted adequate evidence that it has met requirements for test administration.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR FLORIDA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>must sign a Test Administration and Security Agreement and Test Administrator Prohibited Activities Agreement (p.16). Detailed instructions are given for preparing for the test (pp. 16-21); conducting the administration, including test-specific scripts and checklists (pp. 22-95); and wrapping up after the test (p. 96). Detailed instruction are provided for the school assessment coordinator, including providing training for TAs and proctors (pp. 97-107); district assessment coordinators, including providing training for SACs and technology coordinators (pp. 108-113). Instructions for administering accommodations to students with accommodations indicated on an IEP or 504 plan and to ELs are found in Appendix A (pp. 115-122). It appears that trained proctors and test administrators administer all accommodations that may have security implications.</p> <p><b>Evidence 23AIR1a and 1b:</b> Slides from 2014-15 training for the TA interface and TIDE system are provided.</p> <p><b>Evidence 23AIR1-5 and 24AIR1</b> are materials from <b>2015-16</b> to show how FL addressed issues involved in the 2014-15 administration. Slides from TA &amp; student interface training session and the TA and TIDE User Guides (1, 2, &amp; 3) describes the technology and procedures for registration and implementation in detail; a webinar (4) provides updates trainers can use in their training and printed Q&amp;A (5) is provided from the webinar. 24AIR1 is the instructions for downloading the test browser and includes help desk information.</p> <p><u>Science</u></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 FLORIDA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p><b>Science Evidence 14a</b> – 2015 Technical Report, pp. 33-37 provides a description of who must take the assessments, assessment delivery format, and accommodations offered.</p> <p><b>Science Evidence 20</b> – Student Enrollment Tool Power Point (Student Test Data Management Tool – Pearson Access) are instructions for using the online system.</p> <p><b>Science Evidence 21</b> – Grades 5 &amp; 8 Science Test Administration Manual has detailed instructions and scripts for administering the test, including accommodations for SWDs and ELs.</p> <p><b>Science Evidence 23</b> – Testing Platform Training Power Point provide instructions for test administrators.</p> <p><b>Science Evidence 23a</b> - Test Platform Training PowerPoint 2 provides instructions for preparing for testing</p> <p><b>Science Evidence 23R</b> – Spring 2015 EOC &amp; Retake Training Materials – power point with specific instructions in for Bio 1 administration including assuring that students practice with the technology and tools</p> <p><b>Science Evidence 23S</b> – Spring 2015 Gr 5 &amp; 8 Science Training Materials -- power point with specific instructions for G5 &amp; 8 administration</p> <p><b>Science Evidence 24</b> – Technology Specifications are provided.</p> <p><b>Science Evidence 24a</b> - Infrastructure Readiness</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 FLORIDA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>Guide provides information to allow technology coordinators to check their systems to make sure they are ready for testing.</p> <p><u>All Tests</u></p> <p><b>Evidence 18:</b> Shows accommodations FAQs for 2015-16 administration.</p> <p><b>Evidence 19:</b> The 2015 accommodations manual includes participation guidelines and a process for determining what accommodations students with disabilities and English learners should have access to as well as a description of available accommodations, with a checklist for determining access needs relative to computer-based testing.</p>	
<b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b>		
No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR FLORIDA**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p><b>Evidence 25FSA</b> – Overview of Test Administration Monitoring</p> <p><b>Evidence 21FSA5</b> - Spring/Summer 2016 FSA Computer-Based Test Administration Manual</p> <p><b>Evidence 37</b> – Test Administration Incident Report Form</p>	<p>“The FDOE does not directly monitor test administration at school sites, but relies on district staff to implement statewide policies and procedures, ensuring that all requirements are met locally.”</p> <p>School assessment coordinators are responsible for ensuring administration procedures are followed at their school and that secure materials are tracked and handled securely at all times, and are to report any irregularities to their district assessment coordinators. The district assessment coordinator will then contact the FDOE for guidance and to report the issue. FDOE does not collect any forms or documentation to show that school followed proper procedure; we collect evidence or reports of violations/irregularities only. However, there are certain security forms and documentation that schools are required to either store at the school or return to the district for verification. If needed for an investigation, this documentation should be available for inquiring parties; if it is not, the school would be in violation of our requirements.”</p> <p>It is not clear that FDOE conducts any regular monitoring of test administration, even at the district level; the materials provided focus on TA for districts (annual meeting, debrief, monthly conference calls). Districts are required to report testing irregularities (Spring/Summer 2016 FSA Computer-Based Test Administration Manual) and FDOE determines whether any incident requires further investigation.</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 FLORIDA**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
<p>The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that Florida monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Florida**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p><u>ELA/Math</u></p> <p><b>Evidence 14SFAVol.5</b> contains a brief description of security procedures for the 2014-15 test (pp. 16-17), referring the reader to the TAM for more detail.</p> <p><b>Evidence 14SFAVol.7</b> includes an independent study of the issues that arose in the 2014-15 administration. The report did not include any information that would lead to questioning the overall security procedures used during testing.</p> <p><b>Evidence 21FSA5</b> is the Spring 2016 Test Administration Manual. As noted in the overview (and in CE 2.3 notes), the manual contains information about test security policies and procedures for maintaining security and reporting any irregularities or breaches, as well as form that are used to document that security procedures are followed and situation s that might affect security (e.g., accommodations used). Florida’s statute on test security, 1008.24, and the FSBE rule on test security, 6A-10.042, are included in an appendix.</p> <p><u>Science</u></p> <p><b>Evidence 35</b> is the TAM for the winter 2015 EOC Bio assessment includes security procedures and forms.</p> <p><b>Evidence 21</b> is the TAM for 2015 grade 5 and 8 and includes appropriate security procedures for PBT.</p>	<p><b>All Tests</b></p> <p>Evidence presented for <b>2015-16</b> is to illustrate how FL is moving forward after the testing issues in 201-15.</p> <p>Florida has submitted adequate evidence that it has met requirements for test security.</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 Florida**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p><u>Both Tests</u>  <b>Evidence 36b</b> is the rule governing security practices and procedures.</p> <p><b>Evidence 37</b> is a form provided to LEAs for reporting test administration irregularities and incidents that includes spaces for reporting specifics and any local action or resolution of the incident.</p>	
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b>                      No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Florida

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results;</li> <li>• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>• To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p>For integrity of test materials, see CE 2.5.</p> <p><u>ELA/Math</u>  <b>Evidence 14 FSA Vol.6</b>, p 24 (3.1.4) includes minimize group size rules (n=10) for reporting that protect PII.</p> <p><u>Science</u>            Evidence 39 specified a minimum n size of 10 (p. 56) for public reporting to protect PII.</p> <p><u>All Tests</u>  <b>Evidence 38</b> is an appendix to assessment contracts that specifies procedures contractors must follow to protect personally identifiable information</p>	<p>Florida has submitted adequate evidence that it has met requirements for protecting data integrity and privacy.</p>
<b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b>		
No additional evidence is required		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Florida

### SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>[Most of the evidence is the same as submitted for CE 2.1 and 2.2 and is not repeated here -- BPs, alignment report, etc. New evidence used in the review will be listed.]</p> <p>For alignment and other indicators of content evidence for validity, see sections 2.1 and 2.2</p> <p><u>ELA/Math</u></p> <p><b>Evidence 14FSA Vol4</b> (pp. 4-6) describes the sources/types of evidence that is used to support validity related to the FSA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Relationship between content and intended construct (alignment, FA, cog labs on TEIs)</li> <li>2. Fit between targeted construct and actual nature of examinee performance</li> <li>3. Relationship between test items/components to construct (internal structure)</li> <li>4. Relationships of scores to external variables</li> <li>5. The intended and unintended consequences of test use</li> </ol> <p>For 2014-15, test were developed using items from Utah’s SAGE assessment and some existing FL items. Chapter 4 (pp 27-29) shows number of items per reporting category, and <b>Evidence 14FSA Vol2</b> Chapter 2 (pp 3+) shows match of item distribution to blueprint specifications by reporting</p>	<p><b>ELA/Math</b></p> <p>While FL states in the notes section that it has a plan to increase item development to address deficiencies in the 2015-16-focused alignment study, the plan itself was not submitted. (Evidence 17ME does not address alignment gaps since it was prepared before the study.)</p> <p>No evidence of alignment of the writing test to standards or assessment of speaking and listening standards was found.</p> <p><b>All Tests</b></p> <p>We recommend that FL use a comparable structure for its validity argument across all test forms.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Florida**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>category. No formal alignment study was conducted on the 2014-15 forms.</p> <p><u>Science</u></p> <p><b>Evidence 14a</b> (technical report) notes the validity argument for the science assessments, which consists of the following elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Scoring Validity Evidence</li> <li>2. Generalization Validity Evidence</li> <li>3. Extrapolation Validity Evidence</li> <li>4. Implication Validity Evidence</li> </ol> <p>For alignment and other indicators of content evidence for validity, see sections 2.1 and 2.2</p>	
<b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of alignment of the writing assessment to standards in all grades</li> <li>• Evidence of assessment and alignment of writing standards in Grade 3</li> <li>• Evidence of assessing all ELA standards, including speaking and listening, unless a waiver request has been approved</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Florida**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>ELA/Math</u></p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 14SFA Vol 7 Appendix</b> is part of a report of cognitive laboratories conducted by AIR for Smarter Balanced on various types of TEIs. No results of the cog labs are given, however. The proposition from <b>ELA/Math Evidence 14FSA Vol4</b> (pp. 4-6) is that the results apply to the FSA because the same types of TEIs are used but a direct connection is not given. (<b>Evidence 14SFA Vol 7</b> contains the entire report beginning on [pdf #] p.555.)</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 13FSA The 2015-16</b> alignment report shows experts judgment that DOK level 3 (strategic thinking) is measured by some items.</p> <p><b>ELA and Math Evidence Series 09 Item Specifications:</b> For reading and math assessment limits and response mechanisms/item types are given by standard(s). For reading only, task demands are also given.</p> <p><u>Science</u></p> <p><b>Evidence 08s</b> – Test Design Summary, pp. 4-5 show proportion of DOK levels required by form</p> <p><b>Evidence #'s 09s1, 09s2, and 09s3</b> – Test Item Specs for Grades 5 &amp; 8 Science, and Biology EOC show proportion of DOK levels required by form</p> <p><b>Evidence 13</b> – Independent Alignment Study</p>	<p><u>ELA/Math</u></p> <p>Much of the same evidence shown for 3.1 (and 2.1 and 2.2) is repeated here. We are not sure how each piece of evidence is intended to relate to the CE. Not all is applicable, and applicable evidence is not specified.</p> <p>The state would need to show how the SBAC cog lab evidence applies to FSA. If only same item type (not content), may be ok for evidence that item type does not interfere, but still not evidence that desired processes are being measured.</p> <p>Alignment evidence is contributory, but it does not directly address whether educators believe desired/targeted processes are being tapped.</p> <p><u>All Tests</u></p> <p>Evidence that intended cognitive processes are assessed is not sufficient – e.g., through cognitive labs of illustrative task types, expert judgment of what cognitive skills are being tapped, or empirical of the relationship between the item responses and other assessments that tap intended processes.</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 Florida**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>indicated some weaknesses in DOK level match (see CE 2.2)</p> <p><b>Evidence 14a</b> – 2015 Technical Report, pp.15-17; 121 summarize the test development process and review procedures</p> <p><b>Evidence 15</b> – Item Writer Training Material (&amp; general presentation #15b)</p> <p><b>Evidence 16</b> – Science Expert Review Material shows that item were reviewed for scientific appropriateness and accessibility. No information about whether cognitive processes required to respond to items were also reviewed.</p> <p><b>Evidence 39cc</b> – Cognitive Complexity Overview shows that depth of knowledge is considered in item development.</p>	
<b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that intended cognitive processes are assessed in all subject areas</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Florida**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>ELA/Math</u></p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 14FSA Vol4</b> Chapter 5 addresses evidence based on internal structure (pp 32-57). Tables 23 – 28 [29-34] show [disattenuated] correlations among reporting categories within content area for each grade levels and for accommodated forms separately. A CFA analysis is described on pp. 46-55. MPlus was the primary package used, with an R package used for cross-validation or to supplement MPlus if MPlus didn’t converge. For all but 2 tests, the second-order factor model converged. For these tests, a first-factor model with correlated factors was identified. Fit indices all final models indicated good fit. Evaluation of local independence (pp 55-57) also supported the use of a unidimensional measurement model.</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 14FSA Vol1</b> DIF analyses (pp 20-23) for male/female, white, African-America, White/Hispanic, SWD/not SWD, and EL/not ELL were conducted using M-H procedures and items were classified into one of 3 categories (A-C, with C exhibiting the most DIF) depending on degree of DIF found. Items that fell into the C category were reviewed by content experts &amp; psychometricians. Item fit (pp. 25-27) was evaluated and items with poor fit reviewed to determine whether to keep them in the score calculation.</p> <p><u>Science</u></p>	<p>Much of the same evidence shown for 3.1 and 3.2 (and 2.1 and 2.2) is repeated here. We are not sure how this evidence is intended to relate to the CE. Not all is applicable, and applicable evidence is not specified.</p> <p><b>ELA/Math</b></p> <p>For tables, specifying n students would be helpful.</p> <p>Replicability of factor structure on subsequent forms would be useful evidence to collect, and evaluation of results could provide additional validity evidence.</p> <p><b>Science</b></p> <p>No additional comments</p> <p>Florida has submitted adequate evidence that it has met requirements for validity evidence based on internal structure.</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 Florida**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p><b>Science Evidence 14a</b> – 2015 Technical Report pp 24-describes results of DIF analyses for African American, Hispanic, and female focal groups of field test, and specifies that items exhibiting C DIF not be used unless absolutely necessary and items exhibiting B DIF should be reviewed by content DIF. pp. 81-85 describes the unidimensional measurement model used to scale the tests. Pages 112-114: PCA results indicate that the assessments are unidimensional. Second order CFA results indicate that the specified model fit the data.</p> <p><b>Science Evidence 14YB</b> – The Yearbook shows DIF results (e.g., page 21) and scree plots from the PCA are shown (p. 65, pdf p 151).</p>	
<b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b>		
No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Florida**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 14FSA Vol7</b> An AIR report of the relationship of scores on state tests to NAEP scores (pp 275-302) shows that (pp 289-294) ELA G4, NAEP Levels Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced correspond to, respectively, FL levels 2, 3, 4, and 5. For ELA G8, NAEP Levels Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Proficient correspond to, respectively, FL levels 2, 3, 4, and 5. For Math G4, NAEP Levels Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Proficient correspond to, respectively, FL levels 2, 3, 4, and 5. For Math G48, NAEP Levels Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Proficient correspond to, respectively, FL levels 2, 3, 4, and 5.</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 14FSA Vol7 NB</b> is a ppt presentation of the report referenced above.</p> <p><u>Science</u></p> <p><b>Evidence 39S</b> consists of tables showing the relationship between FL G5 for level 4+ and TIMSS G4 advanced; FL G8 level 3+ and 4+ and NAEP G8 proficient +.</p>	<p><b>ELA/Math</b></p> <p>AIR analyses show a positive relationship b/w NAEP scores &amp; FL scores in G4 &amp; G8.</p> <p>No other evidence is presented (e.g., comparison of subscore relationships within content area to those across content areas would be relatively simple; CFA of math &amp; ELA together). Other evidence as listed in guidance is needed. Evidence as a whole is somewhat weak.</p> <p><b>Science</b></p> <p>No evidence in addition to relationship of proportions at different cut scores for TIMMS and NAEP is provided. Other evidence as listed in guidance is needed. Evidence as a whole is somewhat weak.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More evidence of relationships with other variables as specified in the guidance is needed. Relationships to NAEP at two grade levels (ELA/Math) and TIMMS/NAEP (Science) are not sufficient.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Florida

### SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>ELA/Math</u></p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 14FSA Vol4</b> Chapter 3 addresses the reliability of the 2014-15 FSA (pp 8-26). Reliability coefficients that take into account that there are different types of items on the tests were calculated, using 2 categories of item type, in addition to coefficient <math>\alpha</math>. Tables 7 to 9 (pp 11-12) show coefficients for each ELA, Math and EOC online, paper, and accommodated form. Coefficients were reasonable, ranging from .82 to .94 across coefficient type. Cronbach and stratified alpha and Feldt-Raju coefficients for demographic subgroups are shown in Appendix A and are slightly smaller than or similar to full group coefficient, for the most part (no n’s were given). Marginal reliability coefficients were .9 or above, except for math G8 and Alg 2, which had coefficients of .88 and .86 respectively.</p> <p>CSEMs plots are shown in Figures 2 through 4 (pp 16-18). Math G8, Alg 1 and Alg 2 had relatively large standard errors at a larger range of the lower scores on the scale than would be desired. Table 11 shows CSEMs at each cut score: the SEM at the level 4 cut score are similar to others for these 3 tests (Math G8, Alg 1 and 2).</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 14FSA Vol7</b> Pages [pdf #] 2-4 contains classification accuracy analyses. Analyses of classification consistency were not reported.</p>	<p><b>ELA/Math</b></p> <p>All in all, the assessments appear adequately reliable, although evidence of decision consistency was not provided.</p> <p><b>Science</b></p> <p>No additional comments</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 Florida**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p><u>Science</u></p> <p><b>Science Evidence 14a</b> – 2015 Technical Report, pp. 97-107 describe computational procedures.</p> <p><b>Science Evidence 14YB</b> – Yearbook for FCAT 2.0 and NGSSS EOCs (2015), Reliability and Classification Accuracy Reports, p 57 shows reliability indices for G5 and G8 overall and for subgroups. Indices range from .83 to .91 for subgroups and are ~.90 overall. Overall marginal reliabilities are similar. Decision consistency and accuracy are reported on p 59. For EOC Biology, pp 142-143 shows reliability indices for each form of the test, overall and for subgroups. Indices are reasonable for overall and for subgroups. Decision consistency and accuracy are reported on p 144 and are reasonable.</p>	
<b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of decision consistency for ELA/Math – required by bullet 3 but not provided.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Florida

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>ELA/Math</u></p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 14FSA Vol1</b> DIF analyses for major subgroups, including SWDs and ELLs, are described in 5.2. Less than 1% of math &amp; EOC items and less than 1.9% of items exhibited DIF at the C level (p. 22).</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 14FSA Vol4</b> Chapter 7 states that AIR item writers receive training on principles of UD (p. 60).</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 14FSA Vol2</b> Page 17 describes that bias/sensitivity committees review items and provide feedback to content review committees.</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 15ME</b> Training slides have evidence of training in UD, avoiding bias, and accessibility.</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 16 General, 17ME, 18, and 19</b> – see notes in 2.1 and 2.2</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Ev 18 and 19</b> – accommodations FAQs and manuals show accommodations allowed.</p> <p><u>Science</u></p> <p><b>Science Evidence #'s 09s1, 09s2, and 09s3</b> – Test Item Specifications for Grades 5 &amp; 8 Science, and Biology EOC include mention of UD, review for bias and sensitivity.[e.g., page 17 in 09s1]</p>	<p>Also see notes in 2.1, 2.2 and 5.3</p> <p>Florida has submitted adequate evidence that it has met requirements for fairness and accessibility.</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 Florida**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p><b>Science Evidence 14a</b> – 2015 Technical Report, p. 16 indicates that bias and sensitivity reviews are conducted and pp 19-21 describes these reviews by educators and community members (no evidence of panel composition is given). pp 24-describes results of DIF analyses for African American, Hispanic, and female focal groups of field test, and specifies that items exhibiting C DIF not be used unless absolutely necessary and items exhibiting B DIF should be reviewed by content DIF.</p> <p><b>Science Evidence 14YB</b> – Yearbook for FCAT 2.0 and NGSSS EOCs (2015) shows DIF results (e.g., page 21, 28).</p> <p><b>Science Evidence 15</b> – Item Writer Training Material includes lists of potential sources of bias (e.g., 15_0 slide 31++)</p> <p><b>Science Evidence 16</b> – Science Expert Review Material shows that experts review items for appropriateness and accessibility.</p>	
<b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b>		
No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Florida**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>ELA/Math</u></p> <p><b>ELA/Math 14SFA Vol4</b> CSEMs plots are shown in Figures 2 through 4 (pp 16-18). Math G8, Alg 1 and Alg 2 had relatively large standard errors at a larger range of the lower scores on the scale than would be desired. Table 11 shows CSEMs at each cut score: the SEM at the level 3 cut score are a bit higher, but close to others, for these 3 tests (Math G8, Alg 1 and 2).</p> <p><b>ELA/Math 14SFA Vol1</b> Pages 42-47 show the ranges of item difficulties across forms.</p> <p><u>Science</u></p> <p><b>Science Evidence 14YB</b> – Yearbook for FCAT 2.0 and NGSSS EOCs (2015) has p-value summary statistics on page 21 (G5 and G8) and page 87 (Biology), indicating items cover the full range of difficulty, although CSEMs are larger at the ends of the performance continuum. [</p> <p><b>Science FCAT 2.0 &amp; FL EOC 2015 Supplemental Final</b> shows p values for all items.</p>	<p>For content-related/development evidence, see CE 2.1 and 2.2.</p> <p>CSEM plots or TIFs for science would be useful.</p> <p>Florida has submitted adequate evidence that it has met requirements for assessing the full performance continuum.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Florida**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>ELA/Math</u></p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 14FSA Vol. 1</b> Section 8, Scoring (pp. 49-54) describes the models used for scoring. The FSA conducts pattern scoring using 3PL and GPC models. Rules for determining lowest and highest obtainable theta are given. For spring 2015, FSA yielded T scores (transformation of theta scores with mean 50, sd 10) and percentile scores. Scale scores on a vertical scale were reported for ELA and Math, and within-test scaled scores were reported for EOC tests. Students also received performance level scores and scores on reporting categories. (p. 54)</p> <p>Section 10, Quality Control for Data, Analyses, Scoring, and Score Reports (pp. 58-59). Two AIR psychometricians independently conducted analyses, and analyses were confirmed by an outside third party contractor (HumRRO). Prior to administration, mock data is used to check the accuracy of MLEs. Score reports were also checked using dummy data.</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 14FSA Vol. 6</b> – FSA Technical Report 2014-15; Section 1.1, Overview of Florida’s Score Reports. Sample reports in this volume show T scores, percentile scores, raw reporting category scores (p 18). Page 15 indicates that districts received student achievement levels in their reports.</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 14FSA Vol. 1</b> See CE 4.7 for quality assurance procedures.</p>	<p><b>ELA/Math</b></p> <p>Student reports did not provide achievement level scores– only T scores percentiles, raw reporting categories.</p> <p>We suggest including the number of points per category rated to help in interpretation of % agreement.</p> <p><b>Science</b></p> <p>No additional comments</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 Florida**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 14FSA Vol. 4</b> , pages 21 forward has information about rater agreement on the writing prompts and includes both human-human and machine-human (when appropriate) agreement rates via % and kappa.</p> <p><u>Science</u></p> <p><b>Science Evidence 14a</b> – 2015 Technical Report Measurement models (3PL) and scaling procedures are described on pages 81-88, which a check on scale drift. Equating procedures are described on pages 89-92. FL uses both pre-equating and post-equating procedures using common item equating. QC for equating is described on pages 134-137 and includes independent verification. Details of equating are found in the Supplemental Report and the Year Book. Scores are reported according to academic achievement level standards (p. 42-50).</p> <p>(No hand scoring in science)</p>	
<b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ELA/Math – evidence that students will receive score information relative to achievement level standards post 2014-15</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Florida**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>ELA/Math</u></p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 14FSA Vol2 FL</b> administered multiple forms of its EOC tests [accommodated forms are addressed in 4.6].</p> <p>ELA/Math Evidence 15 CalSp The calibration specifications for 2015 (p.10) shows, in Table 4, that multiple forms of Alg 1, Alg 2 and Geometry were administered. The specs call for concurrent calibration of these forms.</p> <p><u>Science</u></p> <p>See evidence for scaling in CE 4.4, which includes evidence of equating procedures</p>	<p>For content-related evidence, see CE 2.1 and 2.2</p> <p>Florida has submitted adequate evidence that it has met requirements for multiple assessment forms.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Florida**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>• Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>ELA/Math</u></p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 14FSA Vol. 1</b> – FSA Technical Report 2014-15, Section 3.2, Accommodations for FSA states that paper forms are available as an accommodation.</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 14FSA Vol. 2</b> – FSA Technical Report 2014-15, <b>Appendix B</b>, Mathematics and EOC Blueprints are for the online forms. <b>Section 4.4</b>, Paper Accommodation Form Construction (pp. 27-29) TEIs that could not be rendered on paper were replaced by m-c items or other TEIs, from the same reporting category if possible. Summary item stats for online and pp were compared (pp 28-29 gives G5 math as an example). TCCs, TIFs, and CSEM curves were compared for online and PP forms (p. 28) [(pp. 25-27 shows G5 math as an example)].</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 14FSA Vol. 4</b> – FSA Technical Report 2014-15; Section 3, Reliability (pp. 8-26) shows similar reliability indices for both versions; Section 5.1, Correlations among Reporting Category Scores (pp. 32-46) show correlations for online and PBT were similar but a bit lower for PBT; Section 6, Evidence of Comparability (pp. 58-59) summarizes information from Vol. 2 above.</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 15CalSp</b> – Calibration Specifications, p. 6 states that the accommodated forms are equated to the online scale using common item equating ( p 10) and the full population tested on the accommodated form (pp 6+ table).</p>	<p>No evidence was submitted regarding device comparability.</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 Florida**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p><u>Science</u></p> <p><b>Science Evidence 14a</b> – 2015 Technical Report, p. 37 notes the availability of a paper form as an accommodation for Biology 1. Since the online form consists of all MC items, no substitution of items is needed on PBT.</p>	
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation that assessments delivered by different types of devices are comparable in terms of features such as screen resolution, etc.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Florida**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>ELA/Math</u></p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 13FSA</b> – FSA Alignment Report* see notes in CE 2.1, 2.2</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 14FSA Vol. 2</b> – FSA Technical Report 2014-15; Section 4, Test Construction describes procedures for content and technical review of the assessment during test construction [other sections of the technical manual provide evidence of technical analyses of quality of the assessment]</p> <p><u>All Tests</u></p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 40</b> – 2015 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Agenda, Minutes shows that FL has a TAC with which it discusses and seeks advice on technical issues.</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 41</b> – TAC Members, FSA &amp; FCAT 2.0, and EOC Assessments shows affiliations and expertise of TAC members.</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 43</b> – Academic Content Standards Review Cycle shows how standards and various implementations are scheduled [for these tests, shows that assessment is in 2014-15]</p> <p><u>Science</u></p> <p><b>Science Evidence 13</b> – Independent Alignment Study see notes in CE 2.1, 2.2</p>	<p>Florida has submitted adequate evidence that it has met requirements for technical analysis and ongoing maintenance.</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 Florida**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p><b>Science Evidence 14a</b> – 2015 Technical Report describes procedures for maintaining technical quality throughout.</p> <p><b>Science Evidence 42</b> - Scale Drift Study conducted in 2015 illustrates ongoing investigations of technical quality.</p> <p><b>Science Evidence 44</b> – Contract for Statewide Science Assessments, pp. 164-169 of 578 of the PDF file shows the intent of the department to maintain technical quality.</p>	
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Florida

### SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs;</li> <li>• Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;</li> <li>• Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS</p> <p><u>All Tests</u></p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 06OPC</b> – One Percent Cap Requirement for SWDs Tested on FAA describes procedures for waiving 1% cap for proficient on</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 06TAP</b> – Statewide Assessment for SWDs, Technical Assistance Paper describes requirements for assessing SWDs, role of IEP team, accommodations, and who can take the AA-AAS</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 07</b> - 6A-1.09422 Statewide, Standardized Assessment Program Requirements; is also found in Ev 06 TAP – includes who must take the state test</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 18</b> – Assessment Accommodations FAQ are clear</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 19</b> – Statewide Assessment Accommodations lists information</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 45</b> – Developing Quality Individual Educational Plans, pp. 136-145 of 284 includes information about how to determine which state assessment a student should take, information on accommodations, consequences of taking the AA-AAS or using non-standard accommodations, diploma options, etc.</p>	<p><u>ELA/Math</u></p> <p>Although manual is from 2015-16, we are considering it as evidence as noted earlier.</p> <p>Florida has submitted adequate evidence that it has met requirements for procedures for including SWDs.</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 Florida**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</li> <li>• Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments);</li> <li>• The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Science Evidence 21 and ELA/Math Evidence 21</b>  <b>FSA</b> Test administration manuals provide information about what accommodations are available and how to provide them.</p> <p><u>ELA/Math</u></p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 14FSA Vol. 5</b> - FSA Technical Report Year 2014-2015, Test Administration; Section 2.1 and 2.2 specify who must take the test and what/how accommodations are provided to students with and IEP or 504 plan. <b>Appendix B</b> is the admin manual and includes information on providing accommodations.</p>	
<p><b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Florida**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS</p> <p><u>All Tests</u></p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 07</b> - 6A-1.09422 Statewide, Standardized Assessment Program Requirements includes who must take the state test</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 07EL</b> – District English Language Learner Plan – Template includes a section on how ELs are assessed on the statewide assessment, with accommodations if needed.</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 18</b> – Assessment Accommodations FAQ (see notes for CE 5.1)</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 18ELrule</b> – Rule 6A.6.09091, Accommodations for ELLs details what kinds of accommodations can be provided to ELs and includes assistance in heritage language (to not interfere with construct assessed).</p> <p><u>ELA/Math</u></p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 14FSA Vol. 5</b> - FSA Technical Report Year 2014-2015, Test Administration; Section 2.1, Eligible Students; and Section 2.2, Testing Accommodations specify who must take the test and what/how accommodations are provided to students. Appendix B (pp. 211-219 of the appended Test Administration Manual in Appendix B) pp 218-19 lists accommodations for ELLs.</p> <p><u>Science</u></p> <p><b>Science Evidence 18UAR</b> – Unique Accommodations Request Form provides a way to</p>	<p>Florida has submitted adequate evidence that it has met requirements for procedures for including ELLs.</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 Florida**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	request accommodations that may be needed but not listed in the state accommodations.  <b>Science Evidence 19</b> – Statewide Assessment Accommodations (see notes for CE 5.1)	
<b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b>		
No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Florida**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;</li> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> <li>• Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p> <p><b>Evidence 05 Florida Statute 1008.22</b> - Student assessment program for public schools; (3)(c)3.</p> <p><b>Evidence 06 Rule 6A-1.0943</b> Statewide Assessment for Students with Disabilities</p> <p><b>Evidence 18ELRule Rule 6A-6.09091,</b> Accommodations for ELLs Statewide Assessment Accommodations</p> <p><b>Evidence 07 Rule 6A-1.09422</b> Statewide, Standardized Assessment Program Requirements; (9), (10)</p> <p>See also evidence under CE 5. 1 and 5,2</p>	<p>No evidence was given to show that accommodations are appropriate and effective, do not alter the construct, and allow meaningful interpretation of results and comparisons.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• evidence to show that accommodations are appropriate and effective, do not alter the construct, allow meaningful interpretation of results and comparisons (this can be from existing research or professional judgement when research is not available)</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Florida**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p> <p>Evidence submitted shows that information districts need about accommodations is distributed, but monitoring is not included in that evidence.</p>	<p>According to the notes provided, the SEA does not directly monitor test administration at school sites, but relies on district staff to implement statewide policies and procedures, ensuring that all requirements are met locally.</p> <p>The Overview of Test Administration Monitoring states that the SEA provides policies and resources for monitoring consistent with state policies. No evidence of the resources or evidence of review of local monitoring was provided.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the state requires districts to monitor (such as monitoring instructions and checklists, etc.) and reviews/evaluates that monitoring of test administration for special populations</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Florida

### SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;</li> <li>• The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply;</li> <li>• The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>All Tests</p> <p><b>Evidence 07</b> - 6A-1.09422 Statewide, Standardized Assessment Program Requirements; (5), achievement levels shows that the state formally adopted academic achievement standards, that they apply to all public and secondary school students, and describe levels of achievement as required.</p>	<p>Florida has submitted adequate evidence that it has met requirements for state adoption of academic achievement standards for all students.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p> <p>No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Florida**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>ELA/Math</u></p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 14FSA Vol. 3</b> –describes procedures used to set achievement standards on the FSA. [Section 3.1, Educator Panel Composition (pp. 16-31); Section 3.3, Training (pp. 33-37); and Section 4, Reactor Panel Meeting (pp. 50-54).] Four cut scores were initially recommended by panels of educators (pp 16-31) using a bookmark procedure (p. 16), a widely-accepted approach. A reactor panel consisting of representatives of various educational and other stakeholder groups reviewed the educator recommendations and recommended revisions. Public input was collected on the two panels’ recommendations, and the Commissioner recommended cut scores taking into account all 3 sources of information. The legislature and State Board reviewed the commissioner’s recommendations.</p> <p><b>Evidence 46FSA RD</b> - FSA Rule Development Workshop Presentation, slide 27 shows characteristics of educator panel participants.</p> <p><u>Science</u></p> <p><b>Science Evidence 14a</b> – 2015 Technical Report, pp. 51-69 describes the modified Angoff procedure used for recommending standards in 2012, reactor panel input, and the final results determined by the SBE based on the Commissioner’s recommendation. Page 52 describes criteria for the panel selection, which include educators with</p>	<p><b>ELA/Math</b></p> <p>Characteristics of educator panel participants do not include experience teaching SWDs or ELs.</p> <p>The process used by educator panel is technically sound and is adequate.</p> <p><b>Science</b></p> <p>No additional comments</p> <p>Florida has submitted adequate evidence that it has met requirements for achievement standards setting.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Florida**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>experience with SWDs and ELLs.</p> <p><b>Science Evidence 51</b> - Standard Setting Detailed Summary provides similar information as found in the technical report.</p> <p>Materials used in the full standard setting process include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Science Evidence 49s</b>, Rule Development Workshop Feedback Form (for public input)</li> <li>• <b>Science Evidence 50</b> - Rule Development Workshop Feedback Survey</li> <li>• <b>Science Evidence 52</b> - Standard Setting Reactor Panel Feedback Summary</li> <li>• <b>Science Evidence 53</b> - Educator Panel General Session Presentation</li> </ul> <p><b>Science Evidence 48</b> - Standard Setting Recommendations for FCAT 2.0 Science (Grades 5 &amp; 8) and Biology 1 shows the cut scores.</p>	
<b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b>		
No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Florida**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>ELA/Math</u></p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 14FSA Vol. 3</b> –describes a \ procedure used to recommend achievement standards on the FSA that demonstrates alignment with content standards. ALDs were developed based on the content standards (p. 15) and vertical articulation was conducted by informing standard setting panelists during the process.</p> <p><b>Evidence 46FSA RD</b> - FSA Rule Development Workshop Presentation shows slides 08-115 show how the FL achievement standards relate to NAEP, TIMSS, and PISA to show that the cuts are rigorous.</p> <p><u>Science</u></p> <p><b>Science Evidence 14a</b> – 2015 Technical Report, page 51, describes the introduction of data from NAEP and external measures of college readiness into the modified Angoff process.</p> <p><b>Evidence 51</b> – Standard Setting Detailed Summary describes ALD development on page 2, showing that the ALDs are related to the academic content standards.</p>	<p>Florida has submitted adequate evidence that it has met requirements for challenging and aligned achievement standards.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Florida**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>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"> <li>• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;</li> <li>• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;</li> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>All Tests</u></p> <p>Section 4 of this review addresses validity and reliability of the scores.</p> <p><u>ELA/Math</u></p> <p>Although evidence of public reporting was not provided in this section, peer reviewers found 2015-16 state-level reporting publicly available on the FDOE website (e.g., <a href="http://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/5668/urlt/89FSA16.pdf">http://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/5668/urlt/89FSA16.pdf</a>) that meets the criteria of this Critical Element. (Peers could not find evidence of subgroup reporting for 2014-15 for ELA/Math.)</p> <p><b>ELA/Math Evidence 11FSA</b> - Understanding FSA Reports, an interpretive guide, shows all the reports delivered by test, format of delivery, and level of reporting, with links to sample reports (Table 1, page 6-7). Reports show student scores by reporting categories (subscores). Summary reports did not include achievement level information and percent not tested. This information is also in Evidence 14FSA Vol. 6 - FSA Technical Report Year 2014-2015_3.31.16_Final.)</p> <p><u>Science</u></p> <p><b>Science Evidence 11</b> – Understanding FCAT 2.0 Reports is an interpretive guide that includes descriptions of reports at all levels. Student reports (p. 15; also <b>Evidence 56a</b>) include reporting according to academic achievement standards and includes content area scores (subscores). Reports at the school level are roster-type reports and do not include summary information (p. 19); district level reports include summary information by achievement level and content area.</p>	<p><b>ELA/Math</b></p> <p>No evidence of reporting the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards in 2014-15.</p> <p><b>All Tests</b></p> <p>No evidence that there is a timeline for delivering reports to parents.</p> <p>Evidence was not provided that alternate formats are provided by the state.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Florida

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>descriptors);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</li> <li>• The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Science Evidence 12</b> – Understanding FCAT 2.0 Reports and Understanding EOC Reports is an interpretive guide that includes samples of reports for Biology 1 at all levels. Student reports (p. 15) include reporting according to academic achievement standards and includes content area scores (subscores). Reports at the school level are roster-type reports and do not include summary information (p. 17); district level reports include summary information by achievement level and content area (p. 18).</p> <p><b>Science Evidence 55a and 55b</b> are press packets for G5 and G8 (a) and Bio 1 (b). These describe results of the science assessments for public reporting.</p> <p><b>Science Evidence 57</b> is a notification to districts that results are available.</p> <p><b>Science Evidence 58</b> includes a timeline for reports to districts but not to parents.</p>	
<p><b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of timely delivery of student score reports to parents</li> <li>• Evidence that reports are available in alternate formats</li> <li>• For ELA/math, evidence of current individual student report that shows student achievement in terms of state grade-level achievement standards</li> </ul>		

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